


THIS BOOK
IS FROM
THE LIBRARY OF
Rev. James Leach



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

BIBLICO-THEOLOGICAL
LEXICON
OF
NEW TESTAMENT GREEK.

BY
HERMANN CREMER, D.D.,
PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF GREIFSWALD.

EDIT: 4th
FOURTH ENGLISH EDITION.

WITH SUPPLEMENT.

Translated from the latest German Edition,

BY
WILLIAM URWICK, M.A.

1) EDINBURGH: #
2) T. & T. CLARK, #38 GEORGE STREET.
NEW YORK:
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS.
3) 1895.

PRINTED BY MORRISON AND GIBB,

FOR

T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH.

LONDON: SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, HAMILTON, KENT, AND CO. LIMITED.

NEW YORK: CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS.

TORONTO: THE WILLARD TRACT DEPOSITORY.



TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE.

PROFESSOR CREMER'S Lexicon of New Testament Greek is in Germany considered one of the most important contributions to the study of New Testament Exegesis that has appeared for many years. As is clear from the author's preface, the student must not expect to find in it every word which the New Testament contains. For words whose ordinary meaning in the classics is retained unmodified and unchanged in Scripture, he must resort still to the classical lexicons. But for words whose meaning is thus modified, words which have become the bases and watchwords of Christian theology, he will find this lexicon most valuable and suggestive, tracing as it does their history in their transference from the classics into the Septuagint, and from the Septuagint into the New Testament, and the gradual deepening and elevation of their meaning till they reach the fulness of New Testament thought. The esteem in which the work is held in Germany is evident from the facts that it has procured for the author his appointment as Professor of Theology in the University of Greifswald, that a second edition has been so soon called for, and that a translation of it has appeared in Holland.

The present translation contains several alterations and additions made by Professor Cremer in the sheets of his second edition ; about four hundred errata, moreover, occurring in that edition have been corrected.

WILLIAM URWICK.

49 BELSIZE PARK GARDENS, LONDON, N.W.,

August 1878.

AUTHOR'S PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION

LEXICAL works upon New Testament Greek have hitherto lacked a thorough appreciation of what Schleiermacher calls "the language-moulding power of Christianity." A language so highly elaborated and widely used as was Greek having been chosen as the organ of the Spirit of Christ, it necessarily followed that as Christianity fulfilled the aspirations of truth, the expressions of that language received a new meaning, and terms hackneyed and worn out by the current misuse of daily talk received a new impress and a fresh power. But as Christianity stands in express and obvious antithesis to the *natural* man (using this phrase in a spiritual sense), Greek, as the embodiment and reflection of man's *natural* life in its richness and fulness, presents this contrast in the service of the sanctuary. This is a phenomenon which repeats itself in every sphere of life upon which Christianity enters, not, of course, always in the same way, but always with the same result—namely, that the spirit of the language expands, and makes itself adequate to the new views which the Spirit of Christ reveals. The speaker's or writer's range of view must change as the starting-point and goal of all his judgments change; and this change will not only modify the import and range of conceptions already existing, but will lead to the formation of new conceptions and relationships. In fact, "we may," as Rothe says (*Dogmatik*, p. 238, Gotha 1863), "appropriately speak of a language of the Holy Ghost. For in the Bible it is evident that the Holy Spirit has been at work, moulding for itself a distinctively religious mode of expression out of the language of the country which it has chosen as its sphere, and transforming the linguistic elements which it found ready to hand, and even conceptions already existing, into a shape and form appropriate to itself and all its own." We have a very clear and striking proof of this in New Testament Greek.

A lexical handling of N. T. Greek must, if it is to be really a help to the understanding of the documents of Revelation, be directed mainly to that department of the linguistic store which is necessarily affected by the influence we have described, *i.e.* to the expressions of spiritual life, moral and religious. For other portions of the linguistic treasury the Lexicons of classical Greek suffice. A lexicon of N. T. Greek such as I mean will be mainly *biblico-theological*, examining those expressions chiefly which are of a biblico-theological import. In order to this, it will not be enough to prove by classical quotations that the word in question is used in classical Greek. The range of the conception expressed in its extra-biblical use must be shown, and the affinity or difference of the biblical meaning must be pointed out. Here the ever recurring antithesis between

nature and *spirit* most strikingly appears; and who will venture to deny that the observation and investigation of this will exert an influence, hitherto too often overlooked, upon our understanding of the truths of Revelation? Thus we shall find, for example, as Nägelsbach (*Nachhomerische Theologie*, p. 239) observes, that "it is with this expression (ὁ πέλας, πλησίον) as with many others in which heathen and Christian ideas meet; the old word has the ring of a Christian thought, and is (so to speak) a vessel already prepared to receive it, though it did not before come up to it." Hence, as Ger. v. Zezschwitz in his lucid little treatise (*Profangräcität und biblischer Sprachgeist*) says, "such a lexicon must be a key, thoroughly elaborated, to the essential and fundamental ideas of Christendom." It will likewise show how the common complaint, that many notions with which theology deals are inadmissible, is directed mainly against conceptions that have been alienated from their scriptural basis, that have lost their clearness, and have (if I may use the term) again become *naturalized*. I regret that through lack of necessary helps I have been unable to trace the historical strengthening or weakening which such conceptions have undergone in patristic Greek. A further valuable addition to such a lexicon Schleiermacher names (*Hermeneutik und Kritik*, p. 69), when he says: "A collection of all the various elements in which the language-moulding power of Christianity manifests itself would be an adumbration (a Sciagraphy) of N. T. doctrine and ethics."

The Seventy prepared the way in Greek for the N. T. proclamation of saving truth. Fine as is the tact with which in many cases they endeavoured to fulfil their task (cf. *ᾠσιος*), it must be allowed that their language differs from that of the N. T. as the well-meant and painstaking effort of the pupils differs from the unerring and creative hand of the master (see e.g. *ἐλπίς*). The words by which they rendered Hebrew ideas (for which, indeed, they sometimes simply substituted Greek ideas) had already undergone much modification in ordinary or in scholastic usage (see e.g. *βέβηλος* and *κοινός*). In many cases the Hebrew word answering to the N. T. conception will be something different in the Septuagint. It is a matter of regret that the materials and helps accessible for a thorough review of the Septuagint are so meagre, and that one has to depend for examples almost solely upon a troublesome and laborious search.

The works of Philo and Josephus afford very little help. In them, even more than in the Septuagint, the endeavour is apparent to import Greek ideas and Greek philosophy into Judaistic thought, so that we find no trace of that missionary character of divine revelation, breaking up and sowing anew the profane soil, which so strikingly characterizes N. T. Greek.

Nevertheless we must on no account overlook the manifold and important affinities of N. T. Greek with the language of Jewish religious schools, with post-biblical synagogal Hebrew. See *αἰών*, *βασ. τοῦ Θ.*, *εἰκόν*, etc. "Christianity, as the universal religion, has moulded the form of its announcements alike from Hellenistic, Old Testament, and synagogal materials" (Delitzsch, *Hebräerbrief*, p. 589). Here, as is well known, we

have the most valuable helps. I regret that the lexicon of Dr. T. Levi upon Targums is not yet complete.

The work which, after the labour of nine years, I have now brought to completion is certainly an attempt only, an effort to do, not a result accomplished; it simply prepares the way for a cleverer hand than mine. The lack of such a preparation I have felt step by step throughout. Hardly any even of the commonest N. T. conceptions has received any adequate investigation, biblical or theological, at the hands of the commentators. The commentaries of Tholuck, my dear tutor, form, with a few others, a notable yet solitary exception. I am therefore obliged to pursue my own course, to make my own way, and peradventure often to go wrong. But thus I have learned more and more to admire the unerring tact of the Evangelical Church, who, by the more immediate discernment of faith, learned long before us what we can only confirm as truth by our after labours. It was of no small use to me to be obliged and to be allowed to test these my studies in the practical work of my ministry.

I have but rarely, as in the case of *δόξα*, had to correct the lexicons of classical Greek. As to the arrangement of words, they are placed according to the simplest laws of derivation, so that the review of the linguistic usage and of the scope of the thought denoted might be as little cumbersome as possible. The alphabetical index at the end will facilitate reference. And now: "*quibus parum vel quibus nimium est, mihi ignoscant. Quibus autem satis est, non mihi sed Domino mecum congratulantes agant!*" (Aug. *De Civ. D.* xxii. 30.)

AUTHOR'S PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

THE extraordinarily favourable reception awarded to this first attempt to reform and scientifically to reconstruct N. T. lexicography must of necessity put me to shame, all the more because no one can see so plainly as myself that it is due more to the want which the lexicon was intended to meet, than to the satisfaction which it rendered to that want. I have endeavoured in this new edition, by emendation, enlargement, revisions, and additions of new words, to satisfy in some degree the claims which may and must fairly be set up. Comparatively few articles have been transferred unaltered from the first edition. While in some cases the changes are but small, *e.g.* the revising and multiplication of examples from profane Greek and Holy Scripture, and affecting precision of expression, a considerable number of articles have been either extended or re-written, such as *ἀγαθός*, *ἀγαπᾶν*, *ἄγγελος* (*ἄγγ. κυρίου*), *ἅγιος*, *δίκαιος*, *ἐπιούσιος*, *περιούσιος*, *κύριος*, and many others; and I trust that the commended purity of the work philologically has not been prejudiced by the attempt more thoroughly to investigate the import and worth of the biblical conceptions always with renewed linguistic thoroughness. Special attention has been given to the comparison of synonyms. Concerning *ἅγιος* and its derivatives, I have instituted investigations fundamentally new, and have, I trust, contributed in some degree to the fuller and clearer apprehension of this fundamental and *κατ' ἐξοχὴν* scriptural conception. More than one hundred and twenty new words have been added, among others: *ἄγειν*, *αἰτεῖν*, *ἀκολουθεῖν*, *ἀλληγορεῖν*, *ἀρνεῖσθαι*, *ἀπλοῦς*, *βούλεσθαι*, *βιάζειν*, *γενεά*, *δόγμα*, *εἶδος*, *ἐκών*, *καταδοκία*, *πατήρ*, *πειράζω*, *πρόσωπον*, *ρύεσθαι*, *τάπεινος*, etc. etc. Though I have not thus as yet attained the standard of the desirable, I think that I have somewhat lessened the feeling of being left in the dark, on the part of those using the book. One and another missing word will be found in the list of synonyms compared. The biblico-theological index of subjects can lay no claim to completeness, but may not be unwelcome to some.

I pray God that the work in this its new form may contribute abundantly to increase the knowledge of His glory and joy in His word, and in a small measure to counteract the misuse of the language of Scripture when employed as the fig-leaf of modern unbelief. "*Det nobis et restituat divina gratia Theologiam tam puram, tam efficacem, tam divinam, qualem aliquando vellemus habuisse et coluisse in aeternitatem delati!*" (Weismann, *Inst. theol. exeg. dogm.* p. 31.)

LIST OF AUTHORS, WITH THE EDITIONS REFERRED TO.

- WINER: Grammatik des neut. Sprachidioms. 6th ed. 1855.
- BUTTMANN: Grammatik des neut. Sprachgebrauchs, by Alex. Buttmann. 1859.
- KRUEGER: Griechische Sprachlehre für Schulen, by K. W. Krüger. 3d ed. 1852.
- MATTHIAE: Ausführliche griechische Grammatik, by Aug. Matthiae. 3d ed. 1835.
- CURTIUS, Gramm.: Griechische Schulgrammatik, by Dr. Georg Curtius. 9th ed., Prag 1870.
- CURTIUS: Grundzüge der griechischen Etymologie, by Dr. Georg Curtius. 2d ed. 1866 (3d ed. 1870).
- SCHENKL: Griechisch-deutsches Schulwörterbuch, by Dr. K. Schenkl. 3d issue, Wien 1867. (By far the best of our smaller Greek lexicons, and specially good in the department of etymology.)
- TRENCH: Synonyms of the New Testament, by R. C. Trench, D.D., Archbishop of Dublin. Parts 1 and 2, 1855 and 1863.

LEXICON

OF

NEW TESTAMENT GREEK.

A, as the first letter of the Greek Alphabet, is coupled with *Ω*, the last, in Rev. i. 8 (Rec. Text, i. 11), xxi. 6, xxii. 13, ἐγὼ εἰμι τὸ *A* καὶ τὸ *Ω* (Bengel, Lachm., Tisch., always τὸ ἄλφα); in i. 8, as the words of κύριος ὁ θεός, with the amplification, ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, ὁ παντοκράτωρ; in xxi. 6, as the words of ὁ καθήμενος ἐπὶ τῷ θρόνῳ (cf. iv. 2, 3, v. 1, 7), amplified as ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ τὸ τέλος; in xxii. 13, the words of Jesus (ver. 16), ἐγὼ — *Ω*, πρῶτος καὶ ἔσχατος, ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ τὸ τέλος. It is difficult to decide whether this designation is meant to be more than a figurative and exhaustive description of ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ τὸ τέλος. Jalkut Rub. f. 174: *Adamus totam legem transgressus est ab א usque ad ה*. Ibid. f. 128. 3: *Deus Israelitis dicitur benedicere ab א usque ה, i.e. perfecte*. (Quoted in Wolf, *Curae phil.*, on Rev. i. 8.) According to this view, the designation would correspond to Paul's words, applied in Eph. i. 23 to Christ, ὁ τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν πληρούμενος (cf. 1 Cor. xv. 28, where the reference is to God), or to the words ἐξ αὐτοῦ καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα, used in Rom. xi. 36 of God; cf. the partition of these words between God and Christ in 1 Cor. viii. 6, Col. i. 16, ἐν αὐτῷ (sc. Χριστῷ) ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα . . . τὰ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν ἐκτίσται, inasmuch as the All-including, All-embracing is thus expressed. Hengstenberg justly objects to explaining the expression of mere *existence*: "The great question which then agitated men's minds was the question of *superiority*,—whether the world was to retain the predominance it then claimed and apparently possessed, or the God of the Christians. This question is answered by the words, 'I am the Alpha and the Omega.' Let him who is troubled about the end only ponder the beginning; let him only muse on what the Psalmist says, 'Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever Thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, Thou art God' (Ps. xc. 2), and his anxiety will vanish." Bengel says, "*Sic, magnifico sensu, finis ab origine pendet*;" and in this self-designation of God and Christ he recognises a triumphant protest against all His foes. He also calls attention to the fact that Hebrew and Greek modes of expression often occur side by side in

the Revelation (cf. i. 7: *ναὶ, ἀμήν*), "since it concerns both Jewish and Gentile readers." He points out that thus it is with this expression; that we never find the words *ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ τὸ τέλος* without the *ἐγώ* — Ω (as may be the case with the other amplifications, *πρῶτος καὶ ἔσχατος, ὁ ὢν κ.τ.λ.*); whence it appears that this is the Greek rendering of the Hebraistically conceived *ἐγώ* — Ω (κ — η).—If, however, we seek a more particular reference of the *ἐγώ* — Ω, we might urge its connection with prophecy, such as in i. 7, xxi. 5, xxii. 9, 10, is in every case more or less presented to us; and thus we discover in the expression a comprehensive reference to the prophecy promulgated up to this time, to God's word, Holy Scripture, whose accomplishment is evidently intended to be guaranteed by this self-designation of God and Christ. A similar view was taken by Lampe, *De foed. grat.* ii. 3. 5. Cf. also M. Baumgarten, *Protestant. Warnung*, iii. 1. 189; Offerhaus (in Wolf, *l.c.*), *Christum esse vitam electorum et spiritum Scripturae*. Many monographs on this subject may be seen in Wolf's *Curae*.

Ἄβυσσος, *ον*, from *βυσσός* Ion. = *βυθός*, depth, bottom. Hence, 1. bottomless, properly an adjective; e.g. *ἄβυσσον πέλαγος, βάθος*, even *πλούτος, πρᾶγμα*. As a substantive, *ἡ ἄβυσσος*, signifying, 2. abyss, bottomless depth, it is only used in biblical and eccles. Greek. Once in Diog. Laert. *Epigr.* iv. 27: *χοῦτω κατῆλθες εἰς μέλαιναν Πλουτέως ἄβυσσον*. "*Sed a tempore Platonis . . . hic usus alienus est:*" Fix in Steph. *thes.* In LXX. = *אֵינַן*, Gen. i. 2, vii. 11, viii. 2, Deut. viii. 7 (Job xxxviii. 16, xxviii. 14), Ps. xxxvi. 7, xlii. 8, civ. 6, Isa. li. 10, Ezek. xxvi. 19, xxxi. 4, 15, Amos vii. 4, Ps. cvii. 26 (Suid.: *ὕδατων πλήθος πολὺ*) = *watery deep*; Job xli. 23 = *הַיָּם*. In Deut. xxxiii. 13 it is not an adj., but is to be construed *ἄβυσσοι πηγῶν*. In the N. T., Rom. x. 7, *τίς καταβήσεται εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον; τουτέστιν Χριστὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναγαγεῖν*, the word denotes the *bottomless abyss*, as the *place of the dead*. That the two ideas are very closely allied, may be seen from Job xi. 8, 9, xxxviii. 16, 17, xxviii. 13, 14; and from this easily arose this Pauline application of the Hebrew expression *עַד הַיָּם* (LXX.: *εἰς τὸ πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης*), Deut. xxx. 13, especially since *ἄβυσσος* is so frequently employed as an antithesis to *οὐρανός*; cf. Gen. vii. 11, Job xi. 8, Ps. cvii. 6, and elsewhere. In like manner the expression *ὑποκάτω τῆς γῆς*, Rev. v. 3, 13; see Phil. ii. 10. It is just this antithesis to heaven that makes *ἄβυσσος* a synonym for *ἄδης*, wherein that *remoteness from heaven which is distinctive of Hades* finds full expression.—In Rev. ix. 1, 2, *τὸ φρέαρ τῆς ἀβύσσου*, xx. 1, the depth or abyss appears as the receptacle and prison of destructive powers, over which reigns *ὁ ἄγγελος τῆς ἀβύσσου*, ix. 11. Compare the petition of the demons in Luke viii. 31: *ἵνα μὴ ἐπιτάξῃ αὐτοῖς εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον ἀπελθεῖν*.—In Rev. xvii. 8, xi. 7, *ἀναβαίνειν ἐκ τῆς ἀβύσσου* is said of the beast; xiii. 18.—In eccles. Greek we find e.g. *ἄβυσσος ζητημάτων ἢ γραφῆς*, Chrys. *hom.* 23 in *Act.*; *ὁ θεός, ἄβυσσος ὢν ἀγαθότητος*, Theodoret, *quaest.* 4 in *Gen.*; *ἡ ἀπόγνωσις εἰς αὐτὴν κατάγει τῆς κακίας τὴν ἄβυσσον*, Chrys.; just as *βάθος* is used in the New Test. and by ecclesiastical writers (see Rom. xi. 33, 1 Cor. ii. 10, Rev. ii. 24).

Ἀγαθός, ἡ, όν, good. Derivation uncertain; perhaps connected with γηθέω, ἄγαμαι, ἄγαν. The application of this epithet expresses a recognition alike simple and full, that the thing spoken of is perfect in its kind, so as to produce pleasure and satisfaction. This feeling of pleasure and wellbeing could hardly be left out of consideration even if the word were not akin to γηθέω. Linguistic usage too fully proves this; thus possessions are in various languages called "goods," to express the satisfaction and pleasure which they give, and to designate them as the condition and furtherance of wellbeing. Plato, moreover, not only enumerates health, beauty, riches, power, as *chief goods*; but, on the one hand, designates whatever gives pleasure as *good*; and, on the other hand, sets aside the definition "the good is a ἡδονή" merely by saying that there are also ἡδοναὶ κακαί, and yet good and evil must not be identified (*Rep.* vi. 505 C, D); the terms *good* and *useful*, moreover, are everywhere continually interchanged. Considering universal usage, the same in both ancient and modern languages, we may venture to affirm that the fundamental conception of the *good* is *wellbeing, pleasure*. It is the wellbeing and pleasure of an existence perfect according to its kind, which so sympathetically affects him who has to do with it (let it be remembered that the Greeks even brought καλός into the closest possible connection with ἀγαθός, made the two, so to speak, into one word), that what is in itself *good* is also at once *for the good and advantage* of him who comes in contact with it. What in itself is good is good also *for some person, to some purpose*, heightens and promotes wellbeing beyond itself. *Good*, accordingly, is existence which is perfect and promotes perfection. Cf. the expression in Rom. vii. 13: τὸ οὖν ἀγαθὸν ἐμοὶ γέγονεν θάνατος;... ἡ ἁμαρτία διὰ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ μοι κατεργαζομένη θάνατον. (This double aspect of the conception appears also in the Hebrew כֵּן, which, except in Genesis, where it is always translated by καλός, is quite as often by the LXX. rendered ἀγαθός as καλός. In כֵּן there is first brought into prominence the beneficial impression which a thing makes, and by which it attains a marked importance; and then the element of completeness.)

The transference of this conception to the sphere of morals was easy. Since that is *good* which, after its kind, is perfect, the sphere of good at once fundamentally limits itself to that *which is as in general a thing should be*, and thus the word becomes synonymous with δίκαιος, from which it differs as κακός (which see) does from ἄδικος, as the state differs from the conduct. Hence it necessarily follows that *the good* is the measure of the δίκη, and not the δίκη of *the good*; and further, we must take into account that ἀγαθός always includes a corresponding beneficent relation of the subject of it to another subject, while δίκαιος only expresses a relation to the purely objective δίκη. (Cf. e.g. Rom. v. 7: μόλις γὰρ ὑπὲρ δικαίου τις ἀποθανεῖται ὑπὲρ γὰρ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ τάχα τις καὶ τολμᾷ ἀποθανεῖν. The δίκαιος does what he ought, keeps within the limits assigned him, limits which he neither selfishly nor unselfishly transgresses, and gives to every one his due; the ἀγαθός does as much as ever he can, and proves his moral quality by promoting the wellbeing of him with whom he has to do: accordingly here also the article

is added (τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ), to indicate a special relation between the persons spoken of. With the thought here expressed, compare Rom. xi. 35: τίς προέδωκεν αὐτῷ καὶ ἀνταποδοθήσεται αὐτῷ. We may remark, further, that in Matt. xix. 16–22, Luke xviii. 18–23, Mark x. 17 sqq., the point of our Lord's question, as He intended it, lies, according to all the narratives, in the ἀγαθός, ἀγαθόν, because the questioner evidently found no satisfaction in the δικαίωμα of the law, to which the Lord refers him. He needed something more than a δίκαιον.) This transference of the word to the sphere of morals, which first took place among the Greeks in the Attic writers (see below), but was undoubtedly more primary in Hebrew, can hardly be called, in the strict sense, a transference; because the good in a moral sense has again such an influence upon wellbeing, that by this use of the word rather the necessary, though not actual, unity of moral and material good is authenticated. It is now easy to see how that use of the word which applies it to things which cannot morally be approved, e.g. when it denotes, as Passow shows, *adroit* for good or evil,—when applied to thieves = *cunning*,—can only be regarded as an inexact mode of speaking, arising from the one-sided prominence given to the element of completeness or perfection contained in the word.

In keeping with this view, the *usus loquendi* may be most simply arranged and surveyed as follows:

I. (a) Good, worthy of admiration, excellent, *omnibus numeris absolutus*, or—of course with the modifications suggested by what has been above stated—as Irmisch says (on Herdn. i. 4, p. 134), "*perfectus . . . qui habet in se ac facit omnia, quae habere et facere debet pro notione nominis, officio ac lege*;" Sturz says in his *Lex. Xen.*, "*accipit notionem fere a nomine ad quod pertinet*:" excellent in its kind. Eustath. in Il. xvii. p. 1121 (in Sturz, l.c.): δοκεῖ δὲ ἐντεῦθεν εἰληφθαι καὶ τὸ ἀγαθὸς σκυτεὺς, ὁ εὐτεχνος καὶ ὅσα τοιαῦτα. Xen. *Cyrop.* i. 6. 19: ἀγαθὸς γεωργός, ἵππεύς, ἰατρός, αὐλητής. Aeschin. *Socr. dial.* i. 10. 12: ἵπποι καὶ κύνες ἀγαθοί. So in the New Test.: Matt. vii. 17, 18, πᾶν δένδρον ἀγαθὸν καρποὺς καλοὺς ποιεῖ, τὸ δὲ σαπρὸν δένδρον καρποὺς πονηροὺς ποιεῖ οὐ δύναται δένδρον ἀγαθὸν καρποὺς πονηροὺς ποιεῖν κ.τ.λ.; Matt. xix. 16 (T. L. omit ἀγ.); Luke xviii. 18; Mark x. 17, διδάσκαλε ἀγαθέ; Luke xviii. 19; Mark x. 18, τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν; Luke viii. 8, ἡ γῆ ἡ ἀγαθή (ver. 15 parall. ἡ καλὴ γῆ); Matt. xxv. 21, 23, δοῦλε ἀγαθὲ καὶ πιστέ; Luke xix. 17, δοῦλε ἀγαθέ; Tit. ii. 10, πίστιν πᾶσαν ἐνδεικνυμένους ἀγαθὴν. When the meaning is not more precisely expressed in the substantive, it is indicated by the accusative, as in Homer, βοὴν ἀγαθός, βίην ἀγ., and Xen. *Cyrop.* i. 5. 9, τὰ πολεμικὰ ἀγαθοί; or by the inf., as in Xen. *Mem.* ii. 6. 14, ἀγαθοὺς λέγειν καὶ πράττειν; Hdt. i. 136, ἀγαθὸς μάχεσθαι; or by a preposition, Xen. *Mem.* iv. 6. 11, ἀγαθοὺς δὲ πρὸς τὰ τοιαῦτα νομίζεις ἄλλους τινὰς ἢ τοὺς δυναμένους αὐτοῖς καλῶς χρῆσθαι; Plut. *Public.* 17, ἣν ἀνὴρ εἰς πᾶσαν ἀρετὴν ἀγαθός; cf. Gregor. Nyss. *de orific. hom.* c. 20, t. 1, p. 98, τὸ ὄντως ἀγαθὸν ἀπλοῦν καὶ μονοειδές ἐστι τῇ φύσει, πάσης διπλῆς καὶ τῆς πρὸς τὸ ἐναντίον συζυγίας ἀλλότριον.

(b) Good, in relation to something else = what is of advantage. It is thus used of

persons in Matt. xx. 15, εἰ ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου πονηρός ἐστίν ὅτι ἐγὼ ἀγαθός εἰμι; Luke xxiii. 50, ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς καὶ δίκαιος (see above); Tit. ii. 5; 1 Pet. ii. 18, τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς καὶ ἐπιεικέσιν (ὑποτασσόμενοι); Rom. v. 7, ὑπὲρ γὰρ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ τάχα τις καὶ τολμᾷ ἀποθανεῖν (opp. to δικ.). Compare with this passage, Xen. *Cyrop.* iii. 3. 4, Κῦρον ἀνακαλοῦντες τὸν εὐεργέτην, τὸν ἄνδρα τὸν ἀγαθόν; Xen. *Hell.* vii. 3. 12, οἱ πλείστοι ὀρίζονται τοὺς εὐεργέτας ἑαυτῶν ἄνδρας ἀγαθοὺς εἶναι; John vii. 12, οἱ μὲν ἔλεγον, ὅτι ἀγαθός ἐστίν ἄλλοι ἔλεγον οὐ, ἀλλὰ πλανᾷ τὸν ὄχλον. It denotes *that which is to advantage* in Eph. iv. 29, λόγος ἀγαθὸς πρὸς οἰκοδομήν (cf. Gal. vi. 10, ἐργαζώμεθα τὸ ἀγαθὸν πρὸς πάντας); Matt. vii. 11, δόματα ἀγαθά; Luke xi. 13; x. 42, ἀγαθὴ μερίς; Jas. i. 17, δόσις ἀγαθῇ; Rom. vii. 12, ἡ ἐντολὴ . . . ἀγαθῇ; 1 Thess. iii. 6, μνεῖα ἡμῶν ἀγαθῇ; 2 Thess. ii. 16, ἐλπίς ἀγαθῇ; 1 Tim. ii. 10, v. 10, ἔργον ἀγαθόν; Acts ix. 36, πλήρης ἔργων ἀγαθῶν καὶ ἐλεημοσυνῶν; Phil. i. 6, ὁ ἐναρξάμενος ἐν ὑμῖν ἔργον ἀγαθόν; Jas. iii. 17, μεστή ἐλέους καὶ καρπῶν ἀγαθῶν; 1 Pet. iii. 10, ἡμέρα ἀγαθῇ. The neuter τὸ ἀγαθόν denotes *good things, things that are to advantage*: Luke xvi. 25, ἀπέλαβες τὰ ἀγαθὰ σου; Rom. vii. 13, τὸ οὖν ἀγαθὸν ἐμοὶ γέγονεν θάνατος . . . ἡ ἁμαρτία διὰ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ μοι κατεργαζομένη θάνατον; viii. 28, τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν τὸν θεὸν πάντα συνεργεῖ εἰς ἀγαθόν; x. 15, οἱ πόδες τῶν εὐαγγελιζομένων εἰρήνην, τῶν εὐαγγ. τὰ ἀγαθά; xiii. 4, σοὶ εἰς τὸ ἀγαθόν; xv. 2, ἕκαστος ἡμῶν τῷ πλησίον ἀρεσκέτω εἰς τὸ ἀγαθὸν πρὸς οἰκοδομήν (Bengel: *bonum*, genus; *aedificatio*, species); Gal. vi. 6, 10; 1 Thess. v. 15, τὸ ἀγαθὸν διώκετε καὶ εἰς ἀλλήλους καὶ εἰς πάντας; Philem. 14; John i. 47, ἐκ Ναζαρετ δύναται τι ἀγαθὸν εἶναι. With this is connected the designation of possessions as *goods* (in German Gut, Güter) in Luke xii. 18, 19, Gal. vi. 6. It denotes also that which we possess in Christ: Rom. xiv. 16, ὑμῶν τὸ ἀγαθόν; Philem. 6, ἀγαθὸν τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν; cf. Luke i. 53, πεινῶντας ἐνέπλησεν ἀγαθῶν; Heb. ix. 11, x. 1, τὰ μέλλοντα ἀγαθά; cf. Xen. *Cyrop.* vii. 1. 11, πολλά τε καὶ ἀγαθὰ κτήσασθαι. — By ecclesiastical writers the Lord's Supper is also called ἀγαθόν: see Suic. *thes. s.v.*; Basilius M. *crisp. Can. III. ad Amphilocho.*: οἱ τοῖς λησταῖς ἀντεπεξίοντες, ἔξω μὲν ὄντες τῆς ἐκκλησίας, εἵργονται τῆς κοινωνίας τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ· κληρικοὶ δὲ ὄντες, τοῦ βαθμοῦ καθαιροῦνται.

II. The word was first transferred to the *moral sphere* by the Attic writers, and amongst these by the philosophers, who used the expression καλὸς καὶ ἀγαθός to denote "the sum total of the qualities of an Athenian man of honour" (Passow). (Luke xviii. 15, καρδιά καλὴ καὶ ἀγαθῇ; v. sub καλός.) Τὸ ἀγαθόν was equivalent to *summum bonum*; ἀγαθόν denoted, in general, *what is morally good*. Compare Matt. xix. 17 (cf. v. 16), where L. T. read τί με ἐρωτᾷς περὶ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ; εἰς ἐστὶν ὁ ἀγαθός: Rec., as in Mark x. 17, 18, Luke xviii. 18, 19, τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν; οὐδεὶς ἀγαθὸς εἰ μὴ εἷς, ὁ θεός. We see here the distinctive New Testament character of this idea, and its affinity here again with δίκαιος (Matt. v. 45, ἐπὶ πονηροὺς καὶ ἀγαθοὺς . . . ἐπὶ δικαίους καὶ ἀδίκους), only that in δίκαιος the relation to the *δίκη*, or to God's revelation, forms the standard; whereas ἀγαθός denotes that inner harmonious perfection which is its own standard and measure, and which primarily (archetypally) belongs to God. Cf. Athan. I. *dial. de trin.* ii. 169: Πῶς οὐδεὶς ἀγαθὸς εἰ μὴ εἷς ὁ θεός; "Ὅτι ὁ θεὸς οὐ κατὰ μετοχὴν ἀγαθότητός ἐστιν

ἀγαθός, ἀλλ' αὐτός ἐστιν ἀγαθότης. ὁ δὲ ἄνθρωπος μετοχῇ ἀγαθότητός ἐστιν ἀγαθός. With a substantive: Matt. xii. 35, ὁ ἀγαθὸς ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ θησαυροῦ (Luke vi. 45 adds τῆς καρδίας) ἐκβάλλει τὰ ἀγαθὰ (Luke vi. 45, προφέρει τὸ ἀγαθόν). (Acts xi. 24, ἦν ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς καὶ πλήρης πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ πίστεως, belongs perhaps to I. b.) Rom. ii. 7, καθ' ὑπομονὴν ἔργου ἀγαθοῦ ζητεῖν ζωὴν αἰών.; Rom. xiii. 3, φόβος τῷ ἀγαθῷ ἔργῳ (Rec. τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἔργων); 2 Cor. ix. 8, ἵνα περισσεύητε εἰς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθόν; Eph. ii. 10, κτισθέντες . . . ἐπὶ ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς, οἷς προητοίμασεν ὁ θεός, ἵνα ἐν αὐτοῖς περιπατήσωμεν; Col. i. 10, ἐν παντὶ ἔργῳ ἀγαθῷ καρποφορεῖν; 2 Thess. ii. 17, στηρίζαι τὰς καρδίας ἐν παντὶ ἔργῳ καὶ λόγῳ ἀγαθῷ; 2 Tim. ii. 21, σκευὸς . . . εἰς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἡτοιμασμένον; iii. 17, ἵνα ἄρτιος ᾖ ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ ἄνθρωπος, πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἐξηρτισμένος (cf. Matt. xix. 17); Tit. i. 16, πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἀδόκιμοι; iii. 1, πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἐτοιμούς εἶναι; Heb. xiii. 21, ὁ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης καταρτίσαι ὑμᾶς ἐν παντὶ ἔργῳ ἀγαθῷ εἰς τὸ ποιῆσαι τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ; 1 Pet. iii. 16, ἡ ἀγαθὴ ἐν Χριστῷ ἀναστροφή. The expression *συνείδησις ἀγαθῇ* in Acts xxiii. 1, 1 Tim. i. 5, 19, and 1 Pet. iii. 16, 21, does indeed denote the conscience as a self-witness filled with moral good, inasmuch as it attests to the man with the absence of guilt the possession of righteousness. But as the absence of guilt is, at all events in actual experience, the first and chief element of the *συνείδησις ἀγαθῇ*, so that the expression—synonymous with *συνείδησις καθαρὰ*, cf. Acts xxiii. 1 with 2 Tim. i. 3—is also parallel with the οὐδὲν ἑμαντῷ σύνοιδα of 1 Cor. iv. 4, and opposed to the *συνείδησις πονηρά, ἁμαρτιῶν*, the absence or removal of which is the only means of attaining a good conscience, I prefer to take *ἀγαθῇ* here in its simple and primary meaning, as denoting the wellbeing, the unimpaired and uninjured condition of the conscience, while its depraved state is to be expressed by *πονηρά*, a bad conscience. We thus obviate the great difficulty involved in attributing moral qualities to conscience itself, whereas it is only affected by these; and thus it is evident why we may with propriety speak of a good, an evil, a bad, a pure, a reconciled conscience; but not of a holy, an unholy, a righteous, an unrighteous conscience. Cf. ὁ ὀφθαλμὸς ποιηρός, Matt. xx. 15. We find the neuter τὸ ἀγαθόν in Matt. xix. 17, L. T.; Luke vi. 45; Rom. ii. 10; vii. 19; xii. 2; xii. 9, κολλώμενοι τῷ ἀγαθῷ; xii. 21, νίκα ἐν τῷ ἀγαθῷ τὸ κακόν; xiii. 3; xvi. 19, θέλω ὑμᾶς σοφοὺς εἶναι εἰς τὸ ἀγαθόν; Eph. iv. 28; 1 Pet. iii. 13, τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ μιμηταί; 3 John 11, μιμοῦ τὸ ἀγ. The plural τὰ ἀγαθὰ in Matt. xii. 35; John v. 29; Rom. iii. 8. Ἀγαθόν in Matt. xix. 16, τί ἀγαθὸν ποιήσω; Rom. vii. 18; ix. 11; 2 Cor. v. 10; Eph. vi. 8; 1 Pet. iii. 11. — Ἀγαθὰ λαλεῖν, Matt. xii. 34. — Opposed to κακός; πονηρός, Matt. v. 45, vii. 11, xii. 34, 35, xxii. 10; to φαῦλος in John v. 29; 2 Cor. v. 10. Synonyms, καλός, δίκαιος.

Κρείσσων, *ον*, *όνος*,¹ compar. of ἀγαθός. According to Etym. M. from κρατός, on which H. Steph.: "*recte, nam pro κρατίων dicitur κράσσω* (cf. Matth. Gr. Gr. sec. 131, A 1). *Inde primum κρέσσω, ex quo κρείσσω.*" Att. κρείττων. The mss. of the New Testament vacillate between *σσ* and *ττ*. In Heb. vi. 9 all the Uncials read *σσ* where the

¹ Retained from ed. 1, not in ed. 2.

Received Text has $\tau\tau$; in all the other passages of Hebrews where the word occurs the Uncials have $\tau\tau$. In 1 Cor. vii. 9, xi. 17, Phil. i. 23, Tisch. reads $\sigma\sigma$. It denotes *superiority in power, worth, and importance*; more excellent, more advantageous (cf. $\kappa\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$, Ps. xvi. 6 = דָּבָר). Hence Philo i. 33. 44, ed. Mang.: $\acute{\epsilon}\phi' \acute{\omicron}\sigma\omicron\nu \kappa\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\tau\omega\nu \acute{\omicron} \pi\omicron\iota\omega\nu, \acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota} \tau\omicron\sigma\omicron\upsilon\tau\alpha \kappa\alpha\iota \tau\omicron \gamma\epsilon\nu\acute{\omicron}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\nu \acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\iota\nu\omicron\nu$. Cf. the oxymoron in Plat. *legg.* i. 627 B: $\tau\omicron \chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\rho\omicron\nu \kappa\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\tau\omega\nu \tau\omicron\upsilon \acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\iota\nu\omicron\nu\omicron\varsigma, \textit{deterius meliore superius}$. The word is used in a sense most nearly akin to the fundamental meaning in Heb. xii. 24: $\kappa\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\tau\omicron\nu\alpha \lambda\alpha\lambda\omicron\upsilon\nu\tau\iota \pi\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha} \tau\omicron\nu \textit{Ἀβελ}$, where Lachm. and Tisch. read $\kappa\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\tau\omicron\nu$ *adverbially* = *more emphatically*. — (a) *More excellent*: Heb. vii. 7, $\tau\omicron \acute{\epsilon}\lambda\alpha\tau\tau\omicron\nu \acute{\iota}\pi\omicron \tau\omicron\upsilon \kappa\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\tau\omicron\nu\omicron\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\upsilon\lambda\omicron\gamma\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\alpha\iota$; i. 4, $\kappa\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\tau\omega\nu \gamma\epsilon\nu\acute{\omicron}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma \tau\omega\nu \acute{\alpha}\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\omega\nu$; vii. 19, $\kappa\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\tau\omega\nu \acute{\epsilon}\lambda\pi\acute{\iota}\varsigma$, opp. to $\tau\omicron \tau\eta\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\omicron\lambda\eta\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\sigma\theta\epsilon\nu\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma \kappa\alpha\iota \acute{\alpha}\nu\omega\phi\epsilon\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$ (ver. 18), $\rho\acute{\upsilon}\delta\acute{\epsilon}\nu \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho \acute{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\omega\sigma\epsilon\nu \acute{\omicron} \nu\acute{\omicron}\mu\omicron\varsigma$ (ver. 19); vii. 22, $\kappa\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\tau\omega\nu \delta\iota\alpha\theta\eta\kappa\eta$; viii. 6, $\kappa\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\tau\omicron\nu\omicron\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\pi\alpha\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\acute{\iota}\alpha\iota$; ix. 23, $\kappa\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\tau\omicron\nu\omicron\varsigma \theta\upsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha\iota$; x. 34, $\tau\eta\nu \acute{\alpha}\rho\pi\alpha\gamma\eta\nu \tau\omega\nu \acute{\upsilon}\pi\alpha\rchi\acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\omega\nu \acute{\upsilon}\mu\omega\nu \mu\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha} \chi\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \pi\rho\omicron\sigma\epsilon\delta\acute{\epsilon}\xi\alpha\sigma\theta\epsilon, \gamma\iota\nu\acute{\omega}\sigma\kappa\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\iota\nu \acute{\epsilon}\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma \kappa\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\tau\omicron\nu\alpha \acute{\upsilon}\pi\alpha\rho\chi\acute{\iota}\nu \kappa\alpha\iota \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\upsilon\sigma\alpha\nu$; xi. 16, $\kappa\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\tau\omicron\nu\omicron\varsigma$ (*sc. πατρίδος*) $\acute{\omicron}\rho\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\iota, \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau' \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu \acute{\epsilon}\pi\omicron\upsilon\rho\alpha\nu\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon$; xi. 35, $\omicron\upsilon \pi\rho\omicron\sigma\delta\acute{\epsilon}\xi\acute{\iota}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota \tau\eta\nu \acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\tau\rho\omega\sigma\iota\nu$ (deliverance in this life) $\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha \kappa\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\tau\omicron\nu\omicron\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\sigma\epsilon\omega\varsigma \tau\acute{\upsilon}\chi\omega\sigma\iota\nu$. On the $\kappa\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\tau\omicron\nu \tau\iota$ ($\tau\omicron\upsilon \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon \pi\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota} \acute{\eta}\mu\omega\nu \pi\rho\omicron\beta\lambda\epsilon\psi\alpha\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\upsilon$) in xi. 40, see Riehm, *Lehrbegr. des Hebr. Br.* 583: "Our living in the time of fulfilment is the great advantage we have above them; and we enjoy this advantage by virtue of the divine decree,—a decree so peculiarly in our favour,—that the Messiah should appear in our days." Heb. xii. 24, Rec., $\kappa\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\tau\omicron\nu\alpha \lambda\alpha\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$, where it would be more correct to read $\kappa\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\tau\omega\nu$, *adv.* Phil. i. 23: $\pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\acute{\omega} \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho \mu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omicron\nu \kappa\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\sigma\sigma\omicron\nu$. — (b) *Preferable, or more advantageous*; 1 Cor. xii. 31, Rec., $\xi\eta\lambda\omicron\upsilon\tau\epsilon \tau\acute{\alpha} \chi\alpha\rho\acute{\iota}\sigma\mu\alpha\tau\alpha \tau\acute{\alpha} \kappa\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\tau\omicron\nu\alpha$, where L. T. $\tau\acute{\alpha} \mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\iota\zeta\omicron\nu\alpha$; 1 Pet. iii. 17, $\kappa\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\tau\omicron\nu \acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\theta\omicron\pi\omicron\iota\omicron\upsilon\nu\tau\alpha\varsigma \pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\chi\epsilon\iota\nu \acute{\eta} \kappa\alpha\kappa\omicron\pi\omicron\iota\omicron\upsilon\nu\tau\alpha\varsigma$, cf. ver. 16; 2 Pet. ii. 21, *a. dat.*, $\kappa\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\tau\omicron\nu \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho \acute{\eta}\nu \acute{\alpha}\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma \mu\acute{\eta} \acute{\epsilon}\gamma\nu\omega\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\iota \tau\eta\nu \acute{\omicron}\delta\omicron\nu \tau\eta\varsigma \delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\eta\varsigma \acute{\eta} \acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\gamma\iota\nu\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\nu \acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\sigma\tau\rho\acute{\epsilon}\psi\alpha\iota \acute{\epsilon}\kappa \tau\eta\varsigma \pi\alpha\rho\alpha\delta\omicron\theta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\sigma\eta\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\gamma\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\omicron\lambda\eta\varsigma$ (cf. ver. 20, $\acute{\eta}\tau\tau\omega\nu\tau\alpha\iota$, and $\chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\rho\omicron\nu\alpha$); 1 Cor. vii. 9, $\kappa\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\sigma\sigma\acute{\omicron}\nu \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu \gamma\alpha\mu\acute{\eta}\sigma\alpha\iota \acute{\eta} \pi\upsilon\rho\omicron\upsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$, where $\kappa\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\sigma\sigma\omicron\nu$, *more advantageous*, is parallel to $\kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{\omicron}\nu \acute{\alpha}\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$ in ver. 8, it is proper for them, it is good for them; cf. ix. 15 and 1 Cor. vii. 1 with ver. 28. Cf. with this passage, Aesch. *Prom.* 752: $\kappa\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\sigma\sigma\omicron\nu \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho \acute{\epsilon}\iota\varsigma\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\xi \theta\alpha\nu\acute{\epsilon}\iota\nu \acute{\eta} \tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\varsigma \acute{\eta}\mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha\varsigma \pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\chi\epsilon\iota\nu \kappa\alpha\kappa\acute{\omega}\varsigma$. $\textit{Κρείσσων}$ does not appear to have been used in a *moral sense* as equivalent to *better* (better is expressed by $\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\omega\nu$). In 1 Cor. xi. 17 also, $\omicron\upsilon\kappa \acute{\epsilon}\iota\varsigma \tau\omicron \kappa\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\sigma\sigma\omicron\nu \acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda' \acute{\epsilon}\iota\varsigma \tau\omicron \acute{\eta}\sigma\sigma\omicron\nu \sigma\upsilon\nu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\chi\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon$, the antithesis appears to be between *advantageous* and *disadvantageous*: in favour of this is the combination $\acute{\epsilon}\iota\varsigma \tau\omicron \dots \sigma\upsilon\nu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\chi\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon$.

$\textit{Κρείσσων}$, the neuter of $\kappa\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\sigma\sigma\omega\nu$ (which see), occurs as an adverb Heb. xii. 24. $\kappa\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\tau\omicron\nu \lambda\alpha\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ (*sq. παρά*) = *more emphatically*. 1 Cor. vii. 38: $\kappa\alpha\iota \acute{\omicron} \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\gamma\alpha\mu\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega\nu \kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{\omega}\varsigma \pi\omicron\iota\acute{\epsilon}\iota, \kappa\alpha\iota \acute{\omicron} \mu\acute{\eta} \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\gamma\alpha\mu\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega\nu \kappa\rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\sigma\sigma\omicron\nu \pi\omicron\iota\acute{\epsilon}\iota$ = *more advantageously, more appropriately*, cf. v. 35.

$\textit{Ἀγαθωσύνη}$, $\acute{\eta}$, only in biblical and eccles. Greek = *goodness and kindness, bonitas* as well as *benignitas*; chiefly, however, in the former signification, which appears to be the exclusive one in the New Test.; Phavorin. $\acute{\eta} \acute{\alpha}\pi\eta\rho\iota\tau\iota\sigma\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta \acute{\alpha}\rho\epsilon\tau\acute{\eta}$. It is the quality of the

man who is ruled by and aims at what is good,—**moral worth**. Eph. v. 9 : ὁ καρπὸς τοῦ φωτὸς ἐν πάσῃ ἀγαθωσύνῃ καὶ δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ ἀληθείᾳ. 2 Thess. i. 11 : εὐδοκία ἀγαθωσύνης, what is pleasing to ἀγαθωσύνῃ (*vid.* εὐδοκία). Rom. xv. 14 : μεστοί ἐστε ἀγαθωσύνης, πεπληρωμένοι πάσης γνώσεως, δυνάμενοι καὶ ἀλλήλους νουθετεῖν. The only doubtful passage is Gal. v. 22, where Theophyl. explains it by *benignitas*; others, on the contrary, in consideration of the word πίστις that immediately succeeds, explain it by *bonitas*, *integritas*. LXX. = חֲפִיז, 2 Chron. xxiv. 16; Eccles. iv. 8, v. 10, vii. 14, ix. 18.

Ἀγαθοεργέω, 1 Tim. vi. 18 : τοῖς πλουσίοις . . . παράγγελλε . . . ἀγαθοεργεῖν, πλουτεῖν ἐν ἔργοις καλοῖς, εὐμεταδότους εἶναι, κοινωνικούς. Otherwise it only occurs in eccles. Greek, where it is equivalent to ἀγαθουργεῖν, the Attic form, which Tisch. and Lachm. have adopted in Acts xiv. 17. Cf. Herod. i. 67, Λίχης τῶν ἀγαθοεργῶν . . . Σπαρτηγέων, Lichas, of the number of Spartans "approved by valour," according to Tim. *lex.* κατ' ἀνδραγαθίαν αἰρετοί; iii. 154, αἱ ἀγαθοεργίαι, *res praeclare gestae*; iii. 160, ἀγαθοεργία Περσέων, what a man has done for the advantage of the Persians, by which he has deserved well of them. Hence ἀγαθοεργεῖν = **to work good**, as also **to act for some one's advantage**. Since in the above passage (1 Tim. vi. 18), in which there is a climax, the word relates to the use made of riches, it would seem best to render it *to do good, so that others shall be benefited, to deserve well*. **To do good, to act kindly**, as in Acts xiv. 17 : οὐκ ἀμάρτυρον ἑαυτὸν ἀφῆκεν ἀγαθουργῶν, where Rec. reads ἀγαθοποιῶν.

Ἀγαθοποιέω, peculiar to eccles. Greek. In Att. ἀγαθὸν ποιεῖν on the one hand, ἐνεργετεῖν on the other. 1. **To do good, to do the good**, opp. to ἀμαρτάνειν, 1 Pet. ii. 20; so also ii. 15 (cf. 16), iii. 6, 17; 3 John 11, μὴ μιμοῦ τὸ κακὸν ἀλλὰ τὸ ἀγαθόν ὃ ἀγαθοποιῶν ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστίν. — 2. In the sense of ἀγαθός, I. b., according to the connection, **to do good, so that some one derives advantage from it**. With acc. in Luke vi. 33, ἀγαθοποιεῖτε τοὺς ἀγαθοποιούντας ὑμᾶς; cf. Num. x. 32 = כִּפְּיָךְ; Tob. xii. 14. With dat. in 2 Macc. i. 2; 1 Macc. xi. 33. Absolutely in Luke vi. 35; Mark iii. 4 and Luke vi. 9, parall. ψυχὴν σῶσαι. In Matt. xii. 12, καλῶς ποιεῖν. — On Acts xiv. 17, Rec., see ἀγαθοεργεῖν. — Opp. to κακοποιεῖν in Mark iii. 4, Luke vi. 9, 3 John 11, 1 Pet. iii. 17; cf. ἀγαθοποιεῖν, opp. to κακοῦν in Zeph. i. 13. As used by astrologers, it is = *bonum omen afferre*. Cf. also καλοποιεῖν = *to act becomingly*, and in some connections *to act kindly*.

Ἀγαθοποιός, ὄν, practising good, acting rightly: 1 Pet. ii. 14, εἰς ἐκδίκησιν κακοποιῶν, ἔπαινον δὲ ἀγαθοποιῶν. — Clem. Al. *Strom.* ed. Sylb. 294 : φύσις τοῦ ἀγαθοποιοῦ τὸ ἀγαθοποιεῖν, ὡς τοῦ πυρὸς τὸ θερμαίνειν καὶ τοῦ φωτὸς τὸ φωτίζειν. Plut. *Is. et Osir.* c. 42 : ὁ γὰρ Ὀσίρις ἀγαθοποιός. It is further used also in the sense of *beneficent*, and is applied by astrologers to favourable constellations. — In Eccles. xlii. 14, ἀγαθοποιὸς γυνή, it refers to a woman who puts on a kind or friendly manner in order to corrupt. — Only in later writers.

Ἀγαθοποιία, ἡ, except in astrological writers, where it is = *beneficentia siderum*,

only in 1 Pet. iv. 19, οἱ πάσχοντες κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ ὡς πιστῶ κτίστη παρατιθέσθωσαν τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν ἐν ἀγαθοποιῇ (L. -ποιταῖς); cf. ii. 15, 20, iii. 6, 17 := well-doing, the practice of good. Clem. Al. *Strom.* ed. Sylb. p. 274, ὅτῳ δὲ ἡ ἐπίτασις τῆς δικαιοσύνης εἰς ἀγαθοποιᾶν ἐπιδέδωκεν, τούτῳ ἡ τελείωσις ἐν ἀμεταβόλῳ ἔξει εὐποιᾶς καθ' ὁμοίωσιν τοῦ θεοῦ διαμένει.

Φιλάγαθος, *ον*, loving good, the friend of good. Aristotle, *Magn. Mor.* ii. 14, describes the σπουδαῖος, who devotes himself in earnest to right doing, as φιλάγαθος, in contrast with φίλαντος which is predicated of the φαῦλος, and, in accordance with the context there, that man is φιλάγαθος who loves and practises *with self-denial* what is good. The word sometimes occurs in Plutarch also, *Mor.* 140 c, ἀνὴρ φιλάγαθος καὶ φιλόκαλος σῶφρονα καὶ κοσμίαν γυναικα ποιεῖ. In the same connection, comp. *Thes. et Romul.* 2. In this general signification, *Wisd.* vii. 22, of σοφία: ἔστι ἐν αὐτῇ πνεῦμα . . . φιλάγαθον.—In ecclesiastical Greek, on the contrary, we find the word mostly used in the particular sense of one who *likes to be kind*, who *likes to do good*, joined e.g. with φιλοκτίρμων. Φιλαγάθως and φιλαγαθωσύνη occur there with a like meaning, while φιλαγαθία in Philo and Clemens Alex. answers to φιλάγαθος in its general sense. Thus, also, Chrysostom explains the word in the only place where it occurs in the N. T. (Tit. i. 8), τὰ αὐτοῦ πάντα τοῖς δεομένοις προϊέμενος; and likewise Theophylact: τὸν ἐπιεικῆ, τὸν μέτριον, τὸν μὴ φθονοῦντα,—the same expositor who explains the ἄπ. λεγ. ἀφιλάγαθος in 2 Tim. iii. 3 by ἐχθρὸς παντὸς ἀγαθοῦ. Considering that ἀφιλάγαθοι in 2 Tim. iii. 3 occupies a middle place between ἀνήμεροι and προδόται, and that φιλάγαθον in Tit. i. 8 appears side by side with φιλόξενον among the requirements in a presbyter, the more general moral qualities σῶφρονα, δίκαιον, ὅσιον, not being enumerated till afterwards, the meaning given by the above-named Greek interpreters must apparently be preferred, and the word may perhaps be explained: one who willingly and *with self-denial* does good, or is kind.

Ἀφιλάγαθος, *ον*, only in the N. T., and there only in 2 Tim. iii. 3, among the characteristics of the wickedness and apostasy of the last days. In accordance with what has been said under φιλάγαθος, the explanation of Theophylact, ἐχθροὶ παντὸς ἀγαθοῦ, must probably be rejected, and the word must be regarded as a negative, and therefore strong expression to denote hard-heartedness, = some such rendering as *unsusceptible of any self-denial in order to kindness*.

Ἀγαπάω, f. -ήσω, to love, is connected with ἄγαμαι, though scarcely as stated by Coray (ἀ γὰρ φιλοῦμεν, ἐκεῖνα καὶ θαυμάζειν εἰώθαμεν, Coray, *ad Isocr.* ii. 157. 9). Rather might we, however, on the ground of this connection—which likewise probably includes the Latin *gaudere*, see Curtius, 158—explain ἀγαπᾶν as = *to have one's joy in anything*. Mistaken, at any rate, are the explanations given by Hemsterhuis (from ἄγαν and the unused theme πάω =) *summo opere curam alicujus gerere*; and by Damm

(*lex. Hom.*), *est pro ἀγαφῶ, ab ἄγαν, valde et ἀφῶ, contingo, compositum, applico quasi me valde ad aliquid, suscipio quid amplexu meo.* The connection with ἄγαν is their only true suggestion.—Homer has for ἀγαπάω the form ἀγαπάζω.

The Greek language has three words for *to love*: φιλεῖν, ἐρᾶν, ἀγαπᾶν. ἐρᾶν is used in only a few passages of the O. T.: Esth. ii. 17 and Prov. iv. 6 = צַהַר; Wisd. viii. 2; ἐραστής, Ezek. xvi. 33; Hos. ii. 5; not at all in the N. T. On the relation between φιλεῖν and ἐρᾶν, cf. Xen. *Hier.* xi. 11: οὐ μόνον φιλοῖα ἄν, ἀλλ' καὶ ἐρῶ ὑπ' ἀνθρώπων, on which Sturz (*lex. Xen.*) remarks: *scil. φιλοῦσιν amici; sed qui vehementius amant, tanquam amasium, ii ἐρώσι.* Ἐρᾶν denotes the love of passion, of vehement, sensual desire; but so unsuitable was this word, by usage so saturated with lustful ideas, to express the moral and holy character of that love with which Scripture in particular has to do, that it does not occur in a good sense even in the O. T., save in Prov. iv. 6, Wisd. viii. 2; and, as already remarked, not at all in the N. T. Concerning this latter fact, Trench (*Synonyms of the N. T.*) well says: "In part, no doubt, the explanation of this absence is, that these words (ἐρως, ἐρᾶν, ἐραστής), by the corrupt use of the world, had become so steeped in earthly sensual passion, carried such an atmosphere of unholiness about them (see Origen, *Prol. in Cant. op.* 3, pp. 28–30), that the truth of God abstained from the defiling contact with them."

Ἀγαπᾶν and φιλεῖν are used, indeed, in many cases synonymously; they even seem sometimes to be used the one in place of the other; cf. *e.g.* Xen. *Mem.* ii. 7. 9, ἐὰν δὲ προστάτης ᾦς, ὅπως ἐνεργοὶ ᾧσι, σὺ μὲν ἐκείνας φιλήσεις, ὁρῶν ὠφελίμους σεαυτῷ οὔσας, ἐκείναι δὲ σὲ ἀγαπήσουσιν, αἰσθόμεναι χαίροντά σε αὐταῖς, with ii. 7. 12: αἱ μὲν ὡς κηδεμόνα ἐφίλουν, ὁ δὲ ὡς ὠφελίμους ἡγάπα. Yet it follows from these very passages that a distinction not too subtle exists between the two words. Cf. Plat. *Lys.* 215 B, ὁ δὲ μὴ του δεόμενος οὐδέ τι ἀγαπήῃ ἄν; Οὐ γὰρ οὖν. Ὁ δὲ μὴ ἀγαπῶν, οὐδ' ἂν φιλοῖ; οὐ δῆτα. Hom. *Od.* 7. 32, 33, οὐ γὰρ ξείνους οἶδε μάλ' ἀνθρώπους ἀνέχονται, οὐδ' ἀγαπαζόμενοι φιλέουσ', ὅς κ' ἄλλοθεν ἔλθῃ. Dio Cassius 24, ἐφιλήσατε αὐτὸν ὡς πατέρα, καὶ ἡγαπήσατε ὡς εὐεργέτην. However often ἀγαπᾶν and φιλεῖν are used in the same combinations and relations, it must not be overlooked that in all cases wherein the simple designation of kindred, a friendly or in any way intimate relation between friends, etc., was required, the words φίλος, φιλεῖν were naturally used, and hence we meet these more frequently by far, ἀγαπᾶν less frequently. Ἀγαπᾶν, moreover, possesses a meaning of its own, which, in spite of other points of agreement, never belongs to φιλεῖν, viz. *to be contented, to be satisfied with* (τινί, and τί, or with the participle, or followed by εἰ, ἐάν; so we find from Homer onwards to the later Greek in Thuc., Plat., Xen., Demosth., Lucian); according to the old lexicographers, = ἀρκεῖσθαι τινί καὶ μηδὲν πλέον ἐπιζητεῖν. On the other hand, ἀγαπᾶν never means "to kiss," or "to do anything willingly," "to be wont to do,"—significations which are peculiar to φιλεῖν. If, after all this, it be asked, in conclusion, How do you account for the surprising fact that everywhere in biblical Greek in both the O. T. and specially in the N. T., where the love which belongs to the sphere

of divine revelation is spoken of, *ἀγαπᾶν* is systematically used, while *φιλεῖν* has received no distinctive colouring at all?—the answer must be, That the love designated by *ἀγαπᾶν* must certainly possess a distinctive element of its own. We shall not go wrong if we define the distinction thus: *φιλεῖν* denotes the love of natural inclination, affection,—love, so to say, originally spontaneous, involuntary (*amare*); *ἀγαπᾶν*, on the other hand, love as a direction of the will, *diligere*. This must be regarded as the true and adequate explanation, at least as regards Scripture usage, and it is surely confirmed by the testimony of classical usage above given. God's love to man in revelation is but once expressed by *φιλεῖν*, not in the text cited by Tittmann (*de synonym. N. T.* p. 53), John xvi. 27, where the special relation of the Father to the disciples of Jesus is spoken of, but in the expression *φιλανθρωπία*, Tit. iii. 4, and there the word has a meaning quite different from its signification in classical Greek. *Φιλεῖν* is never used of the love of men towards God. [But see 1 Cor. xvi. 22: *εἴ τις οὐ φιλεῖ τὸν κύριον.*] Love to God or to our neighbour, as a *command*, is unheard of in the profane writers; this love, again, is always expressed by *ἀγαπᾶν*. Ἀγαπᾶν, and never *φιλεῖν*, is used of love towards our enemies. See, on the other hand, John xv. 19: *εἰ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου ἦτε, ὁ κόσμος ἂν τὸ ἴδιον ἐφίλει.* For the love of Jesus to Lazarus, both *φιλεῖν* and *ἀγαπᾶν* are used, John xi. 3, 5, 36; and in like manner of His love to St. John, John xx. 2; cf. xiii. 23, xix. 26, xxi. 7. But one feels at once how inappropriate *φιλεῖν* would be, e.g. in Mark x. 21: *ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἠγάπησεν αὐτόν.* (We can hardly attach importance to the use of *ἀγαπᾶν* instead of *φιλεῖν* in John xi. 5: *ἠγάπα δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὴν Μάρθαν καὶ τὴν ἀδελφὴν αὐτῆς καὶ τὸν Λάζαρον*, for one cannot see why ἐφίλει, as Cod. D reads, should be regarded as offensive.) The moral and holy love, which is and must be brought to light by divine revelation, may even possibly stand in opposition to natural inclination, whereas the love of inclination, *φιλεῖν*, includes also the *ἀγαπᾶν*. The range of *φιλεῖν* is wider than that of *ἀγαπᾶν*, but *ἀγαπᾶν* stands all the higher above *φιλεῖν* on account of its moral import. It does not in itself exclude affection, but it is always the moral affection of conscious deliberate will which is contained in it, not the natural impulse of immediate feeling. Though the word did not as yet contain this element of moral reflection in the classics, still it was the proper vessel to receive the fulness of biblical import; and as in the N. T. the right word for that love of which the N. T. treats—love which is to be estimated morally, and which is designed for eternity—could no longer be dispensed with, *ἀγάπη*—a word formed, perhaps, by the LXX. as a companion to *ἀγαπᾶν*, and wholly unknown in the classics—became, in N. T. language, the distinctive designation of holy and divine love, while the Greeks knew only *ἔρως*, *φιλία*, and *στοργή*; and this is itself a significant fact for the understanding of *ἀγαπᾶν*. This state of things is already recognised in the Vulgate. Ἀγαπᾶν is once rendered by *amare* (2 Pet. ii. 15), the word usually employed in translating *φιλεῖν*; but in all other cases *diligere* is commonly used, and *ἀγάπη* is = *caritas*, *dilectio*. “In order to distinguish the subordinate relation of natural inclination, both sexual inclination and that of per-

sonal friendship, from the conception of Christian love, the Vulgate avoids the words *amor* and *amare*, and uses instead *caritas* and *dilectio*." R. v. Raumer, *Die Einwirkung des Christenthums auf die althochdeutsche Sprache*, 1845, p. 398. *These are obviously weighty considerations in determining the biblical and Christian conception of love.* How greatly Scripture usage has enriched the word Ἀγαπᾶν, becomes apparent when we compare the following detailed exposition with the notices of the word given in classical lexicons. Classical Greek knows nothing, for instance, of the use of Ἀγαπᾶν to designate *compassionating love*, or the love that freely chooses its object. With reference to the words Ἀγαπᾶν, ἀγάπη, ἀγαπητός, N. T. usage is peculiarly coherent and self-contained.

I. Ἀγαπᾶν is used in all places where the *direction* of the will is the point to be considered; Matt. v. 43, ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου; ver. 44, ἀγαπάτε τοὺς ἐχθρούς, xix. 19, xxii. 37, 39; Mark xii. 30, 31, 33; Luke vi. 27, 35, x. 27; Rom. xiii. 9; Gal. v. 14; Eph. v. 25, 28, 33; Col. iii. 19; Jas. ii. 8; 1 Pet. i. 22, ii. 17. So also where the inclination rests on the *decision* of the will, on a *selection* of the object. So in Heb. i. 9, ἠγάπησας δικαιοσύνην; 2 Cor. ix. 7, ἰλαρὸν δότην ἀγαπᾷ ὁ θεός; 2 Pet. ii. 15, μισθὸν ἀδικίας ἠγάπησεν; 2 Tim. iv. 10, ἀγαπήσας τὸν νῦν αἰῶνα; 1 Pet. iii. 10, ὁ θέλων ζῶην ἀγαπᾶν; cf. John iii. 19, ἠγάπησαν οἱ ἄνθρωποι μᾶλλον τὸ σκότος ἢ τὸ φῶς; John xii. 43, ἠγάπησαν τὴν δόξαν τῶν ἀνθρώπων μᾶλλον ἢ τὴν δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ. Cf. Demosth. *pro cor.* p. 263. 6, ed. Reisk.: οὐτ' ἐν τοῖς Ἑλληνικοῖς τὰ Φιλίππου δῶρα καὶ τὴν ξενίαν ἠγάπησα ἀντὶ τῶν κοινῇ πᾶσι τοῖς Ἑλλήσι συμφερόντων. Plut. *Camill.* 10: ἀγαπήσαι τὴν ἡσσαν πρὸ τῆς ἐλευθερίας. Under this head must also be classed the cases in which Ἀγαπᾶν is used to express the *love which decides the direction of the will*, as in the relation between the Father and the Son. John iii. 35, ὁ πατὴρ ἀγαπᾷ τὸν υἱὸν καὶ πάντα δέδωκεν ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ; John x. 17, διὰ τοῦτό με ὁ πατήρ ἀγαπᾷ κ.τ.λ.; xv. 9, xvii. 23, 24, 26; xiv. 31, ἀγαπῶ τὸν πατέρα. So also when the relation of love between man and God, between the Father and the Son, is expressed by Ἀγαπᾶν, John viii. 42, xiv. 15, 21, 23, 24, 28; 1 John iv. 10 (and 19 Rec.), 20, 21, v. 1, 2; Rom. viii. 28; 1 Cor. ii. 9, viii. 3; Eph. vi. 24; Jas. i. 12, ii. 5; 1 Pet. i. 8; 2 Tim. iv. 8, τοῖς ἠγαπηκόσι τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν αὐτοῦ. When Peter, in John xxi. 15, 16, answers our Lord's question, ἀγαπᾷς με; with φιλῶ σε, he certainly uses the term which Christ Himself once employed to designate the close and special love of the disciples to Himself, John xvi. 27; and Christ evidently points to Peter's word when He repeats the question the third time, saying, ver. 17, φιλεῖς με; But we can hardly suppose that Peter meant by this answer to go beyond our Lord's question, by naming the love of inclination instead of the decided love of the will which was claimed from him. We must rather suppose that he felt humbled by our Lord's question, and does not therefore venture to affirm the love which Christ seeks. Jesus then still more deeply humbles him by His third question,—answering to Peter's thrice-repeated denial of Him,—which takes up and adopts the φιλεῖν of the disciple's reply, and brings home to his heart its meaning.

II. Ἀγαπᾶν is therefore employed when an *eligere* or a *negligere* takes place. Matt.

vi. 24, τὸν ἓνα μισήσει καὶ τὸν ἕτερον ἀγαπήσει, ἡ ἐνὸς ἀνθέξεται καὶ τοῦ ἑτέρου καταφρονήσει; Luke xvi. 13; Rom. ix. 13, τὸν Ἰακώβ ἠγάπησα, τὸν δὲ Ἡσαΐ ἐμίσησα (Mal. i. 2; Hos. xiv. 5; Jer. xxxi. 2; Deut. vii. 8, 13 = כָּחַס); Rom. ix. 25, καλέσω τὸν οὐ λαόν μου λαόν μου καὶ τὴν οὐκ ἠγαπημένην ἠγαπημένην (Hos. ii. 23 = כָּחַס); whence may be easily explained why ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, in Luke iii. 22 and elsewhere, is parallel with ix. 35, ὁ υἱ. μ. ὁ ἐκλεκτός. Cf. Matt. xii. 18, ὁ ἀγαπητός μου, after Isa. xlii. 1, יְהוָה, LXX. ὁ ἐκλεκτός μου. For Rom. xi. 28, κατὰ τὴν ἐκλογὴν ἀγαπητοί, as also the addition, ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκ., Matt. iii. 17, see *s.v.* ἀγαπητός. To this head belong Rev. xx. 9, ἡ πόλις ἡ ἠγαπημένη, as also John xiii. 23, xix. 26, xxi. 7, 20, μαθητὴς ὃν ἠγάπα ὁ Ἰησοῦς; whereas in xx. 2, ὃν ἐφίλει is used with unusual tenderness. Cf. John xii. 25 with Rev. xii. 11. Closely connected herewith is, finally,—

III. The use of ἀγαπᾶν, where love, as free love, becomes *compassion*. Cf. Isa. lx. 10, διὰ ἔλεον ἠγάπησά σε; cf. Luke vii. 5, ἀγαπᾷ γὰρ τὸ ἔθνος; 1 Thess. i. 4, εἰδότες ἀδελφοὶ ἠγαπημένοι ὑπὸ θεοῦ τὴν ἐκλογὴν ὑμῶν; Eph. ii. 4, ὁ δὲ θεὸς πλούσιος ὢν ἐν ἐλέει, διὰ τὴν πολλὴν ἀγάπην αὐτοῦ, ἣν ἠγάπησεν ἡμᾶς κ.τ.λ.; Eph. i. 6, ἐχαρίτωσεν ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ ἠγαπημένῳ—hence both the *redeeming love* of God and the *love* of Christ as *Saviour* are designated by ἀγαπᾶν. The former, in John iii. 16; 1 John iv. 10, 11, 19; John xiv. 21, 23, xvii. 23; Rom. viii. 37; Eph. ii. 4; 2 Thess. ii. 16; the latter, in John xiii. 1, 34, xiv. 21, xv. 9, 12; Gal. ii. 20; Eph. v. 2, 25; Rev. i. 5, iii. 9 (Mark x. 21?). The part. perf. pass. is then used to denote those in whom this love is realized, and in whom the result abides; as in 1 Thess. i. 4; 2 Thess. ii. 13; Col. iii. 12, ὡς ἐκλεκτοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ ἅγιοι καὶ ἠγαπημένοι. In Jude 1, τοῖς ἐν θεῷ πατρὶ ἠγαπημένοις (Rec. ἡγιασμένοις), ἡγ. denotes a thought complete in itself (like ἡγιασμένοι in Heb. x. 10); and the added words ἐν θεῷ πατρὶ are to be explained like ἐν in Heb. x. 10;—that they are ἠγαπημένοι and Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ τετηρημένοι, has its ground in God as the Father.

The meaning of ἀγαπᾶν having been fixed by such usage, it is used finally to denote the *love of Christians towards each other*. John xiii. 34, xv. 12, 17; 1 John ii. 10, iii. 10, 11, 14, 23, iv. 7, 11, 12, 20, 21, v. 1, 2; 2 John 5. In all these passages, as in Rom. xiii. 8, 1 Thess. iv. 9, 1 Pet. i. 22, ii. 17, the object is specified: τὸν ἕτερον, ἀδελφόν, ἀδελφούς, ἀλλήλους, ἀδελφότητα, etc. Without specification of an object, it is used to denote *Christian brotherly and social love* in 1 John iii. 18, iv. 7, 8.

Ἀγάπη, ἡ, love, not found in the profane writers. The LXX. uses it in 2 Sam. xiii. 15; Song ii. 4, 5, 7, iii. 5, 10, v. 8, vii. 6, viii. 4, 6, 7; Jer. ii. 2; Eccles. ix. 1, 6, as an equivalent for כָּחַס, which is elsewhere translated ἀγάπησις and φιλία. It is also found in Wisd. iii. 9, vi. 19. In the N. T. it does not occur in Acts, Mark, and James. The peculiar N. T. use of ἀγαπᾶν would seem to have rendered necessary, so to speak, the introduction of ἀγάπη, a word apparently coined by the LXX., and unknown both to Philo and Josephus. Ἀγάπη in the LXX. does not, it is true, possess any special force, analogous to that which it has in the N. T., unless we choose to lay stress

on its use in Solomon's Song; but from 2 Sam. xiii. 15, Eccles. ix. 1, 6, it is clear that the LXX. aimed at a more decided term than the language then afforded them,—a term as strong in its way as μῖσος, for which ἔρως, φιλία, στοργή were too weak; indeed, it is worthy of remark in general, that while hatred in all its energy was, love in its divine greatness was not, known and named in profane Greek. It denotes the *love which chooses its object with decision of will* (*dilectio*, see s.v. ἀγαπᾶν), so that it becomes self-denying or compassionate devotion to and for the same. Cf. Jer. ii. 2, where it occurs by the side of ἔλεος. In the form of such energetic good-will or self-sacrifice, love appears, indeed, as an isolated trait in profane writers; but it was unknown to them as a ruling principle of life. The Greek φιλανθρωπία, which was a special characteristic of the Athenians, was a different thing from this ἀγάπη, and is surpassed by the φιλαδελφία of the N. T. See 2 Pet. i. 7: ἐπιχορηγήσατε . . . ἐν τῇ εὐσεβείᾳ τὴν φιλαδελφίαν, ἐν δὲ τῇ φιλαδελφίᾳ τὴν ἀγάπην. In classical Greek, φιλαδελφία is used simply of the relation between brothers and sisters; and as to φιλανθρωπία, Nägelsbach says: "We shall not form a correct idea of the spirit and essence of neighbourly love among the Greeks, unless we remember that the word for it, namely φιλανθρωπία, should not mislead us into the belief that it was practised from love to man as such. It was rather an exhibition of that justice which gives to a man that to which he is entitled, whether he is a friend and benefactor who has a personal claim, or a fellow-citizen who has a political claim, or a helpless and needy fellow-man having a divine claim to help.—Nothing more was necessary to the full display of neighbourly love than to give a man the full rights to which he was entitled. It was taken for granted that the heart of him who thus discharged his obligations was rightly disposed towards the other, τὸν πέλας; and, in order to indicate its nature, this disposition of heart was called αἰδώς, or pious respect for usage and prescription. It was accordingly not the free manifestation of a man's own disposition existing even independently of the law, but *respect for the law*. In a word, it was with this form of δικαιοσύνη just as with εὐσέβεια,—so long as both were practised in outward deeds, the question was never raised, What is the source of the deeds?—no distinction was drawn between a free and a legally compulsory fulfilment of duty." — *Nachhomer. Theologie*, p. 261. Synon. with φιλανθρωπία is πραότης, χαρίζεσθαι. Cf. Aesch. *Epist.* xii. 14: καὶ γὰρ ὀργίζεσθαι ῥαδίως ὑμῖν ἔθος ἐστὶ καὶ χαρίζεσθαι. Opp. to ὀμότης. Herewith compare 1 Cor. xiii., ἡ ἀγάπη μακροθυμεῖ, οὐ ζηλοῖ, οὐ περπερεύεται, etc.; as also πλήρωμα οὖν νόμου ἡ ἀγάπη, Rom. xiii. 10. For φιλανθρωπία, see Acts xxviii. 2; in one instance Paul uses it also of God's χάρις, Tit. iii. 4; cf. Eph. ii. 7. — Plut. employs ἀγάπησις to denote sensual love.

Now, we find ἀγάπη used to designate a love unknown to writers outside of the New Testament (cf. καρπὸς τοῦ πνεύματος, Gal. v. 22),—*love in its fullest conceivable form*; love as it is the distinguishing attribute, not of humanity, but, in the strictest sense, of Divinity. (One may think, for instance, of the saying of Aristotle, "The Deity exists not to love, but to be loved.") John xv. 13, μείζονα ταύτης ἀγάπην οὐδεὶς ἔχει, ἵνα τις τὴν

ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ θῆ ὑπὲρ τῶν φίλων αὐτοῦ; cf. Rom. v. 8, *συνίστησιν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἀγάπην εἰς ἡμᾶς ὁ θεός, ὅτι ἔτι ἁμαρτωλῶν ὄντων ἡμῶν Χριστὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀπέθανεν*, cf. v. 10, *ἐχθροὶ ὄντες κατηλλάγημεν τῷ θεῷ διὰ τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ*. We are accordingly told that this form of love was first exhibited in Christ's work of redemption, 1 John iii. 16, *ἐν τούτῳ ἐγνώκαμεν τὴν ἀγάπην ὅτι ἐκεῖνος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἔθηκεν*, where the object is not to characterize the spirit manifested in this fact, but to set forth what the love is that is required from us; cf. what follows, *καὶ ἡμεῖς ὀφείλομεν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν τὰς ψυχὰς θείναι*. In correspondence with this, the action of God towards us has now been shown by the giving up of His Son to be one of ἀγάπη, 1 John iv. 9, *ἐν τούτῳ ἐφανερώθη ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν ἡμῖν, ὅτι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ ἀπέσταλκεν ὁ θεός κ.τ.λ.*, cf. Rom. v. 7; and as this love is, as it were, absorbed in its object, in view of this revelation of God's disposition towards us in Christ, He is said to be Love: *ὁ θεὸς ἀγάπη ἐστίν*, 1 John iv. 8,—whatever He is, He is not for Himself, but for us. (Love and self-surrender are inseparable; cf. Gal. ii. 20, *τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντός με καὶ παραδόντος ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ*.) In ver. 10, *ἐν τούτῳ ἐστὶν ἡ ἀγάπη, οὐχ ὅτι ἡμεῖς ἠγαπήσαμεν τὸν θεόν, ἀλλ' ὅτι αὐτὸς ἠγάπησεν ἡμᾶς*, "Not in our display of love, but in God's, is ἡ ἀγάπη, love in itself, love in its essence, set forth" (Düsterdieck). Hence, 1 John iv. 7, *ἡ ἀγάπη ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστίν*; cf. Gal. v. 22, where love is spoken of as a fruit of the Spirit. 1 John iv. 12, *ἐὰν ἀγαπῶμεν ἀλλήλους ὁ θεὸς ἐν ἡμῖν μένει καὶ ἡ ἀγάπη αὐτοῦ τετελειωμένη ἐστὶν ἐν ἡμῖν*. In this general sense, without specification of an object, it occurs further in 1 John iv. 17, *ἐν τούτῳ τετελείωται ἡ ἀγάπη μεθ' ἡμῶν*; ver. 18, *φόβος οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ, ἀλλ' ἡ τελεία ἀγάπη ἔξω βάλλει τὸν φόβον, ὅτι ὁ φόβος κόλασιν ἔχει, ὁ δὲ φοβούμενος οὐ τετελείωται ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ*, with which cf. Rom. viii. 14 sq., *πνεῦμα υἰοθεσίας*, opp. to *πνεῦμα δουλείας* (*εἰς φόβον*). We do not find, it is true, in the *Pauline* writings, any such penetration into the essence of ἀγάπη; but, nevertheless, the estimate of it is not less high; the expression *ὁ θεὸς τῆς ἀγάπης καὶ εἰρήνης* corresponds pretty nearly to John's words, *ὁ θεὸς ἀγάπη ἐστίν*, and Rom. v. 7 contains even a profounder description of love than any passage in John's writings. Both Paul and John, however, assign to love the same central position as *the distinctive peculiarity of the Christian life*, cf. *κατὰ ἀγάπην περιπατεῖν*, Rom. xiv. 15; Eph. v. 2; Gal. v. 6, *πίστις δι' ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη*; Eph. iv. 16, *εἰς οἰκοδομὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἐν ἀγάπῃ*. See particularly 1 Tim. i. 5, *τὸ τέλος τῆς παραγγελίας ἐστὶν ἀγάπη ἐκ καθαρᾶς καρδίας καὶ συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς καὶ πίστεως ἀνυποκρίτου*, on which Huther remarks: "As the gospel proclaims to the believer *one* divine deed alone, the atonement by Christ which has its root in the love of God; so does it demand *one* human deed alone, to wit, love, for *πλήρωμα νόμου ἡ ἀγάπη*, Rom. xiii. 10." There is this difference, however, between Paul and John, that the latter uses ἀγάπη to designate not only our action towards our fellow-men, but also our action towards God and His revelation in Christ; cf. 1 John ii. 5, 15, iii. 17, iv. 17, 18, v. 3; John v. 42; Rev. ii. 4; cf. Jer. ii. 2. Compare also the description of the Church as the Bride of Christ in the Apocalypse. In the Pauline writings, on the other hand, the relation of

men to God is only once expressed by the substantive ἀγάπη, viz. 2 Thess. iii. 5, ὁ δὲ κύριος κατευθύνει ὑμῶν τὰς καρδίας εἰς τὴν ἀγάπην τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ εἰς τὴν ὑπομονὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ. The other texts in his Epistles where ἀγάπη with the genitive of the *object* is said to occur—Rom. v. 5; 2 Cor. v. 14; 1 Thess. i. 3—cannot, upon closer examination, be brought forward to support this view. As to Rom. v. 5, it is contrary alike to Christian experience and to St. Paul's chain of thought, here and elsewhere, to make the certainty of Christian hope rest upon *love to God* existing in the heart; cf. ver. 8, viii. 35, 39. As to 2 Cor. v. 14, that must be a marvellously forced and distorted exegesis which regards love to Christ as more suitable to the connection as a determining motive for the conduct of the apostle described in vv. 11–13, than Christ's love to us, which leads the apostle to the conclusion or judgment expressed in ver. 15. Lastly, as to 1 Thess. i. 3, to refer the objective genitive τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, which belongs to τῆς ὑπομονῆς τῆς ἐλπίδος, to the preceding τοῦ κόπου τῆς ἀγάπης, is hardly necessary, especially in this juxtaposition, not unusual, as is well known, elsewhere in St. Paul's writings, of faith and love and hope. The Pauline substitute for the Johannine ἀγάπη in this sense, is perhaps πνεῦμα νίθεσίας, Rom. viii. 15; cf. Gal. iv. 6, Eph. i. 5; or that other περισσεύειν ἐν εὐχαριστίᾳ, Col. ii. 7. Further, John represents love to the brethren as a fruit of love to God, whilst Paul represents it as a fruit of πίστις. John, on the other hand, uses πίστις only once (1 John v. 4), πιστεύειν, indeed, frequently, though rarely without an object. As in St. John love of the brethren is connected with love to God, so in St. Paul love is connected with faith; for in faith man appropriates to himself what applies to all, but in love he extends to all, especially to the household of faith, what applies to himself, so that faith without love cannot exist—is utterly worthless, 1 Cor. xiii.

Ἀγάπη is used accordingly to mark (1) *the relation between the Father and the Son*, John xv. 10, xvii. 26; Col. i. 13, ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ. (2) *The redeeming love of God and Christ* (see ἀγαπᾶν), 1 John iv. 9 (iii. 17), iii. 1, iv. 16; John xv. 9, 10, etc.; see above. Rom. v. 8, viii. 39, χωρίσαι ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ; v. 5, ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκκέχυται ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ἁγίου; 2 Cor. xiii. 13; Eph. i. 4, 5, ἐν ἀγάπῃ προορίσας ἡμᾶς εἰς νίθεσίαν; ii. 4, ὁ θεὸς πλούσιος ὢν ἐν ἐλέει διὰ τὴν πολλὴν ἀγάπην ἣν ἡγάπησεν ἡμᾶς, κ.τ.λ. Jude 2, ἔλεος ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ ἀγάπη πληθυνθείη, cf. 2 Cor. xiii. 11; Jude 21, ἑαυτοὺς ἐν ἀγάπῃ θεοῦ τηρήσατε, cf. John xv. 9, 10; 2 Cor. xiii. 13.—2 John 3; Rom. viii. 35; 2 Cor. v. 14; Eph. iii. 19. (3) *The distinctive peculiarity of the Christian life in relation to others*, with specification of the object: εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους, Eph. i. 15; Col. i. 4; εἰς ἀλλήλους καὶ εἰς πάντας, 1 Thess. iii. 12; 2 Thess. i. 3; cf. 2 Cor. ii. 4, 8, viii. 7; ἡ ἀγάπη τῆς ἀληθείας, 2 Thess. ii. 10 (cf. 1 Cor. xiii. 6); εἰς ἑαυτούς, 1 Pet. iv. 8; the immediate object are the ἀδελφοί, so in 1 John; the more remote πάντες, πλησίον, Rom. xiii. 10.—In 2 Pet. i. 7, φιλαδελφία (which see) is distinguished from the ἀγάπη, which extends to all.—It occurs without specification of object in the combinations περιπατεῖν κατὰ, ἐν, Rom. xiv. 15; Eph. v. 2; διώκειν τὴν ἀγάπην, 1 Cor. xiv. 1; ἔχειν, 1 Cor. xiii. 1, 2, 3; Phil. ii. 2; ἐν

ἀγάπη ἔρχεσθαι, 1 Cor. iv. 21; opp. to ἐν ῥάβδῳ. — Gal. v. 13, διὰ τῆς ἀγάπης δουλεύετε ἀλλήλοις; Philem. 9; Phil. i. 16; 1 Cor. xvi. 14, πάντα ὑμῶν ἐν ἀγάπῃ γινέσθω; Eph. iv. 2; Col. ii. 2, iii. 14, ἐνδύσασθαι τὴν ἀγάπην ὃ ἐστὶν σύνδεσμος τῆς τελειότητος; Eph. iii. 18, iv. 15. Further: ὁ κόπος τῆς ἀγάπης, 2 Thess. i. 3; ἐνδειξεις τῆς ἀγάπης, 2 Cor. viii. 24; 1 Thess. v. 8; Heb. x. 24. For manifestations of love, see Phil. ii. 1, παραμύθιον ἀγάπης; 1 Pet. v. 14, φίλημα ἀγάπης. 1 Cor. viii. 1, ἡ ἀγάπη οἰκοδομεῖ; cf. Eph. iv. 16; 1 Cor. xiii. 4-8; Rom. xiii. 10; 1 Pet. iv. 8. — Rom. xii. 9; 2 Cor. vi. 6, ἀγάπη ἀνυπόκριτος. — Conjoined with πίστις, etc., 1 Cor. xiii. 13; 1 Thess. v. 8; Eph. vi. 23; 1 Thess. iii. 6; 1 Tim. i. 14, iv. 12, vi. 11; 2 Tim. i. 13, ii. 22; Gal. v. 6; 1 Tim. ii. 15; 2 Tim. iii. 10; Tit. ii. 2; Philem. 5; Rev. ii. 19. It is designated καρπὸς τοῦ πνεύματος in Gal. v. 22; cf. Rom. xv. 30; Col. i. 8. — See, besides, Rom. xiii. 10; 2 Cor. viii. 8; Phil. i. 9; 1 Thess. v. 13; 2 Tim. i. 7; Philem. 7; 3 John 6; Matt. xxiv. 12. (4) To denote the believer's relation to God and Christ; by Paul, only in 2 Thess. iii. 5; by John, in 1 John ii. 5, 15, iii. 17, iv. 12, v. 3 (in every case here with the genitive of the object). See above. — In 2 Pet. ii. 13, Lachm. reads, instead of ἀπάταις, ἀγάπαις, which is the correct reading in Jude 12, where A C have ἀπάταις. The plural denotes the love-feasts, or *agapae*, at which the supper of the Lord was celebrated; cf. 1 Cor. xi. 17-34; Matt. xxvi. 20 sq.; cf. 1 Cor. x. 17, ὅτι εἰς ἄρτος, ἐν σῶμα οἱ πολλοὶ ἐσμεν, compared with Eph. iv. 16, εἰς οἰκοδομὴν τοῦ σώματος ἐν ἀγάπῃ. *Vid* Herzog's *Real-Encyclopädie*, i. 174 sq.; Suicer, *Thes.* i. 23-28.

Ἀγαπητός, ἡ, ὄν, verbal adj. from ἀγαπάω, in the N. T. with the force of the part. perf. pass. = ἡγαπημένος, beloved, dear; see Buttmann, sec. 134. 8-10. With the meaning of possibility, as = *amabilis*, which is rare even in profane Greek, it is not used in the N. T.; for the two passages adduced as illustrations, viz. 1 Tim. vi. 2, ὅτι πιστοὶ εἰσιν καὶ ἀγαπητοὶ οἱ τῆς ἐνεργείας ἀντιλαμβανόμενοι, and Philem. 16, ἵνα αὐτὸν ἀπέχῃς οὐκ ἔτι ὡς δούλον, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ δούλον, ἀδελφὸν ἀγαπητόν, must be rejected, on a comparison of the usage elsewhere. (For 1 Tim. vi. 2, cf. the like union of πιστὸς καὶ ἀγαπητός in Col. iv. 9; 1 Cor. iv. 17. For Philem. 16, cf. both the constant association with ἀδελφός, and ver. 16b, μάλιστα ἐμοὶ κ.τ.λ.) The LXX. uses it in both senses; in that of the part. perf. pass. for יְיָ, Gen. xxii. 2, 12; Jer. vi. 26; Amos viii. 10; Zech. xii. 10; יְיָ, Ps. cxvii. 2, lx. 7, cviii. 7; יְיָ, Jer. xxxi. [xxxviii.] 20; in the sense of possibility, in Ps. lxxxiv. 2: ὡς ἀγαπητὰ τὰ σκηνώματά σου. We find it used in the N. T., (1) as an adj. ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, Matt. iii. 17, xvii. 5; Mark i. 11, ix. 7; Luke iii. 22 (Rec. Luke ix. 35, where Tisch. has ἐκλελεγμένος; see s.v. ἀγαπάω); 2 Pet. i. 17; Mark xii. 6, ἔτι ἓνα εἶχεν υἱὸν ἀγαπητόν; cf. Od. 2. 365, μῶνος ἐὼν ἀγαπητός; and Od. 4. 817, Il. 6. 401, without μῶνος, as a designation of the only son. We must not, however, connect this use with the designation of Christ in Matt. iii. 17, etc., as the latter is traceable to the Hebrew יְיָ (Luke ix. 35), יְיָ (see above), and expresses the relation of the Son to the Father in the history of redemption; cf. Rom. xi. 28, and also

the addition ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα in Matt. iii. 17, xvii. 5, and see *s.v.* εὐδοκεῖν (Mark i. 11; Luke iii. 22; 2 Pet. i. 17). Cf. further, Rom. xi. 28, κατὰ τὴν ἐκλογὴν ἀγαπητοί, as also the remarks under ἀγαπάω. To the Hebrew טִיף corresponds rather μονογενής, which see. (Luke xx. 13.)—Conjoined with τέκνον, 1 Cor. iv. 14; Eph. v. 1; 2 Tim. i. 2; with ἀδελφός, 1 Cor. xv. 58; Eph. vi. 21; Col. iv. 7, 9; Philem. 16; Jas. i. 16, 19, ii. 5; 2 Pet. iii. 15;—ἀδελφοί μου ἀγαπητοὶ καὶ ἐπιπόθητοι, Phil. iv. 1; ἀγαπητὸς σύνδουλος, Col. i. 7; with proper names, Col. iv. 14; fem., Rom. xvi. 12; Philem. 2; 3 John 1. (2) As a subst. in Rom. xi. 28, κατὰ μὲν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἐχθροί . . . , κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἐκλογὴν ἀγαπητοί. In address, 3 John 2, 5, 11; plur., Rom. xii. 19; 2 Cor. vii. 1, xii. 19; Eph. v. 1; Heb. vi. 9; 1 Pet. ii. 11, iv. 12; 2 Pet. iii. 1, 8, 14, 17; 1 John ii. 7, iii. 2, 21, iv. 1, 7, 11; Jude 3, 17, 20. With a genitive following, Rom. i. 7, ἀγαπητὸς θεοῦ (cf. טִיף, Ps. cxvii. 2, lx. 7, cviii. 7); 1 Cor. x. 14; Phil. ii. 12. The dative in 1 Thess. ii. 8, ἀγαπητοὶ ἡμῖν γεγέννησθε, is no more to be connected with ἀγαπητός than in Eccles. xv. 13, οὐκ ἔστιν ἀγαπητὸν τοῖς φοβουμένοις αὐτόν, but with the verb; cf. Winer, sec. 31. 2, b.—The import of the expression is determined in agreement with what was remarked on ἀγαπᾶν, II. and III.

Ἀγγέλλω, to bring a message, announce, proclaim; followed by ὅτι, John xx. 18, ἀγγέλλουσα τοῖς μαθηταῖς (where Rec. ἀπαγγέλλουσα), which, interchangeably with the acc. and inf., is the usual construction. Derivatives in the N. T. ἀγγελία, ἄγγελος, and the compounds ἀναγγέλλω, ἀπαγγέλλω, etc., all variously employed to designate the proclamation of salvation.

Ἀγγελία, ἡ, message, proclamation, news, 1 John i. 5, ἔστιν αὕτη ἡ ἀγγελία (Rec. ἐπαγγελία) ἣν ἀκηκόαμεν—καὶ ἀναγγέλλομεν ὑμῖν; cf. Isa. xxviii. 9, ἀναγγέλλειν ἀγγελίαν, 1 John iii. 11, αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἀγγελία (var. lect. ἐπαγγ.) ἣν ἠκούσατε . . . ἵνα ἀγαπῶμεν ἀλλήλους, where ἀγγελία is more precisely defined by being connected with ἵνα, as an order, as the announcement of a will, of an intention.—LXX. = מַלְאָכִי, 1 Sam. iv. 19; Isa. xxviii. 9; Ezek. vii. 26; מַלְאָכִי, Prov. xii. 25.

Ἄγγελος, ὁ: I. In a general sense, messenger, synonymous with πρέσβυς, Xen. *Hell.* i. 4. 2, οἳ τε Λακεδαιμονίων πρέσβεις καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι ἄγγελοι, and frequently with κήρυξ, *Anab.* ii. 3. 1 sqq. and often.—Luke vii. 24, ἄγγελοι Ἰωάννου; ix. 52; Jas. ii. 25.—LXX. = מַלְאָכִי, in the same sense, Gen. xxxii. 4 [3]; Josh. vii. 22, and often.—Then, II., in particular, of messengers of God;—(a) of men who have to deliver a divine commission, who are commissioned to speak by God, e.g. prophets, Hag. i. 13, נְבִיאִי יְהוָה וְנְבִיאִי יְהוָה; 2 Chron. xxxvi. 15; priests, Mal. ii. 7 (Eccles. v. 5). This use is rare, it is true; but still it does not seem allowable (cf. 2 Chron. xxxvi. 15) to treat it only as a figurative mode of speech, as though the name given to the messengers of God from the unseen world were transferred to men. By this designation we are, in general, reminded rather of the divine commission only; and it was easy to apply it κατ' ἐξοχήν to the

messengers who came from the unseen world. Cyrill. Alex., τὸ Ἄγγελος ὄνομα λειτουργίας μᾶλλον ἐστίν, ἥπερ οὐσίας σημαντικόν. — Accordingly, the forerunner of the Messiah also is called, not His messenger, but the angel of the Lord, Mal. iii. 1; Matt. xi. 10; Mark i. 2; Luke vii. 27.—It is questionable whether in Rev. i. 20, ἄγγελοι τῶν ἑπτὰ ἐκκλησιῶν, ii. 1, 8, 12, 18, iii. 1, 7, 14, men are so designated in the same sense. The genitive is primarily analogous to the genitive in xvi. 5, ἄγγελος τῶν ὑδάτων; Matt. xviii. 10, οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτῶν; Acts xii. 11, 15; and denotes that which is entrusted to the angel; cf. Matt. iv. 6; the contents of the Epistles also indicate that those persons are meant to whom the churches are entrusted. We are prevented by Rev. i. 16, 20 from taking the genitive as the gen. of origin, and from understanding by ἄγγελοι deputies of the churches (Ebrard, after Phil. iv. 18; Col. iv. 12). It would rather yield a sense to connect this designation with the rabbinical מַלְאָךְ or שֶׁפָּט מַלְאָךְ (the latter in Ewald, *Commentar. in Apok.* 1828, a view which he himself has recently surrendered; see Ewald, *die Joh. Schriften*, 2. 125). The high priest was called מַלְאָךְ at the time of the second temple, as—in opposition to the deviations of the Sadducees—one bound under an oath and delegated by the Sanhedrim to offer the sin-offering on the great day of atonement; and the שֶׁפָּט מַלְאָךְ, the servant of the church, was first appointed simply to attend to the external affairs of the individual congregation, and then, in particular, as reader of the prayers, represented the sacrificing priest (בַּמִּקְדָּשׁ הַקָּדוֹשׁ). Cf. Delitzsch and Kurtz on Heb. iii. 1. But the comparison between these names and the ἄγγελοι τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν is obviously too far-fetched and inappropriate. But to see in ἄγγελοι here a personification of the spirit of the community in its “ideal reality” (as, again, Düsterdieck has recently done), is not merely without any biblical analogy,—for such a view derives no support from Dan. x. 13, 20; Deut. xxxii. 8, LXX.,—but must also plainly appear an abstraction decidedly unfavourable to the import and effect of the Epistles. It would have been far more effective in this case to have written τῇ ἐν . . . ἐκκλησίᾳ γράψον. Assuming the ἄγγ. τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν to be those to whom the churches are entrusted, the only question is, to what sphere do they belong, the terrestrial or the superterrestrial? Their belonging to the earthly sphere is supported, above all, by the address of the Epistles; secondly, by the circumstance that the writer of the Apocalypse could not act as messenger between two superterrestrial beings (cf. Rev. i. 1, xxii. 16); and further, by the consideration that as the candlesticks, so also the stars must belong to one and the same sphere. But if by this expression we are to understand men, it is natural to think of Acts xx. 28; 1 Pet. v. 2; and that too so that these ἐπίσκοποι or πρεσβύτεροι are those whose business it is to execute the will or commission of the Lord, in general as well as in special cases, to the churches, as those whom the Lord has appointed representatives of the churches, and to whom He has entrusted their care; cf. Acts xx. 28; Mal. ii. 7.—Grimm (*Lexicon graecolat. in lib. N. T.*) understands the expression ὧφθη ἀγγέλους, 1 Tim. iii. 16, likewise to refer to men, ἀγγέλους being a poetical name for ἀποστόλους; but this view may possibly rest more upon a certain aversion to the angelology of Scripture than upon

any reasons. Besides, he would have to show that ἄγγελος is more "poetical" than ἀπόστολος.

II. (b) Κατ' ἐξ. ἄγγελοι, angels, denotes the members of the στρατιὰ οὐράνιος, Luke ii. 13; cf. Acts vii. 38; Rev. xix. 14; Matt. xxvi. 53, δώδεκα λεγεῶναι ἀγγέλων; Hebrew מַרְפָּאֵי כָכָב, 1 Kings xxii. 19; 2 Chron. xviii. 18; Ps. cxlviii. 2; Dan. vii. 10; 2 Kings vi. 17; Josh. v. 14, 15. Compare the designation of God as הַיְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ in Isaiah, Jeremiah, Zechariah, Malachi. In accordance with their nature and their appearance they are called *spirits*, πνεύματα, Heb. i. 14; and according to their essence and life, they belong not to the terrestrial, but to the superterrestrial or heavenly sphere of the creation. Hence they are called οἱ ἄγγελοι τῶν οὐρανῶν, Matt. xxiv. 36; ἐν τοῖς οὐρ., Mark xii. 25, xiii. 32; ἐξ οὐρ., Gal. i. 8; cf. Luke xxii. 43; in order to indicate the sphere to which they belong; and they bear the name ἄγγελοι, not on account of their nature, but as describing their office and position as the messengers of God to men. These members of the στρατιὰ οὐράνιος are designed, just as men on their part, to praise God's glory, to glorify God; see Ps. ciii. 20; Eph. i. 14; and, moreover, in such a way that in them especially the omnipotence and resplendent majesty of God are reflected (cf. the very term στρατιὰ οὐράνιος, and God's title, הַיְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ; further, Ps. ciii. 20, בְּיָמֵינוּ; 2 Thess. i. 7, ἄγγελοι δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ; Matt. xxvi. 53; Luke ii. 9, ἄγγελος κυρίου ἐπέστη αὐτοῖς καὶ δόξα κυρίου περιέλαμψεν αὐτούς; Matt. xxv. 31; and thus, perhaps, also the titles ἀρχαί, ἐξουσίαι, θρόνοι, κυριότητες, δυνάμεις, are to be explained); according to their rank in the organism of the coming kingdom of God they are messengers between heaven and earth in the service of God, ἄγγελος θεοῦ, Luke ii. 15 [?]; Matt. xxii. 30; Luke xii. 8, 9, xv. 10; John i. 52; Acts x. 3, xxvii. 23; Gal. iv. 14; Heb. i. 6; without its being intended always by this title to give prominence to their work as God's servants and messengers, for ἄγγελος is simply the technical term derived from their office. When the angels appear in the execution of their mission, it is singly, as a rule, and the angel spoken of is then called ἄγγελος κυρίου, Matt. i. 20, 24, ii. 13, 19, xxviii. 2; Luke i. 11, ii. 9; Acts vii. 30, xii. 7, 23; rarely ἄγγελος τοῦ θεοῦ, Acts x. 3, xxvii. 23; which is explained from the fact that the angel appears in the service of the God of the revelation of salvation; see s.v. κύριος. Cf. Acts xxvii. 23, παρέστη μοι . . . τοῦ θεοῦ οὗ εἰμί, ὃ καὶ λατρεύω, ἄγγελος = מַרְפָּאֵי כָכָב, whereas ἄγγελος κυρίου = הַיְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ. The definite ὁ ἄγγελος κυρίου is only used after the appearing of an angel has been named; cf. Matt. i. 20, 24; Acts xii. 7, 11, vii. 30, 38; Luke ii. 9, 10, 13. This observance is of importance in determining the well-known question about the meaning of the O. T. הַיְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ. For it follows from this that there is no support in the N. T. for the opinion that ἄγγελος κ. always denotes one and the same person. But now there is also no reason for distinguishing the ἄγγ. κυρ. of the N. T. from the הַיְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ of the O. T.; just as little as ἄγγ. κυρ., Acts vii. 30–35, 38 (without the article), can have a different meaning from the same term as it occurs elsewhere in St. Luke's writings, where an ἄγγ. κυρ. appears in exactly the same manner as הַיְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ in the O. T. Cf. with Acts vii. 30–35, 38, the passage, 1 Kings xix. 5, 7, 9, 13, which

is quite similar and very important for this question, where in ver. 5 a מלאך appears who in ver. 7 is called מלאך יהוה. (In ver. 9 the word of the Lord comes to Elijah, and in ver. 13 Jehovah Himself appears, obviously as quite distinct from His angel.) In addition to this, it is to be observed that מלאך יהוה stands in the same relation to מלאך האלהים in the O. T. as ἄγγ. κυρίου does to ἄγγ. τοῦ θεοῦ in the N. T. There, also, מלאך יהוה is the more frequent and usual term to describe the angelic appearance in question, and in fact the same appearance which is elsewhere called מלאך האלהים. (The former occurs 52 times; the latter—apart from 1 Sam. xxix. 9; 2 Sam. xiv. 17, xix. 28—only 7 times: Gen. xxi. 17, xxxi. 11; Ex. xiv. 19; Judg. vi. 20, xiii. 6, 9; 2 Sam. xiv. 20.) Cf. Judg. xiii. 6, and especially ver. 9 with vv. 3, 13, 15, 16. But if an angel, or an angel of God, is more definitely described by the title *angel of Jehovah*, because he appears in the service of the God of the revelation of salvation, an important step has been gained towards the answer to the question as to the relation of this מלאך יהוה to יהוה. If, after the appearance of such an angel, mention is made of Jehovah and not of the angel; if words of the angel are frequently spoken of (though not always) as words of Jehovah; yea, if the presence of Jehovah is replaced by the presence of an angel, or of His angel (Ex. xxxiii. 2, 3, compared with xxxiii. 20), who is therefore the angel of His presence (Isa. lxiii. 9), in whom is His name (Ex. xxxiii. 21),—it follows from this, it is true, that there is a representation of Jehovah by the angel, a certain mediation through the angel,—in the main, the view which we find in Heb. ii. 2, Gal. iii. 19 (see *s.v.* μεσίτης),—but not an identity of any kind whatsoever between Jehovah and His angel. Cf. also Acts vii. 30, 32 with the original passage quoted, and with Judg. vi. 11–23. The relation is the same between Jehovah and His angel as between Jesus and His angel, Rev. i. 1, xxii. 6–9. But if we cannot overlook the distinction between Jehovah and His angel, and in order to do justice to the occasional identifying of the two we infer that the angel of Jehovah, whom we suppose to have been always one and the same, is a manifestation beforehand of the incarnation of God in Christ,—or at least that, in this distinction between Jehovah and His angel, there is an indication of that distinction of subject in the unity of the Godhead which was fully revealed in Christ,—it is of course true that this representation of God by the angel of the Lord (which is so characteristic of the O. T.) recedes in the N. T., where we have the presence of God in Christ. But to infer from this that there subsists a definite relation between the angel of Jehovah and the Son of God,—that the angel of Jehovah is an anticipatory manifestation of Christ,—is not merely logically and exegetically rash in the highest degree; for not a word is said in the N. T. about any such relationship,—a relationship which, if it really existed, would be of the highest import for the Messiahship of Jesus. Such an inference is also quite contrary to the N. T.; for both from Gal. iii. 19, Heb. ii. 2, and especially from the way in which Stephen, Acts vii., introduces the angel of the Lord, where the O. T. contains no mention of it, and from the rare appearance of the מלאך יהוה in the N. T., this only may be inferred, that *angel service as a substitute for God's presence,—an effecting of His revelation by means of angels,—is as characteristic*

of the old covenant as the presence of God in Christ specifically characterizes the new. From the fact of Christ's taking the place of the O. T. *יהוה* *יהוה*,—if we choose thus to call it,—we must, quite on the contrary, conclude, in view of the texts cited, that the *יהוה* *יהוה* is not the O. T. manifestation of Christ, but that the two stand related to one another in the same way as the old and new covenants, *ἐν τῷ λέγειν Καινὴν, πεπαλαίωκεν τὴν πρώτην τὸ δὲ παλαιούμενον καὶ γηράσκον ἐγγὺς ἀφανισμού*, Heb. viii. 13.—See Kurtz, *Geschichte des A. B.*, 2 Aufl. sec. 50. 2; Hofmann, *Schriftbeweis*, 1. 175, 378.

While thus we see how it is that the ἄγγ. κυρίου still appears in N. T. history, though very seldom and less prominently when compared with the O. T., we must not, on the other hand, overlook the fact, that as in the O. T. angels more and more frequently appear as the revelation progresses, so in the N. T. the history of revelation certainly does not run its course without the participation of angels, as Jesus says of Himself, John i. 52, *ἀπάρτι ὄψεσθε τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνεφγότα, καὶ τοὺς ἀγγέλους τοῦ θεοῦ ἀναβαίνοντας καὶ καταβαίνοντας ἐπὶ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*. It is not, however, so much that active participation which is peculiar to the O. T., but rather a participation of a psychological kind which of course does not exclude occasional activity. In lieu of the communication of divine revelations and prophecies in the O. T. by means of angels, something quite different appears. Only at the outset of N. T. history, and at the resurrection and ascension of Christ, are angels employed to convey divine announcements, Matt. i. 20, 24, ii. 13, 19; Luke i. 11 sqq., ii. 9; cf. Matt. xxviii. 2, 5, and parallel passages; then in the visions of the Apocalyptic writers. Cf. Auberlen, *Daniel und Apok.* cap. 3. Generally, where history is narrated, or prefigured in visions (in the Revelation), they occupy their appropriate place; and hence they are mentioned but seldom comparatively in the Epistles, only Rom. viii. 38; 1 Cor. iv. 9, vi. 3, xi. 10, xiii. 1; 2 Cor. xi. 14; Gal. i. 8, iii. 19, iv. 14; Col. ii. 18; 2 Thess. i. 7; 1 Tim. iii. 16, v. 21; Heb. i. 4–7, 13, ii. 2, 5, 7, 9, 16, xii. 22, xiii. 2; 1 Pet. i. 12, iii. 22; 2 Pet. ii. 4, 11; Jude 6. They are λειτουργικὰ πνεύματα εἰς διακονίαν ἀποστελλόμενα διὰ τοὺς μέλλοντας κληρονομεῖν σωτηρίαν, Heb. i. 14,—this is the view of the position, significance, and appearing of angels in the sphere of the revelation of salvation, which runs throughout Holy Scripture, so that their service, though not always directly, yet ever in its ultimate purpose, is for the benefit of those for whom God has provided salvation. Cf. Gen. iii. 24, xxiv. 7, 40, xxviii. 12, xxxii. 1, 2; Matt. xiii. 49, xxiv. 31, etc. To them as such is entrusted the care of the guardianship and well-being of each, Matt. iv. 6 (from Ps. xci. 11), *τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ ἐντελείται περὶ σοῦ κ.τ.λ.*, and accordingly they are the angels of those who are entrusted to their care; so Matt. xviii. 10, *οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτῶν* (i.e. τῶν μικρῶν τούτων τῶν πιστευόντων εἰς ἐμέ, ver. 6); Acts xii. 15, *ὁ ἄγγελος αὐτοῦ*. Cf. Rev. xxi. 12; Matt. xxiv. 31; Dan. x. 12 sqq.; Zech. iii. 7; Josh. v. 13 sqq.; Luke xvi. 22, xv. 10. Not that there is assigned to the angels a special part in the work of salvation on the part of God, nor that in any way by spiritual influence or the exercise of superhuman power they lead to the laying hold upon and possession of salvation on the part of man; but they accompany the history of salvation, in its objective growth

and in its subjective realization, with special interest in those for whom salvation is intended; cf. Luke ii. 13, 14, xv. 10; 1 Pet. i. 12, εἰς ἃ ἐπιθυμοῦσιν ἄγγελοι παρακύψαι. In no other way is even the greatness of God's glory—βάθος πλούτου—made known to them than in the revelation of salvation, and by the church; 1 Pet. i. 12; Eph. iii. 10, ἵνα γνωρισθῇ νῦν ταῖς ἀρχαῖς καὶ ταῖς ἐξουσίαις ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις διὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἡ πολυποίκιλος σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ. Cf. 1 Cor. iv. 9

Only with this limitation can we rightly understand the appearance of angels in the history of salvation, and the above-mentioned enhancement of their prominence in the N. T. For in all the stages of the history of salvation they appear as ministering and participating, and for this very reason serving and participating most actively at the outset of the N. T. revelation, with which heaven again opens. It is not only at the main epochs that their service and participation are regularly mentioned,—at Christ's birth, the flight into Egypt, the temptation, the agony in Gethsemane, the resurrection, and the ascension (1 Tim. iii. 16). Here they are rather in continual movement between heaven and earth, John i. 52; cf. Mark i. 13; Matt. iv. 11. And they again appear in the future at the end of the history of salvation, and then collectively, 2 Thess. i. 7; Matt. xxiv. 31, xxv. 31, xiii. 49, xvi. 27; Heb. i. 6. In behalf of the history of salvation—more than this we cannot venture to say—they appear also as ministering, and as accomplishing God's operations in the sphere of nature, Heb. i. 7; John v. 4; Rev. xvi. 5; cf. xiv. 18, ἄγγελος ὁ ἔχων ἐξουσίαν ἐπὶ τοῦ πυρός.

If after all this we not inappropriately designate the angels as intermediate beings, no perversion would be greater than to find in them echoes or even unsubdued remnants of polytheism; for it is just *by the service and escort of angels* that God's highest sovereignty is glorified, as is evident from the total impression of sacred history, as well as from particular declarations (e.g. Dan. vii. 10; 2 Thess. i. 7; Matt. xxv. 31); God not being in any way limited by angels, nor necessitated to make use of them as if they were "the necessary medium of His relation to the world." And so far from placing themselves between man and the God of his salvation (cf. Col. ii. 18), or hindering the direct access of man to God, they rather, on the one hand, invest the intercourse of God with men with a certain attractive and softening beauty (cf. Acts vi. 15; Ex. xxxiii. 2, 3), by the side of all the splendour and all the sublimity of their appearance (2 Cor. xi. 14); as, on the other hand, by their appearing, they impart to man a humbling impression of the divine majesty and greatness; cf. Isa. vi. ; Luke ii. 9, 10; Rev. xxii. 8, 9.—It may further be observed, that the angels of God are called ἅγιοι, Rev. xiv. 10, Mark viii. 38, Luke ix. 26, Acts x. 22, in order to characterize them in contrast with sinful man; ἐκλεκτοί, 1 Tim. v. 21, to describe them according to their ministering participation in the counsels of divine love (and their being included therein, Eph. i. 20 sqq.; Col. i. 20 ?); see *s.v.* ἐκλεκτός.

II. (c) Mention is also made of ἄγγελοι ἁμαρτήσαντες in 2 Pet. ii. 4, and with this express distinction only in the N. T.; cf. Jude 6, τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχὴν

ἀλλὰ ἀπολιπόντας τὸ ἴδιον οἰκητήριον εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας δεσμοῖς αἰδίοις ὑπὸ ζόφου τετήρηκεν. See Rev. xii. 7, 9, ix. 11; cf. John viii. 44. On account of their fellowship with Satan, not because they stand in the same relation to him as the angels of God to God, they are described as ἄγγ. τοῦ διαβόλου, Matt. xxv. 41; σατάν, 2 Cor. xii. 7. See, on this subject, Beck's profound and copious dissertation, free from all extra-scriptural theosophizing, *Lehrw.* 1, sec. 21, p. 247 sqq.: "*Der Abfall in der unsichtbaren Welt.*"

On the whole subject, see Hahn, *Theol. des N. T.* sec. 107 sqq., pp. 259–384; Beck, *Lehrwissenschaft*, 1. 173 sqq.; Kahnis, *Luther. Dogm.* 1. 553 sqq.; Hofmann, *Schriftbeweis*, 1. 314 sqq.

Ἀρχάγγελος, ὁ, first or highest angel, archangel, leader of the angels. 1 Thess. iv. 16, ὁ κύριος . . . ἐν φωνῇ ἀρχαγγέλου . . . καταβήσεται (cf. Matt. xxv. 31, καὶ πάντες οἱ ἄγγελοι μετ' αὐτοῦ); Jude 9, Μιχαὴλ ὁ ἀρχάγγελος. Cf. Rev. xii. 7, ὁ Μιχαὴλ καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ . . . ὁ δράκων καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ. Michael is, in Dan. x. 13, described as מִיכָאֵל הַיְּרֵמְיָהּ, εἰς τῶν ἀρχόντων; in xii. 1, as מִיכָאֵל הַיְּרֵמְיָהּ, ὁ ἀρχων ὁ μέγας. It is incorrect to say (Hofmann, *Schriftbeweis*, 1. 343) that this title is intended to imply nothing concerning differences of rank in the angel world, but only to explain the relation of Israel to the great world-powers; for then Michael would be "one of the chief princes," "the great prince," merely because "he standeth for the children of Israel," xii. 1. His greatness would depend solely upon the part he took in the history of Israel, whereas it is his greatness, his power, which is to comfort the prophet, and to give Israel help against the oppression of the nations. If, moreover, we take מִיכָאֵל as merely a strengthening of הַיְּרֵמְיָהּ, this latter word clearly denotes a definite rank, by virtue of which he is qualified for the special work and service. Cf. Josh. v. 14: הָיָה כְּצֶדֶק. Moreover, some such difference of rank as ἀρχάγγελος denotes, must, for linguistic reasons, be recognised. For the prefix ἀρχι—which occurs only in words which denote office, dignity, or occupation, very frequently in Plutarch and in the Byzantine age—always expresses a gradation in the sphere spoken of. Cf. in N. T. Greek, ἀρχιερεύς, ἀρχιποίμην, ἀρχιτελώνης; and such words as ἀρχιγραμματεὺς, "chief secretary;" ἀρχικυβερνήτης, "chief helmsman;" ἀρχιπειρατής, "captain of pirates."—Philo, on Gen. xviii. 6, 7, designates Moses ἀρχιπροφήτης καὶ ἀρχάγγελος, as he also styles the Logos ἀρχάγγελος, by which he means to indicate, at all events, a distinction of rank.

Ἰσάγγελος, ὁ, ἡ, angel-like; Luke xx. 36, οὔτε γαμοῦσιν οὔτε γαμίσκονται, οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀποθανεῖν ἔτι δύνανται, ἰσάγγελοι γὰρ εἰσιν, where Mark xii. 25, ὡς ἄγγελοι οἱ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς; cf. Matt. xxii. 30. According to this passage, neither mortality nor sexual communion pertains either to the υἱοὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως or to the angels; cf. 1 Cor. vi. 13; so much the more horrible, therefore, must the sin of the angels appear, which is mentioned in Jude 6 and 2 Pet. ii. 4.

Ἀναγγέλλω, f. ἐλῶ, strictly, to report back; used of the reports brought by persons

returning from somewhere, Xen. *Anab.* i. 3. 21, ἀκούσαντες δὲ ταῦτα οἱ αἵρετοὶ ἀναγγέλλουσι τοῖς στρατιώταις. Judith xi. 15; thus in 2 Cor. vii. 7, ἀναγγέλλων ἡμῖν τὴν ὑμῶν ἐπιπόθησιν. In accordance herewith is to be explained the choice of this word in John xvi. 14, ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λήψεται καὶ ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν, and in ver. 15; ver. 13, ὅσα ἂν ἀκούσῃ λαλήσει καὶ τὰ ἐρχόμενα ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν; 1 John i. 5, ἡ ἀγγελία ἣν ἀκηκόαμεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀναγγέλλομεν ὑμῖν; cf. *Erasm., quod filius annuntiavit a patre, hoc apostolus acceptum a filio renunciavit nobis*; also in John iv. 25, of the Messiah, ἀναγγελεῖ ἡμῖν πάντα; comp. Deut. xviii. 18. This may possibly have to be taken into consideration in 1 Pet. i. 12, οἷς ἀπεκαλύφθη ὅτι οὐχ ἑαυτοῖς ἡμῖν δὲ διηκόνουν αὐτά, ἀ νῦν ἀνηγγέλη ὑμῖν, κ.τ.λ., where the meaning, "to report things that have happened" (Schott), is not to be given to it. It is then used with a weaker sense of the ἀνά, and signifies to send news of, and generally, to report, to notify, to announce, to proclaim. Very frequently in the LXX. = 𐤀𐤏𐤍, etc. Rom. xv. 21, οἷς οὐκ ἀνηγγέλη περὶ αὐτοῦ; Isa. lii. 15, 𐤀𐤏𐤍 𐤒𐤁𐤕 𐤏𐤍 𐤒𐤏𐤍; besides, only with certainty in Acts xiv. 27, ἀνήγγελλον (Rec. ἀνήγγειλαν) ὅσα ἐποίησεν . . . καὶ ὅτι κ.τ.λ.; Acts xv. 4, xix. 18, xx. 20, 27. In classical Greek we find more frequently ἀπαγγέλλω, which Lachm. and Tisch. have received into their text, instead of the Rec. ἀναγγέλλω, in Mark v. 14, 19; John v. 15, xvi. 25; Acts xiv. 27. The second Aor. ἡγγέλην, which in the compounds of ἀγγέλλω is not infrequently used by later writers, occurs in 1 Pet. i. 12; Rom. xv. 21 (cf. Rom. ix. 17; Acts xvii. 13). Construed (1) with the acc.: John iv. 25, xvi. 13; Acts xvi. 38, xix. 18, xx. 20, 27; 2 Cor. vii. 7; 1 Pet. i. 12; 1 John i. 5. Instead of the acc., with a relative clause following, in Mark v. 19; Acts xiv. 27; (2) followed by ὅτι, John v. 15; Acts xiv. 27; (3) περί τινος, John xvi. 25; Rom. xv. 21; cf. Judith x. 22 (ἀπαγγέλλειν περί τινος, often in Polyb.). Except in Mark v. 14, εἰς τινα, it is connected with the dative of the person.

Ἀπαγγέλλω, second Aor. pass. ἀπηγγέλην (cf. s.v. ἀναγγέλλω), Luke viii. 20. Herodian. vii. 9 = ἀγγέλλειν (τινί τι) ἀπό τινος, to announce or report from some place or person; see Acts iv. 23, v. 22, 25, xxiii. 16, 17, 19; then generally, to tell, to announce, to publish, and, indeed, to publish something that has happened, been experienced, heard. It is also used of a commission to be executed *viva voce*, Acts xv. 27, xxvi. 20. LXX. = 𐤀𐤏𐤍, etc.; more common, however, is the word ἀναγγέλλω (q.v.), which occurs less frequently in the profane writers. Ἀπαγγέλλω occurs especially in Luke's writings, the Gospel and Acts. (1) τινί τι, Matt. xxviii. 11; Mark vi. 30; Luke ix. 36, xiv. 21, xxiv. 9; Acts xii. 17, xvi. 38, xxiii. 17. *Of the ministry of the apostles* (cf. on the contrary, ἐπαγγέλλομαι, *of the divine action*), 1 John i. 2, (ἑωράκαμεν καὶ μαρτυροῦμεν καὶ) ἀπαγγέλλομεν ὑμῖν τὴν ζωὴν τὴν αἰώνιον (cf. Acts xxvi. 20). Cf. Matt. xii. 18, κρίσω τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἀπαγγελεῖ, from Isa. xlii. 1, 𐤏𐤏𐤍 𐤀𐤏𐤍 𐤒𐤁𐤕, LXX. ἐξολοσει, where κρίσις denotes, not future things, but *quid sit verum, sanctum, Deo dignum* (Cocceius), the righteous government of God; see s.v. κρίσις.—Heb. ii. 12, ἀπαγγελῶ τὸ ὄνομά σου τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς μου; Ps. xxii. 23, 𐤀𐤏𐤍, LXX. διηγῆσομαι. Instead of τινί, we find πρὸς τινα, Acts xvi. 36;

Xen. *Anab.* vi. 3. 22; εἰς τινά, when the object is impersonal, the place where and to which the proclamation is issued, Acts xxvi. 20, τοῖς ἐν Δαμάσκῳ πρῶτόν τε καὶ Ἱεροσολύμοις εἰς πᾶσάν τε τὴν χώραν τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἀπήγγελλον μετανοεῖν κ.τ.λ.—ἀπαγγέλλειν τι, Matt. viii. 33; Acts xv. 27; Luke viii. 47 (Lachm., Tisch.).

(2) The object subjoined in the form of a relative or objective clause (Winer, sec. 60. 6; cf. Acts xiv. 27, ἀνήγγελλον ὅσα ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς μετ' αὐτῶν καὶ ὅτι ἤνοιξεν κ.τ.λ.), Matt. xi. 4; Luke vii. 22, viii. 47, Rec.; Acts iv. 23, xxiii. 19; 1 Thess. i. 9; 1 John i. 3; followed by πῶς, Luke viii. 36; Acts xi. 13; by ὅτι, Luke xviii. 37; 1 Cor. xiv. 25 (cf. Acts v. 25); by inf. Acts xxvi. 20; acc. and inf. Acts xii. 14 (cf. Winer, sec. 44. 3).

(3) ἀπαγγ. τινὶ περὶ τινος. Luke vii. 18, xiii. 1; John xvi. 25 (cf. 1 Thess. i. 9, περὶ ἡμῶν ἀπαγγέλλουσιν, ὅποιαν εἰσοδὸν ἔσχομεν πρὸς ὑμᾶς, and Acts xxviii. 21, ἀπήγγειλεν ἡ ἐλάλησέν τι περὶ σοῦ πονηρόν). (4) Without object, ἀπαγγέλλειν τι = to give an account to some one, Matt. ii. 8, xiv. 12, xxviii. 8, 9, 10 (Lachm. and Tisch. omit it in ver. 9).—John iv. 51, ἀπήγγειλαν λέγοντες; cf. 2 Sam. xv. 31, וַיִּבְרָךְ וַיִּשְׁמַח.

Διαγγέλλω (second Aor. pass. διηγέλην; cf. s.v. ἀναγγέλλω), to make known through an intervening space, (1) to convey a message or tidings; cf. Xen. *Anab.* i. 6. 2, ὥστε μήποτε δύνασθαι αὐτούς, ἰδόντας τὸ Κύρου στρατόπεδον, βασιλεῖ διαγγεῖλαι; ii. 3. 7, μέχρις ἂν βασιλεῖ τὰ παρ' ὑμῶν διαγγελθῇ; vii. 1. 14, ἐπακούσαντες δέ τινες τῶν στρατιωτῶν ταῦτα ἢ καὶ τῶν λοχαγῶν τις διαγγέλλει εἰς τὸ στρατόπεδον. So in Acts xxi. 26, διαγγέλλων τὴν ἐκπλήρωσιν τῶν ἡμερῶν κ.τ.λ., on which Chrys. remarks, αὐτὸς ἦν ὁ δῆλον ἑαυτὸν ποιῶν, he caused to be known, that, etc. Then (2) = to report further, to publish far and wide; cf. LXX. Lev. xxv. 9, διαγγελεῖτε σάλπιγγος φωνῇ ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῇ ὑμῶν = וּבְכָל אֶרֶץ יִשְׂרָאֵל. Plut. *Camill.* 24, ἡ φήμη [ταχύ] διαγγέλλουσα τὴν πρᾶξιν εἰς τὰς πόλεις. Thus in Luke ix. 60, σὺ δὲ ἀπελθὼν διάγγελε τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ. Rom. ix. 17, ὅπως διαγγελῇ τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῇ, from Ex. ix. 16 = וַיִּבְרָךְ (cf. Ex. xiv.).

Ἐπαγγέλλω, to proclaim; used, like the Lat. *edicere* and *pronuntiare*, of public announcements, decrees; to announce, be it a message, a summons, or a promise. Xen. *Cyrop.* vii. 4. 2, στρατιᾶς ὅποτε δέοιτο, ἐπήγγελλεν αὐτοῖς; Thucyd. vii. 17, στρατίαν τε ἐπαγγέλλων ἐς τοὺς ξυμμάχους; v. 47, ἐπὴν ἔλθῃ ἐς τὴν πόλιν τὴν ἐπαγγείλασαν βοηθεῖν. Most frequently in the sense, to announce a summons, to issue the command for something. Also in the middle, Herodian. vii. 1, ἐπηγγέλλετο ἐτοιμάζειν στρατιήν, he caused to be announced; cf. on this meaning of the middle, Krüger, *Gram.* sec. 52. 11; Matth. *Gram.* sec. 492. 9. In the N. T. only middle, ἐπαγγέλλεσθαι, to announce oneself, i.e. I offer myself for something which I engage to do,—I offer my services. Krüger, sec. 52. 8. 5. Thuc. vi. 88, πόλεων ἐπαγγελλομένων καὶ αὐτῶν συμπολεμεῖν. Mark xiv. 11, ἐπηγγείλαντο αὐτῷ ἀργύριον δοῦναι. 2 Pet. ii. 19, ἐλευθερίαν αὐτοῖς ἐπαγγελλόμενοι αὐτοὶ δοῦλοι ὑπάρχοντες τῆς φθορᾶς. In particular, of the offers of the Sophists to teach something. (Cf. Eccles. iii. 25, γνώσεως δὲ ἀμοιρῶν μὴ ἐπαγγελοῦ.) This is the use in 1 Tim. ii. 10, ἐπαγγελλόμεναι θεοσεβειαν, professing godliness, pretending to be godly,

hence = to pretend, 1 Tim. vi. 21, (ἐκτρεπόμενος τὰς . . . ἀντιθέσεις τῆς ψευδονύμου γνώσεως) ἦν τινες ἐπαγγελλόμενοι κ.τ.λ.; cf. Wisd. ii. 13, ἐπαγγέλλεται γνώσιν ἔχειν θεοῦ. With a *special* meaning the word (as also its derivatives) is used of God, and of the *divine promise of salvation*, for which it is peculiarly appropriate; because, "in distinction from ὑπισχέομαι, it means, to promise spontaneously, to engage oneself to render a service" (Pape, *Dict.*), quae. verbi graeci proprietas, ubi de divinis promissionibus agitur, exquisita observanda est (Beng. on Acts i. 4). In Acts vii. 5, ἐπηγγείλατο δοῦναι; Tit. i. 2, ἐπ' ἐλπίδι ζωῆς αἰωνίου ἦν ἐπηγγείλατο ὁ ἀψευδὴς θεός; cf. 1 John ii. 25; Jas. i. 12, τὸν στέφανον τῆς ζωῆς ὃν ἐπηγγείλατο τοῖς κ.τ.λ.; Jas. ii. 5, τῆς βασιλείας ἧς ἐπηγγείλατο κ.τ.λ.; Rom. iv. 21; Heb. xii. 26, ἐπὶ ἡγγέλται λέγων. Absolutely = to give a promise (cf. above, Ecclus. iii. 25; Aristot. *Eth.* x. 9. 20, τῶν σοφιστῶν οἱ ἐπαγγελλόμενοι); ὁ ἐπαγγελλόμενος, Heb. vi. 13, x. 23, xi. 11; Gal. iii. 19, σπέρμα ᾧ ἐπὶ ἡγγέλται, the seed, to which the promise is given; cf. ver. 18. As Paul also uses ἐπαγγ. only in the middle, and it is a technical term, it falls under the category of those deponent verbs which, in some tenses, especially in the perf., have both an active and a passive meaning; cf. Matth. sec. 496a.—The O. T. has no corresponding technical term.—See προεπαγγελλίζομαι.

Προεπαγγέλλω, to proclaim beforehand, to promise beforehand; it occurs frequently in Dio Cass. in both active and middle.—In the N. T. it occurs in the passive in 2 Cor. ix. 5, ἵνα . . . προκαταρτίσωσι τὴν προεπαγγελμένην εὐλογίαν ὑμῶν (Rec. προκατηγγελημένην); in the middle in Rom. i. 2, δ (sc. εὐαγγέλιον) προεπαγγείλατο διὰ κ.τ.λ.

Ἐπαγγελία, ἡ, proclamation, both in an active and a passive sense. Except as used as an Attic law term in the combination ἐπαγγελίαν ἐπαγγέλλειν, "to bring an accusation [against an orator]" (see Passow), the word occurs only in later Greek, where it is mostly equivalent to *consent, promise, offer* (even *summons*, Polyb. ix. 38. 2), for which, in O. T. Greek, and in Isocr., Dem., Aesch., ἐπάγγελμα is used, *q.v.*; cf. Polyb. i. 43. 6, vii. 13. 2, xviii. 11. 1, ἐν ἐπ. καταλείπειν, to rest content with promising; i. 72. 6, ἐπαγγελίας ποιῆσθαι πρὸς τὴν ἀπόστασιν. On the other hand, Aeschin. p. 24. 14, ἐὰν δ' αὐτὸς ἐν τοῖς πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἔργοις γένηται οἷος νῦν ἐστὶν ἐν τοῖς ἐπαγγέλμασιν. The word seldom occurs in the LXX.; once through a misunderstanding of the Heb. אָמַר, Amos ix. 6; in Ps. lvi. [lv.] 9 = אָמַר. In Ezek. vii. 26, a passage which Schleusner cites in addition, we have not ἐπαγγ. but ἀγγελία = אָמַר. In the only place wherein it occurs in its true sense, Esth. iv. 7, it is added by the LXX. In 1 Esdras i. 7 and 1 Macc. x. 15, it is = promise, promises. In the Prayer of Manasses, ver. 6, it stands as in the N. T. of God's promise of salvation; τὸ ἔλεος τῆς ἐπαγγελίας σου = misericordia conspicua in promissione tua (Wahl).

In the N. T. Acts xxiii. 21, προσδεχόμενοι τὴν ἀπὸ σοῦ ἐπαγγελίαν, in the general sense, promise or consent. Elsewhere always in a special sense, to denote the *divine promises of salvation*, as, in fact, all the derivatives of ἀγγέλλω, as already remarked, are used to designate the proclamation of salvation. As it occurs also in the N. T. (Luke, Acts,

Hebrews, St. Paul's writings, 2 Peter, 1 John) in an active and a passive sense,—though but rarely active, besides Acts xxiii. 21, only in Gal. iii. 18,—we have in N. T. usage of the passive an extension of the meaning, so that it denotes not only *the promise given*, but also the *promised blessing itself*. (I.) Actively, it denotes *the act of promising*, Gal. iii. 18, τῷ Ἀβραὰμ δι' ἐπαγγελίας κεχάρισται ὁ θεός; cf. Bengel on Acts i. 4, s.v. ἐπαγγέλλω. (II.) Passively, (a) *the promise given*. Rom. ix. 9, ἐπαγγελίας ὁ λόγος; Rom. iv. 20, εἰς τὴν ἐπ. τοῦ θεοῦ οὐ διεκρίθη τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ (cf. Plat. *Euthyd.* 274 A, ὑπὸ γὰρ τοῦ μεγέθους τοῦ ἐπαγγέλματος οὐδὲν θαυμαστὸν ἀπιστεῖν). With specification of the purport of the promise, 2 Tim. i. 1, κατ' ἐπ. ζωῆς τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ; 2 Pet. iii. 4, ἡ ἐπ. τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ; Heb. iv. 1, ἐπ. εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσιν αὐτοῦ; 1 Tim. iv. 8, ἡ εὐσέβεια . . . ἐπαγγελίαν ἔχουσα ζωῆς. Cf. 1 John ii. 25, αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἐπ. ἣν αὐτὸς ἐπηγγείλατο ἡμῖν, τὴν ζωὴν τὴν αἰώνιον; Rom. iv. 13, ἡ ἐπ. . . τὸ κληρονόμον αὐτὸν εἶναι τοῦ κόσμου. Without a more definite specification of the purport, *the promise of salvation*, the Messianic promise, Rom. ix. 4, ὧν αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι; Gal. iii. 21, ὁ οὖν νόμος κατὰ τῶν ἐπαγγελιῶν τοῦ θεοῦ; ver. 18; iv. 23. Acts ii. 39, ὑμῖν γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐπ.; xiii. 23, τούτου ὁ θεὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ σπέρματος κατ' ἐπαγγελίαν ἤγαγεν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ σωτῆρα Ἰησοῦ. Ver. 32, εὐαγγελιζόμεθα τὴν πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ἐπ. γενομένην ὅτι ταύτην ὁ θεὸς ἐκπεπλήρωκεν κ.τ.λ.; xxvi. 6, ἐπ' ἐλπίδι τῆς εἰς τοὺς πατέρας ἐπαγγ. γενομένης ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ. In this special sense, the conception expressed in ἐπαγγ., both as to its form (Gal. iii. 18) and purport (Gal. iii. 21), occupies so important a place in the divine economy, that the blessings as well as the members of the economy of salvation are thus characterized. Hence the combinations: γῇ τῆς ἐπαγγ., Heb. xi. 9; τὰ τέκνα τῆς ἐπαγγ., Rom. ix. 8, Gal. iv. 28; πνεῦμα τῆς ἐπαγγ. τὸ ἅγιον, Eph. i. 13; διαθήκαι τῆς ἐπαγγ., Eph. ii. 12; cf. Rom. ix. 4.—Gal. iii. 29, κατ' ἐπαγγ. κληρονόμοι; Eph. iii. 6, συμμέτοχα τῆς ἐπαγγ.; Rom. iv. 14 and Gal. iii. 17, καταργεῖν τὴν ἐπαγγ.; Rom. xv. 8, βεβαιῶσαι τὰς ἐπαγγ.; cf. iv. 16, εἰς τὸ εἶναι βεβαίαν τὴν ἐπ.; Gal. iii. 16, ἐρρήθησαν αἱ ἐπαγγ.; 2 Cor. vii. 1; Heb. vii. 6, ἔχειν τὰς ἐπαγγ.; Heb. xi. 17, ἀναδέχασθαι τὰς ἐπαγγ.—Acts vii. 17; Gal. iii. 16, 22; Eph. vi. 2; Heb. viii. 6. In 2 Pet. iii. 9, οὐ βραδύνει κύριος τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, ὥς τινες βραδυτῆτα ἡγοῦνται ἀλλὰ μακροθυμεῖ κ.τ.λ., we must not (as in our first edition) join κύριος τῆς ἐπ.,—a connection which cannot be justified either by ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, Mark i. 1, or by γῇ τῆς ἐπ. ἀλλοτρία, Heb. xi. 9, and which is so harsh that most manuscripts read ὁ κυρ. τῆς ἐπ.; but we must construe τῆς ἐπ. with βραδύνει, for then only will the antithesis intended between the otherwise synonymous verbs βραδύνειν and μακροθυμεῖν appear (cf. Eccclus. xxxii. (or xxxv.) 22, ὁ κύριος οὐ μὴ βραδύνη οὐδὲ μὴ μακροθυμήσῃ ἐπ' αὐτοῖς) when βραδύνειν is more fully defined by a special object. The thought of course is this: What seems a delaying of the promise is really not so, but a delaying of the judgment; and that at which the mockers mock in the presence of those who wait for the second coming of the Lord, is really for them a call of grace to repentance. Cf. 1 Pet. iv. 17, 18. The intransitive βραδύνειν does not, indeed, elsewhere appear with the genitive, but with the dative or accusative, e.g. βοῇ, “with help,”

in Aeschylus; τὴν σωτηρίαν, Isa. xlv. 13; ὥραν, Plut. *Conv.* 707 E. Still this connection, which the context obliges, is justifiable; because, on the one hand, βραδύς is sometimes joined with the genitive, e.g. Heliod. ii. 29: βραδὺ τῆς ἡλικίας,—in the passage cited by Passow, Thuc. vii. 43, it is joined, not with the genitive, but with the dative;—and, on the other hand, according to the general rule, words signifying “neglecting,” “preventing,” “holding back,” “hindering,” are followed by the genitive; cf. Krüger, sec. 47. 11. 12; Winer, sec. 30. 6. (b) ἐπαγγελία is = *the promised blessing*, so only in Luke, Acts, Hebrews. Acts ii. 33 (cf. Heb. ix. 15, xi. 13); Acts i. 4; Luke xxiv. 49; Heb. x. 36, and xi. 39, κομίζεσθαι τὴν ἐπ. With οἱ κληρονόμοι τῆς ἐπ., Heb. vi. 17; ver. 12, κληρονομεῖν τὰς ἐπ.; xi. 9, συγκληρονόμοι τῆς ἐπ., compare the Pauline κατ’ ἐπαγγελίαν κληρονόμοι, Gal. iii. 29. It is to be observed, that ἐπ. standing alone never signifies “the blessing promised,” that this is purely a derived meaning, and always results from the connections in which the word stands; and it is thus of course also necessary to explain the same connections in one and the same book, as e.g. in the Epistle to the Hebrews, uniformly; so that Heb. xi. 33, ἐπέτυχον ἐπαγγελιών must not (because of the absence of the article) be understood of *the words of promise*, while vi. 15, ἐπέτυχεν τῆς ἐπ., denotes *the promised blessing*; cf. vi. 12, 17. This is clear with reference to the combinations λαμβάνειν τὴν ἐπ., Acts ii. 33; Heb. ix. 15; τὰς ἐπ., Heb. xi. 13; κομίζειν τὴν ἐπ., Heb. xi. 39, x. 36. But with these expressions it seems not to agree, that of the same persons of whom it is said: “they received not the promises, but only saw them afar off” (Heb. xi. 13, 39, ix. 15), it should be said again: “they have through faith and patience inherited the promises,” and that “Abraham was made partaker of the ἐπ.” (vi. 12, 15, 17, cf. xi. 9). But as, according to the context, we cannot take (vi. 12 sqq.) the ἐπαγγελίαι, ἐπαγγελία, to denote anything else than the purport of the promise, we must seek the harmonizing of both statements in ix. 15, τὴν ἐπ. λάβωσιν οἱ κεκλημένοι τῆς αἰωνίου κληρονομίας. As to xi. 33, ἐπέτυχον ἐπαγγελιών, compared with ver. 39, οὐκ ἐκομίσαντο τὴν ἐπ., and ver. 13, μὴ λαβόντες τὰς ἐπ., the absence of the article shows that by ἐπ. we are to understand something different from αἱ ἐπ., viz. not the N. T. salvation, but indefinitely “that which was promised;” cf. Delitzsch, *in loc.*

Ἐπαγγελμα, τό, promise, assurance; 2 Pet. i. 4, τὰ τέμνα καὶ μέγιστα ἡμῶν ἐπαγγέλματα δεδώρηται; 2 Pet. iii. 13, κατὰ τὸ ἐπάγγελμα αὐτοῦ προσδοκῶμεν, conjoined with ὑπόσχεσις in Dem. p. 397. Dion. Hal. 19. 178.

Ἐξαγγέλλω, I. to report from somewhere, to publish abroad; Xen. *Anab.* i. 6. 5, ἐπεὶ δ’ ἐξῆλθεν, ἐξήγγειλε τοῖς φίλοις τὴν κρίσιν τοῦ Ὀρόντου ὡς ἐγένετο· οὐ γὰρ ἠπρόρρητον ἦν. Hence also, to proclaim publicly; Prov. xii. 16, opposed to κρύπτειν; Ps. ix. 15, ὅπως ἂν ἐξαγγείλω πάσας τὰς αἰνήσεις σου ἐν ταῖς πύλαις τῆς θυγατρὸς Σιών. II. = to publish completely; *plene et plane* (Biel, *Lexicon in LXX.*; cf. the German *ausserzählen*, “to tell to the end”); as verbs compounded with ἐκ often mean: thus Eccles. xviii. 3.—In the N. T. only in 1 Pet. ii. 9, ὅπως τὰς ἀρετὰς ἐξαγγείλητε τοῦ . . . ὑμᾶς καλέσαντος κ.τ.λ.; after

Isa. xliii. 21, where we find διηγείσθαι, and xlii. 12, where ἀναγγέλλειν is used. Bengel: *ἐξ in εξαγγείλητε, innuit multorum ignorantiam, quibus fideles debent virtutes Dei praedicare.*

Καταγγέλλω (Xen., Polyb., Plut., and other later writers), to publish somewhither, to proclaim, *τι* or *τινά τι*, Acts xvi. 17, xvii. 3, 23, xxvi. 23; 1 Cor. ii. 1; pass. Acts xiii. 38; without specification of the direction, merely with the object in the accusative, Acts iii. 24, iv. 2, xiii. 5, xv. 36, xvi. 21; 1 Cor. ix. 14, xi. 26; Phil. i. 17; Col. i. 28; in the passive, Acts xvii. 13; Rom. i. 8; Phil. i. 18; *ἐν* with dative, Acts xvii. 13, Rom. i. 8, denotes not the direction, but the locality, in which the *καταγγέλλειν* takes place. The word may contain both a hint of the unknown purport of the proclamation (cf. *καταγγελλεύς*), and a strengthening of the simple verb; cf. Rom. i. 8; 1 Cor. ix. 14, xi. 26; Viger, ed. Herm. p. 638.

Καταγγελεύς, *εως, ὁ = ὁ καταγγέλλων, κατ'άγγελος*, proclaimer, only in Acts xvii. 18, *ξένων δαιμονίων δοκεῖ καταγγελεύς εἶναι*, and in eccl. Greek.

Προκαταγγέλλω, to proclaim beforehand; Jos. *Antt.* i. 12. 3; ii. 9. 4. In the N. T. Acts iii. 18, *ὁ δὲ θεὸς ἃ προκατήγγειλεν διὰ στόματος πάντων τῶν προφητῶν, παθεῖν τὸν Χριστὸν αὐτοῦ, ἐπλήρωσεν*; vii. 52, *ἀπέκτειναν τοὺς προκαταγγέιλαντας περὶ τῆς ἐλεύσεως τοῦ δικαίου*; iii. 24, Rec., where Griesb., Lachm., Tisch. read *κατήγγειλαν*; 2 Cor. ix. 5, Rec., *τὴν προκατηγγελμένην εὐλογίαν*, where Beng., Lachm., Tisch. read the more concrete *προσπηγγελμένην*; cf. Rom. i. 8 with Acts iii. 18.

Παραγγέλλω, to proclaim, more rarely in the sense of a mere communication, as the LXX. in Jer. xli. [xxvi.] 14, *ἀναγγείλατε (נִבְּאֵר) εἰς Μάγδωλον καὶ παραγγείλατε (פָּקֹדֵי) εἰς Μέμφιν*, than to denote a summons, a proclamation, or an enjoining of something which is to be done; cf. Xen. *Cyrop.* ii. 4. 2, *καὶ τῷ δευτέρῳ ἐκέλευσε ταῦτὸ τοῦτο παραγγεῖλαι*, in which sense also the German expressions, *ankündigen, bekannt machen, to proclaim, to make known*, are used to denote what certainly will or must be done. Thus in Greek it is the proper term for military commands. Cf. Acts iv. 18, *παρήγγειλαν τὸ καθόλου μὴ φθέγγεσθαι μηδὲ κ.τ.λ.*; v. 28, *παραγγείλα παρηγγείλαμεν ὑμῖν μὴ διδάσκειν*; ver. 40, xvi. 23. Also in a milder sense = *to charge*. Acts xxiii. 22, *παραγγείλας μηδενὶ ἐκλαλῆσαι ὅτι ταῦτα ἐνεφάνισας πρὸς μέ.*—Used of apostolic commands,—not arbitrary enactments, but pressing injunctions; = *to enjoin*. 1 Cor. vii. 10, *τοῖς γεγαμηκόσιν παραγγέλλω . . . γυναῖκα μὴ χωρισθῆναι*, and in the remaining passages of the Pauline Epistles; cf. 1 Tim. iv. 11, *παράγγελλε ταῦτα καὶ δίδασκε*. Used of Christ when sending forth His disciples, Mark vi. 8, *παρήγγειλεν αὐτοῖς ἵνα μηδὲν αἴρωσιν*. Acts x. 42, *παρήγγειλεν ἡμῖν κηρύξαι . . . καὶ διαμαρτύρασθαι*.—Construed with *τινὶ τι*, 2 Thess. iii. 4, 10 (ver. 10, *τοῦτο παραγγέλλομεν ὑμῖν ὅτι*); without dative, in 1 Cor. xi. 17; 1 Tim. iv. 11, v. 7. Instead of the accusative the infinitive is used; cf. Acts iv. 18, *παρηγγείλαν* (Tisch. omits *αὐτοῖς*) *τὸ καθόλου μὴ φθέγγεσθαι*, and, indeed, the infin. Aor.: Matt. xv. 35; Mark viii. 6; Luke v. 14, viii. 29, 56; Acts x. 42, xvi. 18, xxiii. 22; 1 Tim. vi. 13, 14

(acc. and inf.); 1 Cor. vii. 10. Bernhardy, *Synt.* p. 383 sq. The inf. pres. in Luke ix. 21; Acts i. 4, iv. 18, v. 28, 40, xv. 5, xvi. 23, xvii. 30, xxiii. 30; 2 Thess. iii. 6 (acc. and inf.); 1 Tim. i. 3, vi. 17, without there being apparently any radical distinction between the two constructions; cf. Acts xv. 5 with 1 Tim. vi. 13. See, however, Matth. *Gram.* sec. 501, who thinks there is between the Aor. of the imperat., opt., subj., inf., and the pres. of the same moods, this distinction, that the Aorist denotes a transitory action, action considered in and by itself in its completeness; whereas the present denotes an action which is either continued or often repeated, or of which merely the beginning is taken into consideration. At the same time, it is to be remarked (p. 1130), that the writer may often please himself which representation he makes use of.—Followed by *ἵνα* in Mark vi. 8; 2 Thess. iii. 12 (not 1 Tim. v. 7). The direct narration of the injunction is connected by *λέγων* in Matt. x. 5.

Παραγγελία, ἡ, proclamation, command, Acts xvi. 24, v. 28; *παραγγελία παρηγγελάμεν*, corresponding to the apostolic *παραγγέλλειν*, 1 Thess. iv. 2, cf. ver. 3; 1 Tim. i. 5, cf. ver. 3; 1 Tim. i. 18.

Εὐαγγέλιον, τό, from Hom. to Plut. = the reward for a good message; as *τὰ διδασκάλια* = fees paid for instruction. It also denotes sacrifice for a good message, in Isocr., Xenoph., Aeschin. Later Greek writers use it, at the same time, in the sense of good tidings, e.g. Plut., Lucian, Appian. Chrysostom establishes a forced connection between the two meanings in *Hom. 19 in Act.*: τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦτο ἔστι· τάδε σοι ἔσται ἀγαθά. As τὸ διδασκάλιον denoted primarily *what was taught, doctrina*, and then later (Plut.) in the plur., the *merces docendi*; so, conversely, εὐ. denoted primarily *the reward for a good message*, and then, subsequently, the *good message* itself. The LXX. use it in the latter sense only in 2 Sam. xviii. 25, unless there εὐαγγελία ought to be read instead of εὐαγγέλια, as *הַבְּשָׁרָה* is translated in 2 Sam. xviii. 20, 27; 2 Kings vii. 9; on the other hand, we find in 2 Sam. iv. 10, *וְהָיָה מִן הַנֶּשֶׁה לְעֹלָם* εὐαγγέλια, *הַבְּשָׁרָה*; and in 2 Sam. xviii. 22, where it is also *הַבְּשָׁרָה* = reward for a good message. Its constant use in the N. T. and by eccl. writers in the sense of *good tidings*, is not inconsistent with the formation of the word from εὐάγγελος = *publishing good news* (Eurip., Aeschyl.), nor opposed to the *usus loq.*

In the N. T. = *good news*, and, indeed, always with an altogether special significance; for as *ἐπαγγελία* = *the promise of salvation*, so εὐαγγέλιον (cf. εὐαγγελίζεσθαι, Isa. xl. 9, lii. 7, lxi. 1; Luke iv. 18) = *the news of the actually fulfilled promise of salvation* = *the news of salvation*; cf. Acts xiii. 32, ἡμεῖς ὑμᾶς εὐαγγελιζόμεθα τὴν πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ἐπαγγελίαν γενομένην, ὅτι ταύτην ὁ θεὸς ἐκπεπλήρωκεν κ.τ.λ.; Eph. iii. 6, εἶναι τὰ ἔθνη συγκληρονόμα καὶ σύσσωμα καὶ συμμέτοχα τῆς ἐπαγγελίας ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου. Mark i. 14, 15; cf. Phavor., εὐαγγελίον ἔστι κήρυγμα τῆς νέας σωτηρίας ἢ λόγος περιέχων ἀγαθοῦ παρουσίαν. Theodoret on Rom. i., εὐαγγέλιον τὸ κήρυγμα προσηγόρευσεως ὡς πολλῶν ἀγαθῶν ὑπισχνούμενον χορηγίαν. Hence the expressions ἡ ἀλήθεια τοῦ εὐαγγ., Gal. ii. 5, 14; τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ εὐ., Eph. vi. 19; ἡ ἐλπίς τοῦ εὐ., Col. i. 23, cf. ver. 5,

just as in most of the combinations given below. As regards the sense, we have not to decide between the news to be, or already, delivered, the *news of salvation*, and the act of delivery itself, the *publishing of salvation*, in the transitive sense; for passages like 1 Cor. ix. 14, ὁ κύριος διέταξεν τοῖς τὸ εὐ. καταγγέλλουσιν ἐκ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ζῆν, do not admit of such a change of signification (cf. Phil. i. 12, 7, 16). Further, the combination κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου, ἡμῶν, Rom. ii. 16, xvi. 25, 2 Tim. ii. 8, 2 Cor. iv. 3, 1 Thess. i. 5, 2 Thess. ii. 14, may be quite as suitably explained *the news of salvation to be delivered or actually delivered by me or us*; and in Gal. ii. 7, πεπιστευῖσθαι τὸ εὐαγγ. τῆς ἀκροβυστίας, τῆς περιτομῆς (cf. 1 Tim. i. 11; 1 Thess. ii. 4), the apparently appropriate explanation, “*evangelization of the praeputium*,” “*of the circumcision*,” is excluded by the context, vv. 2, 5, so that the genitive must be regarded as possessive; cf. Rom. ix. 4, ὧν . . . αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι. Besides, the transitive rendering, *publishing of salvation*, *evangelization*, does not harmonize with the formation of the word, which points strongly to the passive meaning, *news of salvation*. Phil. iv. 15, ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ εὐ., is to be explained as in Mark i. 1; cf. Heb. ii. 3; John ii. 11. Εὐαγγέλιον θεοῦ, Rom. i. 1, xv. 16, 2 Cor. xi. 7, 1 Thess. ii. 2, 8, 9, 1 Pet. iv. 17, designates the message of salvation according to its divine origin; cf. Rom. i. 2, 3, δ προεπηγγείλατο . . . περὶ τοῦ νιού αὐτοῦ; on the other hand, εὐ. τοῦ νιού αὐτοῦ in Rom. i. 9; Mark i. 1, εὐ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ νιού θεοῦ; Rom. xv. 19, τοῦ Χριστοῦ, as in Rom. i. 16, Rec.; 1 Cor. ix. 12; 2 Cor. ii. 12, ix. 13, x. 14; Gal. i. 7; Phil. i. 27 (cf. 1 Thess. iii. 2, συνεργὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν τῷ εὐ. τοῦ Χριστοῦ; Mark viii. 35, x. 29, ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ καὶ ἕνεκεν τοῦ εὐ.); as also 1 Tim. i. 11, τὸ εὐ. τῆς δόξης τοῦ μακαρίου θεοῦ, compared with 2 Cor. iv. 6; 2 Cor. iv. 4, τὸ εὐ. τῆς δόξης τοῦ Χριστοῦ, —designate the news of salvation according to its purport, like τὸ εὐ. τῆς βασιλείας in Matt. iv. 23, ix. 35, xxiv. 14; Mark i. 14, Rec., τὸ εὐ. τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ, Tisch. τοῦ θεοῦ. Acts xx. 24, τὸ εὐ. τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ; Eph. i. 13, τὸ εὐ. τῆς σωτηρίας ὑμῶν; vi. 15, τῆς εἰρήνης. The explanation of the genitive in 2 Thess. i. 8, τοῖς μὴ ὑπακούουσιν τῷ εὐ. τοῦ κυρίου ἡμ. Ἰησοῦ may remain doubtful; comp. Heb. ii. 3.—We have the expressions κηρύσσειν τὸ εὐ., Matt. iv. 23, ix. 35, xxiv. 14, xxvi. 13; Mark i. 14, xiii. 10, xiv. 9, xvi. 15; Gal. ii. 2; 1 Thess. ii. 9; λαλεῖν τὸ εὐ., 1 Thess. ii. 2; διαμαρτύρασθαι τὸ εὐ., Acts xx. 24 (cf. εἰς μαρτύριον, Matt. xxiv. 14); τὸ εὐ. καταγγέλλειν, 1 Cor. ix. 14; τὸ εὐ. εὐαγγελίζεσθαι, 1 Cor. xv. 1; 2 Cor. xi. 7; Gal. i. 11; Rev. xiv. 6; ἱεουργεῖν τὸ εὐ., Rom. xv. 16; δουλεύειν εἰς τὸ εὐ., Phil. ii. 22; συναθλεῖν ἐν τῷ εὐ., Phil. iv. 3 (cf. i. 27, συναθλεῖν τῇ πίστει τοῦ εὐ., cf. 1 Thess. iii. 2); πεπληρωκέναι τὸ εὐ. τοῦ Χριστοῦ, Rom. xv. 19; μεταστρέφειν τὸ εὐ. τοῦ Χριστοῦ, Gal. i. 7 (cf. v. 6, μετατίθεσθαι εἰς ἕτερον εὐ., δ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλο, to fall away to another gospel [qualitatively], which, however, is not [numerically] another, because there is no second message of salvation, but, at best, τὸ εὐ. τοῦ Χριστοῦ μετεστραμμένον; cf. 2 Cor. xi. 4, εὐ. ἕτερον δ οὐκ ἐδέξασθε). Further, ὑπακούειν τῷ εὐ., Rom. x. 16; 2 Thess. i. 8; πιστεύειν ἐν τῷ εὐ., Mark i. 15; συγκακοπαθεῖν τῷ εὐ., 2 Tim. i. 8.—Joined with a substantive: 2 Cor. viii. 18, οὐ ὁ ἔπαινος ἐν τῷ εὐ.; 1 Cor. ix. 18, ἐξουσία ἐν τῷ εὐ.; Phil. i. 5, κοινωνία εἰς τὸ εὐ.; cf. 1 Cor. ix. 23,

πάντα ποιῶ διὰ τὸ εὐ. ἵνα συγκοινωνὸς αὐτοῦ γένωμαι. It occurs also, besides, in Acts xv. 7; Rom. xi. 28; 1 Cor. iv. 15, ix. 18; 2 Tim. i. 10; Philem. 13. Not in Luke, Hebrews, Titus, 2 Peter, Jude, nor in the Gospel or Epistles of John.

Εὐαγγελίζω = εὐαγγέλια λέγειν, to bring a joyful message, good news. The active is unknown in the better Greek writers; rare also in the later ones, Dio Cass. lxi. 13.—LXX. 1 Sam. xxxi. 9; 2 Sam. xviii. 19, 20.—In the N. T. Rev. x. 7, εὐηγγελισεν τοὺς αὐτοῦ δούλους τοὺς προφῆτας; xiv. 6, ἔχοντα εὐαγγέλιον . . . εὐαγγελίσαι ἐπὶ τοὺς (αἱ τοὺς) κ.τ.λ. Elsewhere in the middle, Aristoph. *Eq.* 642, λόγους ἀγαθοὺς φέρων, εὐαγγελίσασθαι πρῶτον ὑμῖν βούλομαι; Theophr. *Char.* xvii. 5, πρὸς τὸν εὐαγγελιζόμενον ὅτι υἱὸς σοι γέγονεν; Dem., Lucian, Plut.; LXX. 1 Kings i. 42, ἀγαθὰ εὐαγγελίσαι.—In the N. T. 1 Thess. iii. 6, εὐαγγελισαμένου ἡμῖν τὴν πίστιν καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην ὑμῶν καὶ ὅτι κ.τ.λ.; Luke i. 19, ἀπεστάλην λαλῆσαι πρὸς σέ καὶ εὐαγγελίσασθαι σοι ταῦτα. Except in these passages, it is only used by the N. T. writers to denote the *New Testament proclamation of salvation* (vid. εὐαγγέλιον); cf. LXX. = ܡܠܟܐ, Isa. xl. 9, compared with ver. 10; Isa. lii. 7, ὡς πόδες εὐαγγελιζόμενου ἀκοὴν εἰρήνης, ὡς εὐαγγελιζόμενος ἀγαθὰ; lxi. 1, εὐαγγελίσασθαι πτωχοῖς; Ps. xl. 10, εὐηγγελισάμην δικαιοσύνην; Heb. iv. 2–6. Cf. also the combination with κηρύσσειν, διδάσκειν, παρακαλεῖν, μαθητεύειν, Luke iii. 18, viii. 1, ix. 6, compared with ver. 2, xx. 1; Acts v. 42, xiv. 21.—The augment comes after εὐ . . . εὐηγγελίζετο, etc. Cf. Lobeck, *Phryg.* 269; Winer, 66; Krüger, sec. 28. 4, 6, 15, 2.

I. Middle εὐαγγελίζομαι. (1) With an object of the person or the thing: to publish something (to some one) as a *divine message of salvation*. (a) τί τι. Luke ii. 10, εὐαγγελίζομαι ὑμῖν χαρὰν μεγάλην (ὅτι ἐτέχθη ὑμῖν σήμερον σωτήρ); Luke iv. 43, ταῖς ἐτέραις πόλεσιν εὐαγγελίσασθαι με δεῖ τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ; Acts viii. 35, εὐηγγελίσατο αὐτῷ τὸν Ἰησοῦν; Acts xvii. 18, τὸν Ἰησοῦν καὶ τὴν ἀνάστασιν (αὐτοῖς, Rec., and Lachm., which Tisch. omits) εὐηγγελίζετο; 1 Cor. xv. 1, τὸ εὐ. δ' εὐηγγελισάμην ὑμῖν; 2 Cor. xi. 7, τὸ τοῦ θ. εὐ. εὐηγγελισάμην ὑμῖν; Gal. i. 8, παρ' ὃ εὐηγγελισάμεθα ὑμῖν; Eph. ii. 17, εὐηγγελίσατο εἰρήνην ὑμῖν. Instead of the dative of the person, ἐν with the dat., Gal. i. 16, ἵνα εὐαγγελίζωμαι αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν; Eph. iii. 8, ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν εὐαγγελίσασθαι τὸ ἀνεξιχνίαστον πλοῦτος τοῦ Χριστοῦ. (b) τι. Luke viii. 1, τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ; Acts viii. 12, τὰ περὶ τῆς βασιλείας (Tisch. omits τὰ) καὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ; Acts v. 42, Ἰησοῦν τὸν Χριστόν; viii. 4, τὸν λόγον (cf. vv. 5, 12); xv. 35, τὸν λόγον τοῦ κυρίου; x. 36; Rom. x. 15, εἰρήνην, τὰ ἀγαθὰ (Isa. lii. 7); Gal. i. 23, τὴν πίστιν; Acts xiv. 15 followed by acc. and inf., εὐαγγελιζόμενοι ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ τούτων τῶν ματαίων ἐπιστρέφειν ἐπὶ θεὸν ζῶντα. (c) τί τινα. Acts xiii. 32, ἡμεῖς ὑμᾶς εὐαγγελιζόμεθα τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν κ.τ.λ.; cf. Alciph. *Ep.* iii. 12, ταῦτά σε οὖν εὐαγγελίζομαι; Heliod. *Aeth.* ii. 10, Εὐαγγελίζομαι σε τὴν Δημινέτης τελευτήν; Chrys. *Hom.* 106, ἔστι δὲ εὐαγγέλιον ἐρμηνεία τοῦ πράγματος . . . εὐαγγελίζεται γὰρ ἡμᾶς τὴν πολύμνητον τοῦ σωτῆρος οἰκονομίαν. (2) Without a thing for its object = to proclaim the divine message of salvation. (a) τι. Luke iv. 18; Rom. i. 15; 1 Cor. xv. 2; Gal. i. 8, iv. 13; εἰς, 2 Cor. x. 16 (cf. 1 Pet. i. 25). (b) τινα.

the most intensive construction = by proclaiming the message of salvation, to bring one into relation to it, to *evangelize* him. Luke iii. 18; Acts viii. 25, 40, xiv. 21, xvi. 10; Gal. i. 9; 1 Pet. i. 12, ἡ νῦν ἀνηγγέλη ὑμῖν διὰ τῶν εὐαγγελισαμένων ὑμᾶς; cf. Euseb. *Vit. Const.* iii. 26: τὰς γυναῖκας εὐαγγελιζόμενος. Cf. Lobeck, *Phryg.* 268. (c) Used absolutely, Luke ix. 6, xx. 1; Acts xiv. 7; Rom. xv. 20; 1 Cor. i. 17, ix. 16, 18.

II. Passive. (1) With an impersonal subject. Luke xvi. 16, ἡ βασ. τοῦ θ. εὐαγγελίζεται; Gal. i. 11, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τὸ εὐαγγελισθὲν ὑπ' ἐμοῦ; 1 Pet. i. 25, τὸ ῥῆμα τὸ εὐαγγελισθὲν εἰς ὑμᾶς; iv. 6, νεκροῖς εὐηγγελίσθη. (2) With a personal subject. Matt. xi. 5, πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται (compare Luke iv. 18); Luke vii. 22; Heb. iv. 2, 6.

Εὐαγγελιστής, οὗ, ὁ, only in N. T. and ecclesiastical Greek, *proclaimer of the message of salvation*, Acts xxi. 8; Eph. iv. 11; 2 Tim. iv. 5. ("Heralds of the gospel history;" Otto, *die geschichtl. Verh. der Pastoralbr.* p. 80.) Theodoret's definition does not touch the essence of the word: ἐκεῖνοι περιτόντες ἐκήρυττον; cf. 2 Tim. iv. 4, 5, ἐπὶ τοὺς μύθους ἐκτραπήσονται. σὺ δὲ . . . ἔργον ποίησον εὐαγγελιστοῦ, with Rom. i. 16; 1 Cor. i. 17; Eph. iv. 11; Jerome, *omnis apostolus evangelista, non omnis evangelista apostolus*. In distinction from the *προφήτης*, the evangelist speaks of the facts of redemption, the revelations of God (cf. the combinations *κηρύσσειν, διαμαρτύρεσθαι τὸ εὐ.*, etc., *s.v.* εὐαγγέλιον), the *διδάσκαλος* about them; the *προφ.* has revelations. Cf. Harless on Eph. iv. 11. At a subsequent period (Chrys.) the authors of the four Gospels were so called.

Προεὐαγγελίζομαι, to proclaim beforehand a joyful message, or something as a joyful message. Philo, *de nomm. mut.* p. 1069, ed. Paris, τὸν νεοττὸν οὐχ ὀρᾶς, . . . τὴν ἐλπίδα τοῦ πέτεσθαι δυνήσεσθαι προεὐαγγελιζόμενος; id. *de mund. op.* 7, ὧν ἡ μὲν (*sc.* πρῶτα) προεὐαγγελίζεται μέλλοντα ἥλιον ἀνίσχειν; Mang., *quorum alterum praeannunciat lactum adventum solis orituri*. Gal. iii. 8, προεὐηγγελίσατο (touching the augm., *vid. s.v.* εὐαγγελίζω) τῷ Ἀβραάμ = ἐπαγγέλλεσθαι, *q.v.*; cf. the correspondence between ἐπαγγελία and εὐαγγέλιον under εὐαγγέλιον, according to which ἐπαγγέλλεσθαι does not materially differ from προεὐαγγελιζέσθαι. Bengel says on this passage: *Verbum ad catachresin accedens suavissime. Abrahamo ante tempora evangelii evangelizatum est. Evangelium lege antiquius*. Cf. Gal. iii. 12, 16 sqq.

"Ἅγιος, ἱά, ἰον, holy, is the rarest of five synonyms, ἱερός, ὅσιος, σεμνός, ἅγιος, ἁγνός, which the Greeks had to express the idea of holiness, so far at least as they knew such an idea. In biblical Greek, on the other hand, of the Old as well as of the New Testament, it is the only word by which the *biblical* conception of holiness is expressed,—that conception which pervades the Bible throughout, which moulds the whole of divine revelation, and in which, we may say with perfect truth, are centred the fundamental and leading principles and aims of that revelation. What constitutes the essence of holiness in the biblical sense is not primarily contained in any of the above-

named synonyms; the conception is of purely biblical growth, and whatever the Greeks surmised and thought concerning the holiness of Divinity in any sense remotely similar to that in which Holy Scripture speaks of it, they had not any one distinct word for it, least of all did they express it by any of the terms in question. For the purpose of rendering or receiving the biblical conception and its contents, these terms can only come into consideration or be regarded as designations of God's holiness in so far as holiness is that element in the divine nature which lies at the basis of, determines and moulds, the reverence which is due from man towards God,—therefore *in a purely formal sense*. As Greek of itself did not possess the right word for it, the only term presenting itself as in any degree appropriate—*ἅγιος*—had to be filled and coined afresh with a new meaning; and thus *ἅγιος* is one of the words wherein the radical influence, the transforming and newly fashioning power of revealed religion, is most clearly shown. Of all the ideas which, within the world subjected to the influence of Christianity or in the modern languages, are bound up in the word *holy*, none are to be found in the ancient tongues, Greek and Latin, in the terms above named, save those of "the sublime," "the consecrated," "the venerable." The main element—the moral—is utterly wanting. Hence it is not merely a topic of linguistic interest, it is a significant moral phenomenon which here presents itself to our inquiry.

In order to show, first of all, that the Greeks did not possess the true conception of holiness, as it more or less fully has penetrated the consciousness of mankind through revealed religion, we must anticipate, so far as to assert that *holiness in the Scripture sense is a historico-ethical conception*. Now, as to the Homeric age, Nägelsbach (*Homer. Theol.* i. 12) says: "Holiness, as a constituent element of the Divine viewed in itself, or only perceived in the intercourse of the gods among themselves, is never mentioned. Never is there a title given to the Godhead indicating a consciousness similar to that in which the Bible speaks of the holiness of the true God." Afterwards, indeed (cf. Nägelsbach, *Nachhomer. Theol.* i. 28 sqq.), all moral and ontological perfections are attributed to the gods (Isocr. xi. 41: ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν οὐχ ὅπως τοὺς θεοὺς ἀλλ' οὐδὲ τοὺς ἐξ ἐκείνων γεγονότας οὐδεμίας ἡγοῦμαι κακίας μετασχεῖν, ἀλλ' αὐτοὺς τε πάσας ἔχοντας τὰς ἀρετὰς φῦναι καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις τῶν καλλίστων ἐπιτηδευμάτων ἡγεμόνας καὶ διδασκάλους γεγενῆσθαι. Plato, *Rep.* ii. 381 C), and the Greek becomes conscious of the holiness of his deity, principally in that not only does he punish evil outwardly,—it might be purely for the sake of order and discipline,—but inwardly hates evil and blames the man." But it does not rest here. Holiness, so far as in these aspects the Greeks became conscious of it, at once takes up an element which converts it into its direct opposite, into unholiness. For the *νέμεσις*, "the re-establishing of the right relation between God and man," wherein precisely divine holiness manifests itself, is at once turned into jealousy against mankind (τὸ θεῖον πᾶν ἐὼν φθονερόν, Herod. i. 32), because "the deity sees in every extraordinary happiness, in every extraordinary greatness which falls to the lot of man, even apart from any presumptuousness, an injury to his preroga-

tive, which he guards with envious jealousy." And now comes the last step: "a satanic element is attributed to the deity, and the seducing and deluding of man into sin is ascribed to him." In Theogn. 401 a man is spoken of who strives after ἀρετή, because he hopes for his happiness from it. But—*petit ille virtutem ultra quam satis est*. The excess of such striving is to the gods a reason for plunging him into sin. It was beyond the power of the Greeks to carry out and maintain their presentiments of the holiness of the Deity even to the remotest approach to the scriptural "Be ye holy, for I am holy," to say nothing of carrying it on to the "I am holy, I the Lord, who sanctifieth you." We shall see *how the scriptural conception of God's holiness, notwithstanding the original affinity, is diametrically opposite to all the Greek notions*; how, whereas these very views of holiness exclude from the gods all possibility of love (Nägelsbach, *Nach homer. Theol.* i. 37),—so that Aristotle can say, "the Deity exists not to love, but to be loved,"—the scriptural conception of holiness unfolds itself only when in closest connection with divine love, and only thus can it be apprehended. It is, however, important for us to know that the Greek language offered no single and adequate term whereby to express that combination of all moral and ontological perfections which Isocrates and Plato demand for the gods.

None of the words to be considered, *ἱερός*, *ὅσιος*, *σεμνός*, *ἄγιος*, *ἀγνός*, have anything of this fulness of meaning, either etymologically or by usage. It is only as formal designations of the divine holiness, as we have already said, that they come into consideration, for the purpose of rendering and receiving the biblical conception; and it is significant that the rarest of them, *ἄγιος*, is the very one which biblical Greek takes into its service, the word which, according to usage, was least affected with the profane spirit, and therefore offered the purest vessel for the new contents; whereas the most frequently recurring word in classical Greek, *ἱερός*, is almost completely excluded from Scripture use. "*Αγιος* is so seldom used in classical Greek, "that it never occurs in the Tragedians—that highest court of appeal for Attic usage—save in one doubtful passage (Aeschylus, *Suppl.* 858);" see Zezschwitz; whereas *ἱερός* is quite unusual in biblical Greek, in the LXX. especially so rare, that while constantly in the Apocrypha, and, to say the least, often still in the N. T., the Holy Place is designated τὸ ἱερόν, the LXX. always name it τὸ ἅγιον, τὰ ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων, ναὸς ἅγιος (this latter in classical Greek = ἱερόν ἅγιον). See *ἱερός*. *Σεμνός* only is in biblical Greek still rarer than *ἱερός*. "*Όσιος*, on the contrary, and *ἀγνός* have a clearly defined sphere far narrower than in classical Greek. In order to apprehend and estimate this fact, it will be convenient to represent the worth and import of these terms in classical usage; thus we shall find that in fact *ἄγιος* alone of them all, etymologically and by usage, was the first to suit the scriptural "holy," and that the biblical conception in its turn, which identified itself with the word, so far outstretched its literal meaning, that the newly-coined *ἄγιος* formed the root of a family of words unknown to classical usage, *ἀγιότης*, *ἀγιωσύνη*, *ἀγιάζω*, *ἀγιασμός*, *ἀγίασμα*, *ἀγιαστήριον*, *καθαγιαῶν*, whereas it was in classical Greek simply a single member of the family of words derived from *ἄγος*.

It is first to be remembered that the strictly ceremonial, and therefore religious, terms for *holiness* are *ἱερός* and *ἄγνός*, and likewise *ἄγιος* where it occurs; further, that of these *ἄγνός* only, and of the two remaining synonyms *σεμνός* only, are predicated of the gods, and this, moreover, in a sense and manner which show that holiness in the biblical meaning did not harmonize with the religious conceptions of the Greeks. "*Όσιος* denotes that which, through divine or human law, custom, usage, is consecrated (*becharmed*, so to speak), but it has by no means any distinctively religious import. While in connection, *e.g.*, with *δίκαιος* it denotes divine right, and *δίκαια*, human precepts; on the other hand, when used with *ἱερός*, it signifies what is set apart as holy by man, "what is consecrated and sanctioned by universal law and consent" (Passow),—*gefreit*, as is said in old German,—*ἱερός* referring to divine, divinely consecrated things, precepts, etc. In the LXX. it is with happy tact (see *s.v.* *Όσιος*) employed to represent the Heb. קֹדֶשׁ, for which in the N. T. we have *ἄγιος καὶ ἡγιασμένος*; a few times also = שְׁלוֹם (Deut. xxix. 19), קָדוֹר, יָשָׁר, תָּם, תְּמִימִים, but never for קָדוֹשׁ.—*Σεμνός*, from the root *σεβ*, contains the fundamental idea of reverential dread, awe-struck reverence (see *s.v.* *σέβω*), and denotes what inspires reverence and awe. It is predicated of the gods,—among the Attics specially of the Eumenides,—and of all "that belongs to the gods and is sacred to them, of what emanates from them, and otherwise is under their protection and care" (Passow). Yet in use it denotes, almost even less than *Όσιος*, any specially religious or even ethico-religious conception, and thus is quite inadequate for the biblical idea of holiness. For it not only stands also "for what is humanly venerable, all that by usage, power, or other distinguishing feature is raised in moral and intellectual dignity above the ordinary" (Passow), but is used, with a purely external reference, of what is grand, magnificent, tasteful, even fine (*e.g.* dress), that excites attention = impressive, affecting, sanctimonious (in Eurip.). It does not occur in the LXX.; in the N. T. in four places only: Phil iv. 8; 1 Tim. iii. 8, 11; Tit. ii. 2. "*Όσιος* and *σεμνός* are both only *secondary designations* of the religious conception of holiness, and thus are inappropriate to represent the Scripture conception.

The choice thus remained between the purely religious or ceremonial terms *ἱερός*, *ἄγιος*, and *ἄγνός*. Of these *ἱερός* is not only the most frequent, but the most appropriate word with a Greek to express his notion of holiness, so far as this is expressed in the synonyms now before us; whereas *ἄγιος* only now and then expresses a special feature of the *ἱερόν*, and *ἄγνός* soon by usage obtained so one-sided an application and meaning, that it might have been difficult to recoin it in the requisite way.

Ἱερός is, in its fundamental meaning, a term denoting *the outward manifestation of divine greatness*. Connected with the Sanscrit *ishiras*, vigorous, fresh, blooming, it means primarily *vigorous, mighty, great*,—a meaning which Curtius traces still in *ἱερός* ἰχθύς, ἱερὴ ἰς. "During the best period of the Homeric epos, *holy* must already have been its prevailing signification; but in particular forms of expression it still retained the older, the sensuous meaning" (Curtius, p. 358). It is a predicate of all that stands in connection with the gods or comes from them, or is consecrated to them; but its contents are so

little defined, that quite generally and in the formal sense it denotes what is divine, *θεῖον*, e.g. in the combinations Hes. *Theogn.* 57, *Ζεὺς ἱερὸν λέχος εἰς ἀναβαίνων*; *Il.* xi. 84, *ἱερὸν ἡμᾶρ*; xi. 194, *κνέφας*. Cf. Nügelbach, *Homer. Theol.* i. 24: "*ἱερά*, in ordinary usage, were not merely things formally consecrated by men to the gods, e.g. towns, places; also not merely things with which are connected moral relations placed under the protection of the gods,—as in *Il.* xviii. 504, the *ἱερὸς κύκλος* of the judges; *Il.* xvii. 464, the chariot board, *δίφρος*, as the place of sacred companionship between the warrior and the charioteer,—but those things also are called *ἱερά* which one views as directly and originally the property of the gods. With this *ἱερός* we may compare, not indeed *δῖος*, which, according to Nitzsch (on *Od.* i. p. 189), refers to birth and origin, but perhaps *θεῖος*, which, like *divinus*, sometimes signifies godlike, extraordinary, as it were supernatural excellence, e.g. in *θεῖος χορός*, *Od.* viii. 264, and sometimes expresses the divine origin of a gift or talent; thus, salt is called *θεῖον*, *Il.* ix. 214."

It is particularly to be observed that *ἱερός* is *never* used as an *epithet of the gods themselves*, and is *as little* employed even in a remotely similar sense of *men*, as the biblical *קדוש* and its derivatives. For instance, we seek in vain among the derivatives and compounds of *ἱερός* for the conception of *hallowing*, which has attached itself to the biblical term *holy*. Sometimes, perhaps, it occurs of men in the same sense,—as in Pind. *Pyth.* v. 97, kings are called *ἱεροί*, because they are under the protection of the gods, and derive their dignity from the gods (*Hom. Il.* ii. 205); Aristoph. *Ran.* 652, *ἱερὸς ἄνθρωπος*, of one initiated into the mysteries; Plut. *De Socr. daem.* 589 D, *οἱ τῶν δαιμόνων λόγοι διὰ πάντων φερόμενοι μόνους ἐνηχοῦσι τοῖς ἀθόρυβον ἦθος καὶ νήνεμον ἔχουσι τὴν ψυχὴν οὓς δὲ καὶ ἱερούς καὶ δαιμονίους ἀνθρώπους καλοῦμεν*; *De def. orac.* 2, *ἄνδρες ἱεροὶ δύο συνδραμόντες εἰς Δελφοῦς*,—and it might be regarded as analogous when, in 2 Kings iv. 9, Elisha is called by the Shunamite woman *קדוש ה' אלהים*; but this is also the only and not quite perfect analogy in biblical usage in which *קדוש* (only occurring thus again, Ps. cvi. 16) is used of individual persons. In 2 Pet. i. 21, the reading of the Rec. Text, *οἱ ἅγιοι θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι* (instead of *ἀπὸ θεοῦ ἄνθρ.*), would be remotely analogous to this use of *ἱερός*. In *De Alex. fort.* i. 10, Plutarch calls the Indian gymnosophists *ἄνδρες ἱεροὶ καὶ αὐτόνομοι*; not because they are *τῷ θεῷ σχολάζοντες*, as he describes them further on, but, as the connection with *αὐτόνομοι* suggests, in the same sense in which he elsewhere joins *ἀνὴρ ἱερὸς καὶ ἄσυλος* = inviolable, *Mor.* 410 A; *Vit. Tib. Graeck.* 14, 15, 21; cf. *Quaest. Rom.* 219 B, *τὰ ἄσυλα καὶ ἅγια ἱερά*; yet this again is something different from that unapproachableness which the biblical *holy* involves, Isa. lxxv. 5, where the LXX. renders *קדוש* by *καθαρὸς εἶναι*. The ethical character of the biblical *holy* is quite foreign to the Greek *ἱερός*. There is only one known passage wherein *ἱερός*, as the predicate of a man, is possibly, as Suidas thinks, synon. with *εὐσεβής*, Soph. *Oed. Col.* 287, *ἦκω γὰρ ἱερὸς εὐσεβής τε καὶ φέρων δησιν ἀστοῖς τοῖσδ'*. Still it seems to me at least doubtful whether even here *ἱερός* stands in an ethical sense, and does not rather refer to the divine guidance and conduct of Oedipus. Plato, *De leg.* 319 A, *νεμεσᾷ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ὅταν τις ψέγῃ τὸν ἐαυτῷ ὁμοῖον ἢ ἐπαινῇ τὸν*

ἐαυτῷ ἐναντίως ἔχοντα· ἔστι δ' οὗτος ὁ ἀγαθός· μὴ γὰρ τοι οἶον λίθους μὲν εἶναι ἱεροὺς καὶ ξύλα καὶ ὄρνεα καὶ ὄφεις, ἀνθρώπους δὲ μή· ἀλλὰ πάντων τούτων ἱερώτατον ἔστιν ἄνθρωπος ὁ ἀγαθός, καὶ μιαιωτάτον ὁ πονηρός, proves not only that it was not usual to attribute ἱερός as a predicate to men, but also that when it was thus used it possessed no ethical meaning at all. Most widely removed from the ethical meaning is the use of it, to mention one more instance, in Luc. *Macrob.* 29, ἱερώτατε Κύντιλλε. Tittm. *Syn. N. T.*, in voce ἱερός proprie nihil aliud cogitatur, quam quod res quaedam aut persona Deo sacra sit, nulla ingenii morumque ratione habita; imprimis quod sacris inservit.

Of ἅγιος, likewise, it is true that neither is it a predicate of the gods nor is it used of men. It denotes a quality of the ἱερόν (*i.e.* θεῖον), with which, for the most part, in the few places where it occurs, it is joined, and it manifestly has more of an ethical character than ἱερός, because it gives prominence to that side of the ἱερόν which demands from men conduct characterized by moral reverence and reverential fear, awe-inspiring, reverend. It often occurs in Herodotus, *e.g.* ii. 41. 3, Ἀφροδίτης ἱερόν ἅγιον; ii. 44. 1, ἱερόν Ἡρακλέους ἅγιον; Xen. *Hell.* iii. 2. 19, ἔνθα ἦν Ἀρτέμιδος ἱερόν μάλα ἅγιον. Often also in Plutarch, *e.g.* *De tranquill. an.* 477 C, ἱερόν μὲν γὰρ ἀγιώτατον ὁ κόσμος ἐστὶν καὶ θεοπρεπέστατον, and elsewhere. In the same connection also in Plato, *Crit.* 116 C, ἐν μέσῳ μὲν ἱερόν ἅγιον αὐτόθι τῆς τε Κλειτοῦς καὶ τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος ἄβατον ἀφείτο. It appears specially to have been a predicate of temples or places for worship (Plat. *Legg.* x. 904 D, μετέβαλε τόπον ἅγιον ὄλον), and indeed, according to Plat. *Legg.* x. 884, of those places consecrated to the gods which claimed general reverence; for it occurs in this passage of Plato, not of private, but only of public sanctuaries: μέγιστα δὲ (*sc.* κακά)—αἱ τῶν νέων ἀκολασίαι τε καὶ ὕβρεις· εἰς μέγιστα δέ, ὅταν εἰς ἱερὰ γίγνωνται, καὶ διαφερόντως αὐ μεγάλα ὅταν εἰς δημόσια καὶ ἅγια ἢ κατὰ μέρη κοινά—distinguished from ἱερὰ ἴδια, of which ἅγια cannot, according to this, be properly predicated.—The connection of the word with σεμνός also confirms the meaning laid down, ἅγιος being used to complete or strengthen σεμνός; Plato, *Sophist.* 249 A, σεμνὸν καὶ ἅγιον νοῦν οὐκ ἔχον; *Crit.* 51 A, μητρός τε καὶ πατρὸς καὶ τῶν ἄλλων προγόνων ἀπάντων τιμιώτερόν ἐστι ἢ πατὴρ καὶ σεμνότερον καὶ ἀγιώτερον καὶ ἐν μείζονι μοῖρα καὶ παρὰ θεοῖς καὶ παρ' ἀνθρώποις. Ἅγιος also occurs in Plut. *Quaest. Rom.* 290 B, τὰ ἄσυλα καὶ ἅγια ἱερὰ; Plato, *Legg.* v. 729 E, πρὸς τοὺς ξένους διανοητέον ὡς ἀγιώτατα συμβόλαια ὄντα. The important distinction between ἅγιος and ἱερός appears in Plut. *Conviv.* v. 682 C, [οἱ ἐρωτικοὶ καὶ ἀκόλαστοι] τελευτῶντες οὐδὲ τῶν ἀγιωτάτων ἀπέχεσθαι δύνανται σωμάτων, while the prostituted bodies of the ἱεροδούλοι are called ἱερὰ σώματα.

If, now, we pass on to examine the etymology of the word, it appears with tolerable, indeed we might say with full, certainty that ἅγιος signifies what deserves and claims moral and religious reverence; and this was true originally of ἄγνός also, though in it that meaning was by use obliterated, so that ἅγιος is the only word left appropriate to denote a purely religious conception of holiness. That it is akin to the German "*hegen, Haag, Gehege*," is a fanciful rather than a true conjecture, and must decidedly be rejected, accord-

ing to the laws of consonantal change. In Greek it is connected with ἄγιος, ἄζομαι, and their derivatives; and the consideration of these words, to bring into relief the primary meaning, is the more indispensable, because Greek lexicographers have hitherto passed them by rather carelessly. Ἄζομαι, a rare word, chiefly used in Homer and the Tragg. (in the pres. and imp. middle, once only in Sophocles in the active), denotes pious dread and awe of the gods and of parents, consequently *piety*, and is by Eustathius explained by σέβομαι (see above, the combination of ἄγιος and σεμνός). *Il.* v. 830, μηδ' ἄζο θούρον Ἄρηα; *i.* 21, Ἀπόλλωνα; *Od.* ix. 478, ξένους. It is used absolutely in *Od.* ix. 200, οὐνεκά μιν σὺν παιδὶ περισχόμεθ' ἥδ' ἑναικὶ ἀζόμενοι ᾗκει γὰρ ἐν ἄλσει—Ἀπόλλωνος.—According to latest investigations, ἄγιος must not be confounded with ἄγιος, a word hitherto regarded as the Ionic form of ἄγιος. Curtius (p. 155 sqq.) compares with ἄγιος (= *guilt*, *curse*) the Sanscrit āgas, *offence*, and with ἄγιος (= *consecration*, *sacrifice*; Hesych.: ἄγισμα θυσίας) the Sanscrit jāg, jāgami, *sacrificio*, *colo*; jāgus, jāgam, jāgñam, *sacrifice*; the Zend yaz, “to worship,” “to sacrifice;” yazu, “great,” “exalted.” Accordingly, ἄγιος would be what is an object of religious or sacrificial reverence. When we no longer identify ἄγιος with the more frequent ἄγιος, we find it occurs very seldom. With the signification “sacrifice,” “propitiatory sacrifice,” it is used in *Soph. Fr.* 703; *Ant.* 775, φορβῆς τοσοῦτον ὥς ἄγιος μόνον προθείς, ὅπως μίasma πᾶσ' ὑπεκφύγη πόλιν. In *Thuc.* i. 126. 1, 127. 1, 128. 1, 2, 135. 1, 2, 13. 1, we must read, not ἄγιος, but ἄγιος ἐλαύνειν = “to remove the trespass,” “to expiate.” So also in *Plutarch*. That the two words must be distinguished, is clear also from the express direction of the *Etym. M.* that ἄγιος, with the signification μιαιφόνος, has the *spiritus lenis*, according to which, then, the note of the scholiast on *Soph. Oed. R.* 656 must be corrected: κατ' εὐφημισμὸν καὶ τὰ μιαιφονήματα ἄγιος λέγεται, καὶ οἱ μιαιφόνες ἐναγείς καλοῦνται. But at all events it is manifest, from the confounding of the two words, that the ideas of a sacrificial process, of religious reverence, were associated with ἄγιος, and consequently with ἄγιος. If one might even say, without danger of specializing the conception too much, that ἄγιος denotes what is to be revered by sacrifice or propitiation (see above, *Soph. Ant.* 775), we should have herein an excellent starting-point for the choice of this word to express the biblical conception of holiness. *These conceptions must on no account be excluded* from the meaning of the word because they reappear in all the other words which belong to this stem. The derivatives of ἄγιος are in this connection to be left out of consideration, because (as is above stated and explained) they belong, without an exception, to biblical and patristic Greek. We have here only to do with the derivatives of ἄγιος: ἀγίζω, ἀγισμός, ἀγιστεύω, ἀγιστεία, ἀγιός, and the derivatives of this last one. Ἀγίζω is = *to consecrate*, e.g. altars; to consecrate sacrifices, i.e. *to offer them*; and the often-used καθαγίζω = *to sacrifice*, *to burn as a sacrifice*; ἐναγίζω, specially of sacrifices to the dead; ἀγισμούς ποιεῖν, *to bring offerings* (*Diod. Sic.* iv. 39); ἀγιστεύειν = *to perform the holy rites*; also ἐφαγιστεύειν. *Plat. Legg.* vi. 759 D, ὁ μέλλων καθ' ἱερὸν νόμον περὶ τὰ θεῖα ἱκανῶς ἀγιστεύειν, where *Timaeus* explains ἀγιστεύειν by ἱεροθύειν. Cf. *Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom.* i. 40, ἀγιστεύοντες δὲ τὴν ἱεουργίαν

ἔθεσιν Ἑλληνικοῖς. — Ἀγιστεία signifies the *cultus*, the holy rites accompanying the sacrifices, the temple service; see *Lexicons*. Ἀγνός, a form like σεμνός, δεινός, at first equivalent to *reverenced, consecrated*, is an attribute of the gods, and of what is dedicated or made holy to them—sacrifices, places of worship, feasts. Concerning the strange transition of the word to the meaning *pure, chaste, unmixed*, in which it is then adopted in biblical usage, see ἀγνός. For the connection of this word also with acts of worship, we have not only such combinations as ἀγνῶς καὶ καθαρῶς ἔρδειν τοῖς θεοῖς, Hes. O. 339; Soph. Trach. 257, ὅθ' ἀγνὸς ἦν = *atoned for*, but also the derivatives, ἀγνεύειν, which means not only *to be pure, chaste*, but also *to purify, to expiate*, ἀγνίζειν, ἄγνισμα, ἄγνισμός, ἀφαγνίζειν, ἐφαγνίζειν, of sacrificial purification.

From this it is evident that ἅγιος is an exclusively ethico-religious conception, which is not the case with the other synonyms excepting ἀγνός, and even in the case of ἀγνός is not always kept to. If it does not also attribute to the subject to which it belongs any moral quality, yet it demands for it not only a religious, but an ethico-religious conduct; and for this very reason, this, the rarest of all the terms in question, is the most appropriate to take up into itself and to convey the biblical conception of holiness. Narrow enough, and not yet depreciated, so as not to injure the special religious or historico-ethical character of the biblical conception, and again, by virtue of its rare use, wide enough to embrace the essence of biblical holiness, completely new to the view of profane writers, it has been applied by the LXX. as the almost regular translation of שָׁרָף, and has received such a distinct impress in biblical usage as to form (as already frequently remarked) the root word of a newly formed series: ἀγιότης, ἀγιωσύνη, ἀγιάζειν, ἀγιασμός, ἀγίασμα, ἀγιαστήριον, καθαγιαίνειν, representing the Hebrew שָׁרָף and its derivatives; whereas of the derivatives of ἄγιος, belonging to classical Greek, only those of ἀγνός reappear in biblical Greek, answering to the close affinity between ἅγιος and ἀγνός, as this appears still more in the derivatives of the latter than in ἀγνός itself and its usage. For completeness' sake it may further be remarked, that ἀγνός itself never serves as a translation of שָׁרָף; this word is rendered only by καθαρός (Num. v. 17) besides ἅγιος; שָׁרָף by καθαρὸν εἶναι, Isa. lxxv. 5; δοξάζειν, Isa. v. 16; Piel, Hiphil, Hithpael = ἀγνίζειν, Josh. iii. 5; Ex. xix. 10; 2 Chron. xxx. 17, etc.; καθαρίζειν, Job i. 5, and also by the explanatory rendering of it by διαστέλλειν, Josh. xx. 7; παρατάσσειν, Jer. vi. 4 (παρασκευάζειν?); ἀναβιβάζειν, Jer. li. 28.

We have now to inquire into the *import and range of the biblical conception of holiness* which, transferred to ἅγιος by the LXX., established its authority in the hitherto profane sphere by the N. T. announcement of salvation. There is a certain difference between O. and N. T. usage, not affecting the import of the word, but arising out of the historical relations of N. T. revelation to the O. T. The N. T. does not introduce what is actually new, it simply adopts a conception clearly and definitely expressed in the O. T.; but the thing itself which corresponds to the word is realized in the N. T. The difficulty of clearly bringing out, not one side nor a few aspects only of the conception, but

its complete fulness, and the various opinions entertained on the subject which are least of all settled by the latest attempt (that of Diestel) to define *holy* as a relative conception, demand yet a fuller investigation.

First, it is to be noted that holiness is predicated (besides God) of those men and things only which either God has appropriated as His own, or have been dedicated to Him by men. Now, as this predicate is applied *to other subjects besides God only in a secondary and derived manner*, on account of certain relations in which they stand to Him (as is expressly stated in Deut. xxviii. 9, 10: "Jehovah shall establish thee an holy people to Himself, as He hath sworn unto thee, . . . and all the people of the earth shall see that the name of Jehovah is named upon thee"), it is self-evident that the predicate of holiness does not in a formal sense express the establishment of such relations, but that the men and things in question themselves and in their degree participate in the divine holiness, and embody and manifest it. The question therefore arises first and foremost, What do we express concerning God when we predicate *holiness* of Him?

Etymologically, the signification of קדוש is not free from doubt. "The most probable view is, that the verbal stem קדש, which is akin to חדש (as קצב to חצב, חצף to קצף, חצר, etc.), comes from the root דש, from which also דשא springs, which primarily signifies *enituit*, to break forth shiningly" (Oehler, in Herzog's *R.-Encyk.* xix. 618). Hofmann, on the contrary, finds (*Schriftbeweis*, i. 82) that קדוש "means what is out of the common course, beyond the common order of things," so that the affinity between the roots חדש and קדש answers to the affinity of their meaning; "both denote *that which is different*: the former, *different from what has been*; the latter, *different from the common*." The word, however, thus, in the face of the psychological laws of language, obtains a purely formal abstract meaning, and the rich contents of the conception which it expresses would appear only after a very careful reflection upon the difference between קדוש and חל; indeed, by the explanation *God is the Holy One*, "as He is the absolutely separate self-contained Being who, in contrast with the world to which He does not belong, is in His supra-mundane essence the self-existent one," we express in a purely negative way a formal relation between God and the world, and in reality it is only asserted that holiness is the negation of all relation between God and the world. Besides, it will appear that the signification *to separate*, belongs to קדש only in a derived manner.

We must try to discover the essence of holiness, from the connection in which the word occurs, and from its historical usage. It is mentioned for the first time when God's presence among the people chosen and prepared for Him begins, and when an historical relation of communion takes the place of what had till then been only individual intercourse. קדש does not occur in Genesis, nor its derivatives, except in chap. ii. 3. We first meet with it in Ex. iii. 5, in the account of God's appearing to Moses in the burning bush which was not consumed, wherein is presented to us a perfect and unique symbol of the holiness of God in Israel. Next,—apart from Ex. xii. 16, xiii. 2,—in Ex. xv. we find, with reference to the deliverance wrought by God for His people, the first express

emphasizing of God's holiness, ver. 11: "Who is like unto Thee among the gods, O Jehovah? who is like unto Thee, glorious in *holiness*, fearful in praises, doing wonders?" Ver. 13: "Thou hast in Thy mercy led forth the people whom Thou hast redeemed: Thou hast led them by Thy power to the dwelling of Thy *holiness*." Ver. 17: "Thou shalt bring them in, and plant them in the mountain of Thy inheritance, in the place which Thou hast prepared for Thy dwelling, Jehovah; in the *holy place*, O Lord, that Thy hands have prepared. Jehovah shall be king for ever and ever." God's first great redemptive act for Israel—their marvellous deliverance out of Egypt—had been accomplished; God's holiness had been displayed in His judgments upon Egypt, while in Israel His grace was experienced, and had unfolded itself in the sovereign rule of Jehovah, the covenant God. This twofold proof of God's holiness—in judgment and in redemption—continually meets us. Henceforward God in His holiness is present among His people, and the place of His presence is His sanctuary, and there was Israel's dwelling to be (cf. Isa. lxiv. 10). God's holiness, accordingly, must manifest itself in and upon Israel; Israel must participate in it. "Ye shall be holy, for I am holy," is henceforward the keynote and the norm of the union subsisting between God and His people; so that the "I am holy" is explained, "I am holy, Jehovah, who sanctifieth you," Lev. xxi. 8; Ex. xxxi. 13.

The holiness of God, which at first manifested itself thus in gracious or retributive operations of power, conditions and brings about the holiness of His people; for it appears as *the principle of the covenant made between Him and them*, unfolding itself alike in their divinely-given laws and in their heavenly guidance. In the ordinances of national life summed up in the Decalogue and the ceremonial law, and indeed of their entire moral and religious life, we find this principle: "Ye shall be holy, for I am holy," Lev. xix. 2 sqq., xx. 8 sqq. God's holiness and the place where He dwells demand, and at the same time render possible, an atonement, Lev. xvi. 16, 33, Num. viii. 19, which can be effected only in the sanctuary, Lev. xvi. 17, 27; and it is of the greatest importance, in order to a right conception of holiness, to observe how this religious and ceremonial life, whose central point is atonement, reflects this principle in the language also—the holiness of God, and the sanctifying both of God and of what belongs to Him, specially of His people. We need only call to mind the continual recurrence of the words "holy place," "to make holy," "to sanctify myself," in the language of their religious life. It thus appears how fully *righteousness*—the requirement and goal of the law, both of the Decalogue, and of the ceremonial law for the vindication and carrying out of the Decalogue—is the necessary correlative of *holiness*.

But abiding only by the truth, that God's holiness *conditions* the sanctification of the moral and religious life of His people, we should arrive at a conception of it which at bottom coincides with righteousness, and the manner God's holiness elsewhere is spoken of would remain inexplicable. It is of the highest importance to hold fast also by the truth that God's holiness *brings about* the holiness of His elect people; how the "I

am holy" becomes at once "I am holy, Jehovah, who sanctifieth you." God's holiness leads on to the sanctifying of His people. Hereupon we have the expression of God's holiness in His guidance of the people and in the historical progress of the revelation. Of great weight here are the statements of Ezek. xx. 41, 44, xxviii. 22, 25, xxxvi. 23, 24 sqq., xxxvii. 26 sqq., xxxix. 7, 25, xxxviii. 16. By judgment, as by redemption and cleansing from sin, God sanctifies Himself and His name, which Israel has profaned by their sins, and taken away its holiness before the nations; and in like manner He sanctifies Himself by acts of judgment upon the enemies of Israel, who have inflicted punishment upon the people and have despised God on account of them; and the result of this self-revelation of God is: "I will magnify myself, and sanctify myself; I will be known in the eyes of many nations; and they shall know that I am Jehovah," Ezek. xxxviii. 23. The self-manifestation of God in the leadings and history of His people in preparing a way for and bringing about their ultimate salvation, is a manifestation of His holiness, asserted alike in the punishment of sin and in the cleansing from guilt and sin inseparably connected with redemption, Ezek. xxxvi. 23, 25-27, 29-33. Of special significance here is the designation of God as קדוש יִשְׂרָאֵל, often in Isaiah, and 2 Kings xix. 22; Ps. lxxviii. 41, lxxxix. 19; Jer. l. 29, li. 5; cf. Ezek. xxxix. 7: קדוש בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל. God is the *Holy One of Israel* in His acts of deliverance wrought for Israel, to which the manifestation of judgment is the necessary set-off, while the free revelation of holiness aims at redemption, Ps. lxxviii. 42 sqq. He is holy in His electing love, Isa. xlix. 7, לִמְעַן יְהוָה אֱשֶׁר נֶאֱמָר קדוש, יִשְׂרָאֵל וּבְחֶרֶק, Lev. xx. 21; and as such He appropriates the name נָאִל, which in Isa. xli. 14, xliii. 3, 14, xlvii. 4, xlviii. 17, xlix. 7, liv. 5, lv. 5, is parallel with the קדוש יִשְׂרָאֵל, so that the one logically follows from the other. He is the refuge of the lost, Isa. xvii. 7. Here, again, God's holiness is the essential element of His self-revelation to Israel, and indeed of the revelation of salvation as the final goal of this self-manifestation; cf. Isa. liv. 5: "Thy Saviour the Holy One of Israel; the God of the whole earth shall He be called." "Great is the Holy One of Israel," shall it be said in the day of redemption, Isa. xii. 6. (The following are the places in Isaiah where קדוש יִשְׂרָאֵל occurs: Isa. i. 4, v. 19, 24, x. 17, 20, xii. 6, xvii. 7, xxix. 19, 23, xxx. 11, 12, 15, xxxi. 1, xxxvii. 23, xli. 14, 16, 20, xliii. 3, 14, 15, xlv. 11, xlvii. 4, xlviii. 17, xlix. 7, liv. 5, lv. 5, lx. 14.) The holiness of God in this its significance meets us in that primary saving act, the deliverance of Israel out of Egypt (Ex. xv.; cf. Num. xx. 12, 13; Josh. iii. 5); it appears in the election, deliverance, and gracious guidance of Israel; and this *meaning must be faithfully received, and must not be defiled through unbelief*, Num. xxvii. 14; Deut. xxxii. 51. This is very important: *faith* on man's part must answer to the holiness of God; an unconditioned reliance not on mere power, but upon the power of love, the grace of God. Mention is made of this just in the same way in the Psalms and elsewhere. Redemption proceeds from the sanctuary, from the holiness of God, Ps. xx. 3, lxxvii. 14 sqq. (cf. Isa. lxxv. 25), cvi. 47, xcvi. 1, cii. 20, ciii. 1, cv. 3, 42, cxlv. 21, xxii. 4, 5; Jonah ii. 5, 8. Prayer and praise alike mention God's holiness, 2 Chron. xxx. 27; 1 Chron. xvi. 10; Ps.

xxx. 5, xcvii. 12; and the answer to prayer is based upon this, Ps. xxviii. 2, iii. 5, xx. 7; cf. Ps. xxxiii. 21: "we have trusted in His holy name." Isa. x. 20. God swears by His holiness when He would assure us of His redeeming love and the final accomplishment of His saving promise, Ps. lxxxix. 36, lx. 8, cviii. 8. God's holiness will not suffer Israel to be destroyed, Hos. xi. 9; cf. Isa. lvii. 15; Ezek. xx. 9, according to which last-named passage God spared and did not destroy Israel, that His name might not be polluted among the heathen; and yet Israel was not suffered to go unpunished, vv. 14 sqq. —1 Kings ix. 3-7; 2 Chron. vii. 16, 20: "I have sanctified this house; mine eyes and mine heart shall be there perpetually." The antithesis to sanctification is rejection, and therefore God's holiness is revealed in His election; Lev. xx. 26: "Ye shall be holy unto me: for I Jehovah am holy, and have severed you from the nations, that ye should be mine." Cf. also Isa. xliii. 28, xlix. 7; Jonah ii. 5. We may also compare such passages as 1 Sam. ii. 2; Isa. lii. 10; Zech. ii. 17; Ps. lxviii. 6; Isa. lxii. 12. In a word, *God is holy in His electing love, as the God of grace and of redemption.*

Now it would be as unjust and one-sided absolutely to identify God's holiness with His grace or redeeming love (Menken)—thus neglecting the connection of redemption with election—as it is to make, according to the popular view, the holiness of God dependent upon its connection with the law, and thus, if not wholly to identify it with His righteousness, yet to regard it as nothing else than the principle on which righteousness is based. It must be taken for granted that the holiness of God is not only the principle of the Decalogue, but of the ceremonial law, and thus also of the *atonement*. But it is just here that we have the point of union between these two manifestations of the divine holiness. God's holiness, which not only gives, but itself constitutes, the *law* for Israel, at the same time provides *redemption*; it extends to both, for it reveals itself as the principle of that atonement, wherein the removal and punishment of sin and saving and bliss-giving love are alike realized. All revelations of mercy are made in the Holy Place, the place of atonement; cf. Ps. xx. 3. By the law, the Decalogue and the ceremonial law (concerning their inner unity, see *νόμος*), God prepares Israel to be His possession and His sanctuary, that He may show them His grace; cf. Num. viii. 19. God's holiness, which has been and is still to be revealed so gloriously in the redemption of Israel, conditions and effects the cleansing of the people from sin, Ezek. xxxvi. 23 sqq., for it stands in most decisive antagonism to every sinful thing, which it must either judge or in some other way remove; cf. the significant passage Isa. vi., where not only the prophet's conviction of sin, but his cleansing likewise, is derived from the holiness of God. It only needs an occasion to convert the saving revelation of God's holiness into its opposite; Isa. x. 17: "The light of Israel shall be for a fire, and His Holy One for a flame;" cf. ver. 20: "The remnant of Israel, and such as are escaped, . . . shall stay upon the Lord, the Holy One of Israel." It is the same holy God who punishes Israel for their sin, and who yet spares and delivers them from judgment, and in both ways displays alike the holiness of His name, Ezek. xxxix. 21 sqq. God's holiness is manifest, there-

fore, as fully in judgment as in redemption; cf. Jer. xxv. 30; Mic. i. 2; Hab. ii. 20; Josh. xxiv. 19; Lev. x. 3; so that in Isa. v. 16 we read, וַיִּנְבֹּא יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת בְּמִשְׁפָּט וְהָאֵל הַקֹּדֶשׁ נִקְרָשׁ בְּעֶרְקָהּ. We must, however, take care not to regard judgment as the chief and primary outcome of holiness; because the revelation of holiness belongs properly to the history of redemption, holiness is here displayed in its fulness. According to Ps. xcix. 3, as all that Israel would say of the *name* of God is summed up in the words "*He is holy*," cf. vv. 5, 9; this holiness itself was known above all things in this, "He is a God who forgave Israel, and an avenger of their deeds," ver. 8. Corresponding to this is the relation of man to God's holiness. Man trusts His holy name, and thereby hallows it, Ps. xxxiii. 21, Isa. x. 20; he dishonours it by unbelief, Num. xxvii. 14, Deut. xxxii. 51; at the same time he hallows it by fear, Isa. xxix. 23, viii. 13, cf. also Ex. xv. 11, Ps. xcix. 3, cxi. 5, 9, Prov. ix. 10; and must not defile it by sin. Man's true relationship to God's holiness accordingly is that *blending of fear and trust* which we find in Holy Scripture throughout, e.g. Ps. cxxx. 4; Rom. xi. 22; Phil. ii. 12, 13; 1 Pet. i. 17, etc.

From all this it is clear that *God's holiness is the fundamental and moulding principle of the whole revelation of redemption in all its elements*, and that the history of redemption, as a whole, can be understood only from the standpoint of divine holiness. We must now endeavour, by arranging the several elements, to determine the essence of holiness so as logically to discover its meaning.

As God's holiness is man's law, it excludes all communion of *sinful* man with Him (Isa. vi.; Josh. xxiv. 19; 1 Sam. vi. 20; Ex. xix. 22; Num. iv. 15, 20; cf. Isa. lxxv. 5). It does not exclude man's fellowship with God in and by itself, just because this is the law for man. We might almost more correctly say it demands this fellowship. Now the fact that fellowship between God and man is realized only in the form of the *election*, tending to pardon and redemption, corresponds with this exclusive significance of holiness; election answers to the exclusion, and thus God's holiness historically appears in the election of His people, in His guidance of them from their deliverance from Egypt, onwards to that redemption which is intended for the whole world, based upon pardon and atonement. Corresponding with that turning-point in history, begun by the deliverance from Egypt, according to its import as explained by St. Paul, Gal. iii. 19 sq. (see *μεσίτης*), is the fact that God's holiness there for the first time in its full meaning appears in history, and finds expression in the law, in the regulations of life, and the regulations of worship. It must be borne in mind, however, that knowledge of this holiness to a certain extent—a natural knowledge, if we may so say, and conformable with the infancy of the race—was possessed before, and was always to be found wherever there was any knowledge of God. The first mention of holiness, therefore (Ex. iii. 5), is not as of something unknown and new. But "that great sight, the burning bush unconsumed," was a perfect symbol of God's holiness as it was now in a special manner to be revealed to Israel, the nation of a final and historical vocation; cf. Isa. x. 17, vi. 4 sqq. Opposition to sin is the first

impression which man receives of God's holiness ; this opposition to sin appears as *positive* in the progress of the history, whereas in the mere form of rejection it would appear as negative opposition, and as identical with judging righteousness. Exclusion, election, cleansing, redemption,—these are the four forms in which God's holiness appears in the sphere of humanity ; and we may say that God's holiness signifies *His opposition to sin manifesting itself in atonement and redemption or in judgment*. Or as holiness, so far as it is embodied in law, must be the highest moral perfection, we may say, taking *enituit* as the primary meaning of קדש, holiness is the perfect purity of God, which in and for itself excludes all fellowship with the world, and can only establish a relationship of free electing love, whereby it asserts itself in the sanctification of God's people, their cleansing and redemption ; therefore, "the purity of God manifesting itself in atonement and redemption, and correspondingly in judgment." This primary conception of *purity* is supported especially by the strongly expressed connection of both conceptions in the N. T., e.g. 2 Tim. ii. 21 ; 2 Cor. vii. 1 ; Eph. v. 26 ; Heb. ix. 13, 14 ; 1 Thess. iv. 7. By this view all the above elements are done justice to ; holiness asserts itself in judging righteousness, and in electing, purifying, and redeeming love, and thus it appears in reality as the impelling and formative principle of the revelation and history of redemption, without a knowledge of which an understanding of the revelation is impossible, and by the perception of which it is seen in its full clear light. We thus also see the close connection subsisting between holiness and righteousness, and the parallelism between holiness and glory, Isa. vi. 1 ; see δόξα. "God is light," this is a significant and exhaustive N. T. phrase for God's holiness, 1 John i. 5.

Since, therefore, God's holiness becomes historically manifest in sanctification, we see how in what sense that is called *holy*, or *sanctified*, which God by electing love appropriates to Himself, viz. so far as, by this elective appropriation, God's holiness—His love excluding sin, or taking it away—is to be shown therein, or so far as the chosen object is received into saving fellowship with the pure God ; see Isa. iv. 3, 4. It makes no difference whether it be the children of Israel, the Sabbath, the temple, the priesthood, that are called *holy* ; in every relation of communion based upon election, the object of the election participates according to its degree in the holiness. Even the קדש may be called *holy* or *sanctified*, Lev. xxvii. 28 ; not, indeed, because the *excluding* element of God's holiness is manifest therein, but so far as it is separated from all fellowship with man either by God or for God ; see ἀνάθεμα. It is important here to observe, that when God gives over to judgment, or rejects what before He had chosen (see ἐκλέγειν), holiness is withdrawn from it, Isa. xliii. 28 ; cf. Jonah ii. 5 ; 2 Chron. vii. 20. Though the attribute of holiness on the part of the creature does not in and for itself indicate any moral quality, still in the issue it becomes so, because it is based upon sanctification, which cannot be conceived of without purification and cleansing, Ex. xix. 22 ; Num. xvii. 2 ; Isa. iv. 3, 4 ; 2 Chron. xxx. 15, 17 ; Num. vi. 11 ; 2 Chron. xxix. 5, 6 ; Lev. viii. 15, xvi. 19, xi. 44, 45. Cf. Ps. xv. 1 sqq.

In like manner, what men dedicate to God, and thus associate with Him, or set apart for Him, becomes holy, because herein also God's excluding and re-electing holiness becomes manifest. Thus the first-born is sanctified, Ex. xiii. 2, Num. iii. 13, viii. 16, 17, Deut. xv. 19; the cities of refuge, Josh. xx. 7; and whatever was dedicated to God, Lev. xxvii. 15, 16, 19 (as distinct from *נָחַל*), Ex. xxviii. 38, Ezra viii. 28, 2 Chron. xxix. 19. When men dedicate themselves or others to the Lord, they do it by sacrifice and purifying, by cleansing and atonement, 2 Chron. xxix. 19; Job i. 5; Ex. xix. 10 sqq.

It is further to be observed, that when men sanctify that which is God's,—His name, for instance,—they do not attribute anything special, but they use it and value it in conformity with God's holiness by faith and fear, and by sin and unbelief they defile it; see *ἀγιάζω*.

Thus it is clear that sanctification, whether it proceeds from God or man, always implies a *setting apart* as a necessary antecedent or consequent of the act (cf. Lev. xx. 26); but to suppose that setting apart and sanctifying are one and the same thing, would involve a weakening of the conception of sanctification and holiness, and the fulness of meaning belonging to the word in the history of redemption would have to be traced back to a primary conception which tells next to nothing, without establishing anything but a very loose logical connection. Cf. 1 Chron. xxiii. 13: *יִפְדֶּה אֶת־הָאֱהֹרָה לְהַקְדִּישׁוֹ*. In the few places where to sanctify means simply to set apart, e.g. Jer. xii. 3, Lev. xx. 26, the signification is a derived one, and, withal, not merely = *to set apart*, but = *to set apart for God*. For this supposed root conception of setting apart we should not appeal to the rare expression *קָדַשׁ מְלֻחָטָה*, Jer. vi. 4, li. 27, 28, Joel iv. 9, Mic. iii. 5,—not to mention *קָדַשׁ צִוֵּה*, Joel i. 14,—because even in the classics a war undertaken under the protection and leadership of the gods was considered a holy war, and was regarded as a divine judgment; cf. *ἱερὸς δῖφρος*, Hom. *Il.* xvii. 464. Nor does it tell for the meaning "setting apart" as the root meaning of *קָדַשׁ*, that the conception of polluting is expressed by *חָלַל* = *to loosen*, *to abandon*, and that *חָלַל* is the antithesis to *קָדַשׁ*. *חָלַל* certainly denotes what is open to unhindered and universal use, what is free to every one, but it never stands alone with this meaning. In the few places where it occurs, it is always in contrast with *קָדַשׁ*, and it is by virtue of this contrast that it has its special meaning, Lev. x. 10; 1 Sam. xxi. 5, 6; Ezek. xxii. 26, xlii. 20, xliv. 23, xlviii. 15. We cannot say: because *חָלַל* denotes what is unhindered and common to all, therefore *קָדַשׁ* means the special, separated, set apart; but we must argue: because what is *holy* includes the notion of separation and exclusion, its opposite is expressed by *חָלַל*. This is evident if we ask why *חָלַל* denotes the opposite of *קָדַשׁ*. If it were because the primary meaning of *קָדַשׁ* were selection or separation, this would also be the primary meaning of *בְּרִית* (Ps. lxxxix. 35, lv. 21; Mal. ii. 10), *מִקְלָחָה* (Lam. ii. 2), *בָּרָם* (Jer. xxxi. 5; Deut. xxii. 6, xx. 6, xxviii. 30), with which *חָלַל* is likewise joined as a technical term; whereas in all these cases limitation or separation is not the primary conception of the object, but is simply an inference implied in the case itself; cf. Lev. xix. 29: "Thou shalt not abandon (*חָלַל*) thy daughter to whoredom."

לל means primarily "to bore through," "to make a hole through," "to open," "to tear asunder," "to abandon," anything that hitherto has enjoyed some protection or estimation, or has been closed up; to dissolve a position which hitherto had been maintained and respected; e.g. אָרץ, Jer. xvi. 18; Isa. xlvii. 6, חָלַלְתִּי נְהַלְתִּי וְאַתָּנִים בִּידֶךָ; Ezek. xxviii. 16, אֲחַלְלֶה סֵהַר אֱלֹהִים; Num. xxx. 3, לֹא יַחַל דְּבָרוֹ, "he shall not break his word." It stands in antithesis to the esteem with which anything is to be treated, and is parallel with נָאץ, בֹּזֶה, and other words = "to despise;" cf. Ps. lxxxix. 32, אֲסַחֲקֶנּוּ יַחֲלִלוּ וּמְצוֹתַי לֹא יִשְׁמְרוּ; Jer. xvi. 18; Ezek. xxii. 8; Zeph. iii. 4; Isa. xxiii. 9; Ezek. xx. 16, 24. What is holy becomes specially the object of such treatment, because it demands the highest and most earnest respect (cf. Ex. iii. 5; Josh. v. 15; Isa. lxv. 5), God abandoning and rejecting what before He had specially chosen and sanctified (Isa. xxiii. 9; Ps. lxxxix. 35; Isa. xliii. 28; Ezek. xxviii. 16, etc.), or men despising or abandoning to disesteem what God has sanctified, or God's own holiness, His name, or the like; cf. Lev. xxi. 12, 15; Num. xviii. 22. This only is evident from this contrast, as we already otherwise know, that holiness and exclusion therefrom are not identical conceptions, but that exclusion and inaccessibleness, separation and setting apart, pertain to what is holy. Thus לל, in common usage, signifies the κοινόν, not in and for itself, but so far only as it is not included within the sphere of sanctification; it everywhere includes the idea of what is unsanctified, and accordingly the LXX. never render it by κοινός, but, in harmony with Greek usage, by βέβηλος, though thus injustice is done to the biblical view. For though the contrast between לל and שָׁבַר determined the entire Jewish estimate of things, what was not devoted to the gods among the Greeks was not always called βέβηλον; so that, in the language of Israelitish life and of the N. T., κοινός gradually took the place of the βέβηλος of the LXX., and received that moral tinge to which those modern languages, influenced by Christianity, owe the moral import of the meaning of the word "common." לל does not signify what is κοινόν in and for itself, but κοινόν theocratically estimated; cf. Acts xxi. 28, κεκοίνωκεν τὸν ἅγιον τόπον τοῦτον, with the passage from Plato above cited, Legg. x. 884, εἰς δημόσια ἅγια ἢ κατὰ μέρη κοινά (see κοινός). Accordingly, the antithesis between ἅγιος and κοινός, שָׁבַר and לל, at first only natural, became moral; and the antithesis between קֹדֶשׁ and טָמֵא is closely allied thereto, Lev. x. 10; Ezek. xxii. 26, xlv. 23; Heb. ix. 13, τοὺς κεκοινωμένους ἀγιάζει πρὸς καθαρότητα. What is unsanctified we may say becomes virtually unholy.

These are the main features of the O. T. conception of holiness, which appear also in the N. T., only divested of its limitation to Israel. Cf. Ps. xcix., "the earthly echo of the seraphic Trishagion" (Delitzsch) contains the same conception of holiness.

"Αγιος, in the N. T., is used (I.) of God and the Spirit of God. It may seem strange that holiness is so seldom predicated of God in the N. T. Besides the quotation in Rev. iv. 8 of the Trishagion of Isa. vi. 3, which does not appear expressly as a quotation, and of Lev. xi. 44, xix. 2, in 1 Pet. i. 15, 16, κατὰ τὸν καλέσαντα ὑμᾶς ἅγιον καὶ αὐτοὶ ἅγιοι ἐν πάσῃ ἀναστροφῇ γενήθητε, διότι γέγραπται ὅτι ἅγιοι ἔσεσθε ὅτι ἐγὼ

ἅγιος, and of Ps. xcix. 3, cxi. 9, in the song of the Virgin, Luke i. 49, ἐποίησέν μοι μεγαλεῖα ὁ δυνατὸς, καὶ ἅγιον τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ εἰς γενεὰς κ.τ.λ. (cf. Ps. lxxvii. 14, 15, xcvi. 1; Ex. xv. 11; Josh. iii. 5), it occurs in *St. John's writings only*, John xvii. 11, πᾶτερ ἅγιε, τήρησον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου; Rev. vi. 10, ἕως πότε, ὁ δεσπότης ὁ ἅγιος καὶ ἀληθινὸς κ.τ.λ.; 1 John ii. 20, χρίσμα ἔχετε ἀπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου. (Stier [*Reden Jesu*, v. 420, Eng. trans. vi. 468] sees in the πᾶτερ ἅγιε of John xvii. 11, "the concentration of the O. and N. T. expressions into one new phrase, uniting as synonymous (?) the deepest word of the past revelation with that now revealed.") But to conclude from this fact that God's holiness disappears in the N. T. (Diestel) would be extremely hasty and incorrect, and especially would overlook the difference between the O. and N. T. manifestations of holiness. For, apart from the fact that sanctification proceeding from God occupies so important a place in the N. T. (see under II.), it is a significant fact, and one that completely corresponds to the fulness of God unfolded for the first time in the N. T., that holiness is in the N. T. κατ' ἐξ. the predicate of the Spirit of God, not only as He is the bearer and mediator of the revelation at every stage, but also as He has appeared amongst mankind as a new divine principle of life; cf. ἀνακαίνωσις πν. ἁγ., Tit. iii. 5; ἁγιασμός πνεύματος, 2 Thess. ii. 13; 1 Pet. i. 2. While in the O. T. the Spirit of God is called the Holy Spirit only in Ps. li. 13, Isa. lxiii. 10, 11, the expression τὸ πνεῦμα ἁγίου runs throughout the N. T. as the designation of the Spirit; and this is perfectly in harmony with the presence of God, whose holiness is the hallowing of His people, being now realized in the Holy Ghost. For the essence of God is concentrated in His Spirit (1 Cor. ii. 11), and hence through Him all revelations also are made. Holiness, therefore, being the characteristic element of God's essence in His revelation, is specially appropriate to the Spirit of God; Matt. i. 18, 20, iii. 11, xii. 32, xxviii. 19; Mark i. 8, iii. 29, xii. 36, xiii. 11; Luke i. 15, 35, 41, 67, etc.; and this may possibly be decisive for the understanding of what Christ says concerning the sin against the Holy Ghost in Matt. xii. 32 and the parallel passages.

(II.) Of men and things occupying the relation to God which is conditioned and brought about by His holiness, whether it be that God has chosen them for His service, as instruments of His work, or that God's holiness has sanctified them and taken them into the fellowship of the redeeming God, the God of salvation. Hence connected with ἐκλεκτός and ἡγαπημένος, Col. iii. 12; cf. Luke xxiii. 35, ix. 35; Mark i. 24; Eph. i. 4. As an epithet, it stands joined with ἀνὴρ, in Mark vi. 20, of John the Baptist, by the side of δίκαιος (cf. 2 Kings iv. 9); of the προφῆται, Luke i. 70, Acts iii. 21; ἀπόστολοι, Eph. iii. 5, 2 Pet. i. 21, Rec., ἅγιοι θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι (in place of ἀπὸ θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι), in order to designate the persons in question, partly, generally, according to their fellowship with the holy God (Mark vi. 20), and partly as servants of the saving purpose based on divine holiness and unfolding itself therein, by virtue of which relation they are on their part chosen vessels of the divine holiness. Thus Christ is called κατ' ἐξ., . . . ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ, Mark i. 24, Luke iv. 34, John vi. 69; cf. Acts iii. 14, ὁ ἅγιος καὶ δίκαιος;

iv. 30, ὁ ἅγιος παῖς σου Ἰησοῦς, as in the O. T. the high priest is called in Ps. cvi. 16, הַיְהוָה שֶׁרָא. Cf. כֹּהֵן, Deut. xxxiii. 8, Ps. xvi. 10; see *s.v.* ὁσῖος. In the same or an analogous sense, ἅγιος is also an epithet of κλήσις, 2 Tim. i. 9; διαθήκη, Luke i. 72; γραφαί, Rom. i. 2; νόμος, ἐντολή, Rom. vii. 12, 2 Pet. ii. 21; τόπος, Acts xxi. 28, Matt. xxiv. 15, and elsewhere. As God's holiness becomes sanctification, and believers are received into the fellowship of the redeeming God (not simply, in general, into fellowship with God), the predicate ἅγιος is suitable of them also, seeing that it expresses the special grace which they experience who are in the fellowship and possession of the N. T. salvation; cf. ἀγιάζειν.

Significant, and in keeping with the meaning which we have found to belong to the conception of holiness, is the combination ἅγιοι καὶ πιστοί, Eph. i. 1, Col. i. 2; cf. Rev. xiii. 10, ὧδέ ἐστιν ἡ ὑπομονὴ καὶ ἡ πίστις τῶν ἁγίων; and also the above-mentioned combination with ἐκλεκτοί and ἡγαπημένοι, Col. iii. 12, Eph. i. 4; κλητοὶ ἅγιοι, 1 Cor. i. 2, Rom. i. 7. That it has to do with what those thus designated have experienced or are experiencing, is clear from Rev. xx. 6, μακάριος καὶ ἅγιος ὁ ἔχων μέρος ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει τῇ πρώτῃ. Cf. 1 Pet. ii. 5, ἱεράτευμα ἁγιον; ver. 9, ἔθνος ἁγιον; Eph. ii. 19, συμπολιταὶ τῶν ἁγίων; 2 Thess. ii. 13, εἴλατο ὑμᾶς ὁ θεὸς . . . εἰς σωτηρίαν ἐν ἀγιασμῷ πνεύματος. The naming of believers—of Christians—by ἅγιοι,—in full, οἱ ἅγιοι τοῦ θεοῦ, Acts ix. 13,—which occurs in the Acts, the Pauline Epistles, and the Epistle to the Hebrews, corresponds not so much to the Hebrew כֹּהֵן, which is used very seldom as a designation of the people of God (only in Deut. xxxiii. 3, Ps. xvi. 3, xxxiv. 10, Dan. viii. 24), but rather to כֹּהֵן, the rendering of which by the word ὁσῖος, chosen by the LXX., has not passed into the usage of N. T. Greek. In the O. T., כֹּהֵן, therefore, was not appropriate to designate God's people, because שֶׁרָא in its application to them asserted holiness as a law rather than as a blessing (Lev. xix. 2, etc.), whereas כֹּהֵן gives prominence to the electing love of which the people were the objects. For the same reason, the translators of the Septuagint did not see any reason to render כֹּהֵן by ἅγιοι; but in the N. T., in keeping with the holiness which appeared in the world as redemption, ἅγιοι could unhesitatingly be used to designate the N. T. people of God, without throwing into the shade the element of electing love. Some have wished to maintain that in certain places οἱ ἅγιοι is a name of honour, or even a caste designation for the Jewish Christians at Jerusalem; and it is true that in 1 Cor. xvi. 1, cf. ver. 3, 2 Cor. viii. 4, ix. 1, 12, οἱ ἅγιοι signifies the Jerusalem church, the poor members in particular. However, there is no ground to suppose that this designation was specially suitable to the Jerusalem church, either to honour it as the mother church, or to designate it according to its locality, according to "the holiness of its place of residence, which is extolled both in the O. and N. T., Ps. xvi. 3, LXX., Isa. xiv. 2, Zech. ii. 16, Matt. iv. 5, xxvii. 53, Rev. xi. 2, xx. 9, xxi. 2, 10" (Kurtz, *Hebräerbr.* p. 46). For it is only in a very definite connection that the Jerusalem church is called οἱ ἅγιοι,—in a connection which has nothing to do with any special honouring of it, etc., viz. only where a collection for the poor of that church is

spoken of; and in every case, again, it is only the connection, as in Rom. xv. 25, 31, 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 3, or the historical relations, as in 2 Cor. viii. 4, ix. 1, 12, compared with 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 3, that proves that the Jerusalem church is meant; cf. Rom. xv. 25, 31. But that *διακονεῖν τοῖς ἁγίοις*, Rom. xv. 25, and *ἡ διακονία ἡ εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους*, 2 Cor. viii. 4, do not of themselves designate the poor of the church at Jerusalem, but only in the connection in which they are placed, is clear from Rom. xii. 13, *ταῖς χρεαίαις τῶν ἁγίων κοινωνοῦντες*; 1 Cor. xvi. 15, *εἰς διακονίαν τοῖς ἁγίοις ἔταξαν ἑαυτούς*; cf. Rom. xvi. 1; so that it is an over-hasty inference to assert that in Heb. vi. 10, *διακονήσαντες τοῖς ἁγίοις καὶ διακονοῦντες*, we find a designation of the Jerusalem Christians.

Ἄγιος, however, emphasizes not only the relation to God, but also the corresponding moral conduct, e.g. 1 Pet. i. 15, 16, *κατὰ τὸν καλέσαντα ὑμᾶς ἅγιον καὶ αὐτοὶ ἅγιοι ἐν πάσῃ ἀναστροφῇ γενήθητε κ.τ.λ.*; iii. 5, *οὕτως γάρ ποτε αἱ ἅγιοι γυναῖκες αἱ ἐλπίζουσαι εἰς θεὸν ἐκόσμου ἑαυτάς*; Rev. xiv. 12, *ὧδε ἡ ὑπομονὴ τῶν ἁγίων ἐστίν, οἱ τηροῦντες τὰς ἐντολάς τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὴν πίστιν Ἰησοῦ*; xix. 8, *τὰ δικαιώματα τῶν ἁγίων*; Eph. v. 3, *καθὼς πρέπει ἁγίοις*; cf. also *φίλημα ἅγιον*, Rom. xvi. 16, 1 Cor. xvi. 20, 2 Cor. xiii. 12, 1 Thess. v. 26. In no case is the moral quality produced and required by the divine sanctification to be excluded; 1 Cor. vii. 34, *ἡ ἄγαμος μεριμνᾷ τὰ τοῦ κυρίου, ἵνα ᾗ ἁγία καὶ σώματι καὶ πνεύματι*; Eph. i. 4, *εἶναι ἡμᾶς ἁγίους καὶ ἀμώμους κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ*, v. 27; Col. i. 22, *παραστήσαι ἡμᾶς ἁγίους καὶ ἀμώμους καὶ ἀνεγκλήτους κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ*, and elsewhere. Cf. *ἁγιασμός, ἀγιωσύνη*.

Ἀγιότης, ἡ, holiness; like all derivatives of ἅγιος, unknown in classical Greek. In the N. T. only in Heb. xii. 10, in the ethical sense, *ὁ δὲ (sc. πατὴρ τῶν πνευμάτων παιδεύει) ἐπὶ τὸ συμφέρον, εἰς τὸ μεταλαβεῖν τῆς ἀγιότητος αὐτοῦ*; cf. ver. 11.—In 2 Macc. xv. 2 it is used in the historico-redemptive sense, the Sabbath being described as *ἡ προτετιμημένη ὑπὸ τοῦ πάντα ἐφορῶντος μεθ' ἀγιότητος ἡμέρα*.—Lachm. reads the word also in 2 Cor. i. 12; Tisch., too, in his *ed. acad. ex trigl.*; the latter, however, has restored the old reading, *ἐν ἀπλότῃ καὶ εἰλικρινείᾳ*, in his 7th ed., with the remark, *probabilius est ἀγιότητι, utpote quod esset multo plus quam ἀπλότῃ, aliena manu inlatum quam sublatum esse*. In patristic Greek also, but seldom.

Ἀγιωσύνη, ἡ, holiness. Written sometimes with σ and sometimes with ω,—the latter the more correct, as in *ἱερωσύνη, ἀγαθωσύνη, μεγαλωσύνη*, because a short syllable precedes. It is evidently to be derived not from *ἀγιοῦν* = *ἀγιάζειν* (Valck.), but from ἅγιος, and denotes *sanctity*, not sanctification, which does not need to be proved. Used by LXX. in Ps. xcvi. 12 = עֲדָבָה; Ps. xcv. 6 = נֶשֶׁב; Ps. cxliv. 5 = נִיב. 2 Macc. iii. 12, *πιστεύειν τῇ τοῦ τόπου ἀγιωσύνῃ*. Clem. Alex. *Paed.* iii. p. 110, ed. Sylb., *ἀγιωσύνην ὑποκρίνεσθαι*. It occurs in only three places in the N. T. 1. In Rom. i. 3, of the holiness of God pervading and moulding the scheme of redemption, and manifested finally in and by Christ: *τοῦ ὀρισθέντος υἱοῦ θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει κατὰ πνεῦμα ἀγιωσύνης ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν*, side by side with *τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ τοῦ γενομένου ἐκ σπέρματος Δαβὶδ κατὰ σάρκα*, where the

topic is not the contrast of natural and moral qualities, but of human and divine relationship or dependence. We have not here the simple *κατὰ σάρκα . . . κατὰ πνεῦμα*, as if to indicate a conflicting contrast in Christ's person (cf. Gal. iv. 23, 29; different in 1 Tim. iii. 16, *ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί, ἐδικαιώθη ἐν πνεύματι*), but, as the topic is what makes Christ *υἱὸς θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει, πνεῦμα ἁγιοσύνης*, not *πν. ἁγιον*, because the peculiarity of the antithesis of the *πνεῦμα* to the *σάρξ* was to be made prominent. 2. Of the holiness of man, to be made manifest in moral conduct; 1 Thess. iii. 13, *εἰς τὸ στηρίξαι ὑμῶν τὰς καρδίας ἀμέμπτους ἐν ἁγιοσύνῃ* (cf. Eph. i. 4, v. 27; Col. ii. 22); 2 Cor. vii. 1, *ἐπιτελεῖν τὴν ἁγιοσύνην*, and expressions like *παιεῖν τὴν δικαιοσύνην, τὴν ἀληθείαν* = *perfectly to show forth holiness*.

Ἀγιάζω, to make holy, to sanctify. In classical Greek, *ἀγίζω* = *to consecrate*, e.g. altars, sacrifices, etc., answers to this word, which, like all derivations of *ἅγιος*, is peculiar to bibl. Greek. Ἀγίζω means, "to set apart for the gods," "to present," generally = "to offer." It occurs but seldom; *καθαγίζειν* is for the most part used. Pind. *Ol.* iii. 19, *βωμῶν πατρὶ ἁγιοθέντων*. Soph. *Oed.* c. 1491, *Ποσειδαονίῳ θεῷ Βούθυτον ἐστίαν ἀγίζων*. Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* i. 57, *Αἰνείας δὲ τῆς μὲν υἱὸς τὸν τόκον . . . τοῖς πατρῷοις ἀγίζει θεοῖς*; iv. 2, *τὰς ἀπὸ τῶν δειπνῶν ἀπαρχὰς ἀγίζουσιν*. The biblical *ἀγιάζειν* differs not inconsiderably from this, for it is seldom used of sacrifices, but mostly to denote what is effected by the sacrifice, and it signifies, "to place in a relation with God answering to His holiness." Sacrifice is necessary in order to such sanctification; Heb. x. 29, *ἐν τῷ αἵματι τῆς διαθήκης ἡγιασθή*; xiii. 12, *ἵνα ἀγιάσῃ διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος τὸν λαόν*; x. 10, *ἡγιασμένοι ἐσμὲν οἱ διὰ τῆς προσφορᾶς τοῦ σώματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐφάπαξ*. Hence, too, it is joined with *καθαρίζειν*, which denotes the application of the atonement to the subject, and occupies a middle place between *ἱλάσκεσθαι* and *ἀγιάζειν*; see *καθαρίζειν*. Ex. xxix. 36, 37; 2 Tim. ii. 21; 2 Cor. vii. 1; Eph. v. 26, and elsewhere. Cf. Heb. ix. 13, *τοὺς κεκοινωμένους ἀγιάζει τρὸς τὴν τῆς σαρκὸς καθαρότητα*. It lies in the essence of holiness that *ἀγιάζειν* stands in antithesis with *κοινοῦν*; as, however, *καινόν* is first qualified in meaning by this contrast (see *ἅγιος*), we must not infer the signification of *ἅγιος, ἀγιάζω* therefrom, for in this case we should have to start from the meaning which *κοινός* receives only through its relation to *ἅγιος*. This mistaken way of deciding the meaning of *ἀγιάζειν* is adopted whenever it is explained as = *ἀφορίζειν*, as is done in patristic Greek. Cf. Schleusner, s.v.: "*Propria hujus verbi significatio, unde omnes translatae profectae sunt, haec est, ut notet: Separare aliquid a communi et profano usu, et in peculiarem, maxime sacrum usum discernere, ac sit, i.g. ἀφορίζειν, quo ipso verbo a Theodoro ad Joel iii. 9 explicatur.*" In like manner Suicer, Bretschneider, and others. More rarely it is explained by *δοξάζειν*, as Chrysostom on Matt. vi. 9, *ἡγιασθήτω = δοξασθήτω*. We may say that *ἀφορίζειν* gives prominence to the negative, and *δοξάζειν* to the positive, element in the word. But, as was remarked under *ἅγιος*, while holiness always includes separation, it must never be identified with it; and in the few places where "to sanctify" means "to set apart," e.g.

Jer. xii. 3, Lev. xx. 26, this is only a derived meaning, and, indeed, is not simply = *to set apart*, but *to set apart for God*.

We have seen, under ἅγιος, that we must distinguish who the subject of the ἀγιάζειν is. To sanctify means, *to make anything a participator, according to its measure, in God's holiness*, in God's purity as revealed in His electing love. (1.) *With God as the subject*. When God sanctifies anything, the divine holiness through elective appropriation—i.e. God's love excluding or removing sin—is said to be manifested thereto, as this was symbolized in the O. T. in ritualistic ordinances, the types of the future (Matt. xxiii. 17, ὁ ναὸς ὁ ἀγιάσας τὸν χρυσόν, and ver. 19, τὸ θυσιαστήριον τὸ ἀγιάζον τὸ δῶρον, are expressive of O. T. ideas). The word usually means, *to adopt into saving fellowship with God*. Further, we must distinguish the different ways in which the object participates in God's holiness, whether, as the organ of divine revelation and minister of divine saving purposes, it becomes the bearer in its measure of divine holiness, or whether it experiences in itself holiness as cleansing from sin and redemption (see ἅγιος, II.). An instance of the former we have in John x. 36, ὃν ὁ πατήρ ἡγίαζεν καὶ ἀπέστειλεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον. The second part of this sentence represents Christ as the organ and minister of God's saving purpose, and the ὃν ὁ πατήρ ἡγίαζεν clearly denotes the same thought as does the title, "the holy one of God," given to Christ, Mark i. 24, Luke iv. 34, John vi. 69; the sense in which the high priest is called, Ps. cvi. 16, הַיְיָ שֹׁרֵר; and the mighty ones chosen of God to carry out His judgments against Babylon, Isa. xiii. 3, שְׂרָרִים (cf. שֹׁרֵר, Jer. xxii. 7, li. 27, 28, Zeph. i. 7). Hence the forced explanation of Calvin, Luthardt, and others, approved of in the 1st ed., becomes inadequate: "When Jesus left the Father to enter into the fellowship of the world, the Father took Him, so far as He was to become the Son of man, out of this fellowship, and sent Him into the world as one who did not share the character of the world." The divine holiness, on the other hand, as it denotes deliverance from sin and salvation, and reception into saving fellowship with God, is referred to in John xvii. 17, ἀγιάσον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ σου (cf. ver. 19, ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἐγὼ ἀγιάζω ἐμαντόν, ἵνα ᾤσιν καὶ αὐτοὶ ἡγιασμένοι ἐν ἀληθείᾳ); see ἀλήθεια as designating the blessings of redemption, 1 Cor. vi. 11, ἀλλὰ ἀπελούσασθε, ἀλλὰ ἡγιασθητε, ἀλλὰ ἐδικαιώθητε ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ καὶ ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν; 1 Thess. v. 23, αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης ἀγιάσαι ὑμᾶς ὁλοτελεῖς κ.τ.λ., where the connection between sanctification and redemption is unmistakeable. So especially in designating believers the children of God, as ἡγιασμένοι; Acts xx. 32, δοῦναι κληρονομίαν ἐν τοῖς ἡγιασμένοις πασιν; xxvi. 18, τοῦ λαβεῖν αὐτοὺς (sc. τὰ ἔθνη) ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ κληρὸν ἐν τοῖς ἡγιασμένοις; they are ἡγιασμένοι ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, 1 Cor. i. 2, because this divine and saving act is accomplished in Christ, and mediated through Him, see above; and hence elsewhere Christ is the subject accomplishing this sanctification, Eph. v. 6, ἵνα αὐτὴν (sc. τὴν ἐκκλησίαν) ἀγιάσῃ καθαρίσας κ.τ.λ., where καθαρίσας is named at the same time, without which the ἀγιάζειν does not take place; cf. Lev. xvi. 9, לְאַהֲרֹן יָבֵן לְנֶפֶשׁוֹ יִשְׁרָף יִרְחֹבֶבֶן, Josh. vii. 13, Heb. ix. 13, 14, where to the ἀγιάζει πρὸς καθαρότητα, ver. 13, in ver. 14

καθαριεῖ answers. Specially in the Epistle to the Hebrews, Christ, or the blood of Christ, appears as the subject accomplishing the sanctification, which must not be confounded with what, in unscriptural language, is distinguished as sanctification from justification, and which, nevertheless, is not to be identified with justification, seeing that sanctification includes admission to living fellowship with God. Cf. Heb. x. 29 with ix. 4, ἁγιασμός. Heb. ii. 11, ὃ τε γὰρ ἁγιάζων καὶ οἱ ἁγιαζόμενοι ἐξ ἑνὸς πάντες (cf. Ex. xxxi. 13); Heb. x. 10, ἡγιασμένοι ἐσμέν οἱ διὰ τῆς προσφορᾶς τοῦ σώματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ; x. 14, μὴ γὰρ προσφορὰ τετελείωκεν εἰς τὸ διηκεῖς τοὺς ἁγιαζομένους; x. 29, τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης κοινὸν ἡγισάμενος, ἐν ᾧ ἡγιάσθη; xiii. 12, Ἰησοῦς, ἵνα ἁγιάσῃ διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος τὸν λαόν. For Rom. xv. 16, ἵνα γένηται ἡ προσφορὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν εὐπρόσδεκτος, ἡγιασμένη ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ; cf. ἅγιος, I., what is said concerning πν. ἅγ.—The expression, 1 Cor. vii. 14, ἡγιάσται ὁ ἀνὴρ ὁ ἄπιστος ἐν τῇ γυναικί, καὶ ἡγιάσται ἡ γυνὴ ἡ ἄπιστος ἐν τῷ ἀδελφῷ, clearly cannot signify the sanctification in its fulness which the N. T. divine and saving work produces; for a personal faith is required in the object of it, which is in this case denied. Still it is unmistakeably intimated that by virtue of the marriage union the unbelieving side in its measure participates in the saving work and fellowship with God experienced by the believing side; and therefore Bengel *in loc.*, comparing 1 Tim. iv. 5, says, "*Sanctificatus est, ut pars fidelis sancte uti possit, neque dimittere debeat.*" Cf. 2 Tim. ii. 21.

(2.) When men "sanctify" anything, we must distinguish whether the object is already God's in and for itself, and therefore ἅγιον, or whether it is now for the first time appropriated to God and brought into association with Him. See ἅγιος. In the first, as in Matt. vi. 9, Luke xi. 2, ἁγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου (cf. Heb. x. 29, κοινὸν ἡγείσθαι), 1 Pet. iii. 15, κύριον τὸν θεόν ἁγιάσατε ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν, the word denotes that manner of treatment on the part of man which corresponds with the holiness of God, and which springs from faith, trust, and fear; cf. 1 Pet. i. 17. If the second, the establishing a connection with God, and excluding all connection with sin, as in 1 Tim. iv. 5, πᾶν κτίσμα ἁγιάζεται διὰ λόγου θεοῦ καὶ ἐντεύξεως (where, therefore, divine and human sanctification are combined), it means the preservation and establishing of fellowship with the God of salvation, Rev. xxii. 11, ὁ ἅγιος ἁγιασθήτω ἔτι; cf. 2 Cor. vii. 1; Heb. xii. 11.—2 Tim. ii. 21, ἐὰν οὖν τις ἐκκαθάρῃ ἑαυτὸν ἀπὸ τούτων, ἔσται σκευὸς εἰς τιμὴν, ἡγιασμένον, εὐχρηστον τῷ δεσπότῃ.—This circumstance, peculiar to the N. T., is worthy of notice—namely, that the reflective, "to sanctify oneself," which occupies so important a position, comparatively speaking, in the O. T., does not occur in the N. T. at all (unless we except Rev. xxii. 11); because the thing itself, Heb. x. 10, ἡγιασμένοι ἐσμέν κ.τ.λ. (cf. 1 Cor. i. 30), has already taken place through the self-sanctification and offering of Christ, John xvii. 19, ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἐγὼ ἁγιάζω ἑμαυτὸν, ἵνα ὧσιν καὶ αὐτοὶ ἡγιασμένοι ἐν ἀληθείᾳ. See further, ἁγιασμός.

Ἁγιασμός, ὁ, sanctification. Rarely in the LXX. Only the older editions read

it in Isa. viii. 14, Lev. xxiii. 27, Judg. xvii. 3; it is certified only in Ezek. xlv. 4 (= שְׁרָרָה, sanctuary) and Amos ii. 11 (paraphrase for שְׁרָרָה; also for *sanctuary*). In the Apocrypha it occurs 2 Macc. ii. 17, 3 Macc. ii. 18, for *sanctuary*; 2 Macc. xiv. 36, ἅγιε παντὸς ἁγιασμοῦ κύριε, διατήρησον εἰς αἰῶνα ἀμίαντον τόνδε τὸν προσφάτως κεκαθαρισμένον οἶκον, where it obviously is used to strengthen the ἅγιε superlatively, therefore = *holiness*, though Schleusner takes it actively, and renders, "*omni divino cultu prosequende*." Cf. Ecclus. xvii. 9: ὄνομα ἁγιασμοῦ αἰνέσουσιν, ἵνα διηγῶνται τὰ μεγαλεῖα τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ. The meaning of Ecclus. vii. 31, θυσία ἁγιασμοῦ, is doubtful, though many take it as signifying *sanctuary*. This use of the word in the LXX. and the Apocrypha rests upon the fact that, like other words of the same form, a passive as well as an active meaning can be given to it, e.g. πλεονασμός, βασανισμός, and others. Both significations occur in patristic Greek, though here the passive prevails, while in the N. T. it is the rarer.

(I.) Actively, *sanctification*, and indeed (1) the accomplishment of the divine saving work designated by ἁγιάζειν, the setting up, advancing, and preserving of the life of fellowship with the God of grace and righteousness. 1 Thess. iv. 7, οὐκ ἐκάλεσεν ὑμᾶς ὁ θεὸς ἐπὶ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ, ἀλλὰ ἐν ἁγιασμῷ; sanctification, as the removal of existing impurity, accompanies and characterizes the calling; the change of prepositions is observable in this passage. 2 Thess. ii. 13, εἴλατο ὑμᾶς ὁ θεὸς . . . εἰς σωτηρίαν ἐν ἁγιασμῷ πνεύματος. 1 Pet. i. 2, ἐκλεκτοὶ ἐν ἁγιασμῷ πνεύματος, because it is the Spirit who accomplishes this saving work. See ἅγιος.—(2) The preservation and nurture of the divine life-fellowship on the part of the man who has become the subject of divine influences. 1 Thess. iv. 3, 4, τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ, ὁ ἁγιασμός ὑμῶν, ἀπέχεσθαι ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ τῆς πορνείας, εἰδέναι ἕκαστον ὑμῶν τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σκεῦος κτᾶσθαι ἐν ἁγιασμῷ καὶ τιμῇ; cf. ver. 7. Cf. Chrys., Theophyl., and Theodoret, who explain it in Heb. xii. 14 by σωφροσύνη, in the narrow sense of *chastity, continence*. 1 Tim. ii. 15, μένειν ἐν πίστει καὶ ἀγάπῃ καὶ ἁγιασμῷ μετὰ σωφροσύνης. Heb. xii. 14, εἰρήνην διώκετε μετὰ πάντων καὶ τὸν ἁγιασμόν, οὗ χωρὶς οὐδεὶς ὄψεται τὸν κύριον (cf. Matt. v. 8). It cannot be denied that the passive meaning claimed for these texts in the first edition, as if they denoted a divine work *accomplished* in the individual, is in some degree strained. If the reflective meaning, "to sanctify oneself," is and must be, as remarked under ἁγιάζειν, foreign to the N. T., we must suppose here an inconsistency of linguistic usage, not without its parallel, which is connected with the element of abstinence from impurity peculiar to the O. T. "to sanctify oneself;" cf. Lev. xi. 44; Rom. xi. 18; Josh. iii. 5, vii. 13. It is important to observe, however, that ἁγιασμός in this sense does not correspond with the O. T. self-preparation by sacrifice and abstinence for the divine saving revelation, and that wherever sanctification in the N. T. appears as pertaining to man, as self-sanctification, it is not in the sense in which we have accustomed ourselves to distinguish sanctification as pertaining to man from the divine work (viz. justification), whereby we utterly preclude any right understanding of the divine activity for salvation expressed by the words, "to sanctify" and "sanctification." It is wrong

to suppose that in the N. T. sanctification on man's part, and as the work of man, follows justification as the work of God; we should rather say that sanctification in this sense is a proof and confirmation of the divine sanctification experienced by the man, an ἐπιτελεῖν τὴν ἀγιοσύνην, 2 Cor. vii. 1. It does not mean, as in the language of church life, a self-accomplished freedom from sin, but only the avoidance of sin, the freeing being God's act; and this is most important for the nurture of the inner life, the life of faith. In a word, it is in keeping neither with the character nor with the language of the N. T. to speak of a sanctification which is at bottom a self-sanctification. The sanctification meant is not of the man himself, but of his proving,—evincing by his actions,—of his walk.—For the active ἀγιασμός in patristic Greek, see Chrys. *or.* 1, *de pseudo-proph.*, τὸ μνημονεύσαι αὐτοὺς (*sc.* τοὺς ἡγουμένους) ἀγιασμός ἐστι ψυχῆς. Basil, *Hom. in Ps.* xiv., τὸν ἀγιασμὸν κοτορθώσας ἄξιός ἐστι τῆς ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ ὄρει κατασκηνώσεως.

(II.) Passive. Sanctification as the effect of the conduct referred to, in its results = holiness. Thus, 1 Cor. i. 30, Χριστὸς . . . ἐγενήθη ἡμῶν ἀγιασμός, cf. with v. 11; Heb. x. 10; Isa. viii. 14, ἔσται σοι εἰς ἁγίασμα; This word signifies, as everywhere, so here—where some editions read ἀγιασμός—sanctuary. Rom. vi. 22, δουλωθέντες τῷ θεῷ, ἔχετε τὸν καρπὸν ὑμῶν εἰς ἁγιασμόν; ver. 19, παραστήσατε τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν δούλα τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ εἰς ἁγιασμόν; cf. Oecumen. on 1 Thess. iii. 13, τοῦτο ἀληθῶς ἀγιασμός, τὸ παντὸς ρύπου καθαρὸν εἶναι. In patristic Greek it is used to designate the holy communion, water of consecration, and of baptism, either as divinely given rites or relics, or as objects of holy reverence, answering to the active ἀγιασμός as a designation of the *Trishagion* in the Liturgy.

Ἄγνός, ἡ, όν, like ἅγιος, to be traced back to ἄγος, primarily, perhaps, like most of the comparatively rare adjectives of this form (*e.g.* σεμνός, δεινός) with passive signification, dedicated or adored by sacrifice, the latter when applied to the gods, the former when used of men or things. We have shown under ἅγιος that all words of this stem contain a reference to sacrificial acts. In Homer, Aeschylus, Euripides, it is used of the gods, and of what is dedicated, consecrated, to them, *e.g.* sacrifices, places of worship, feasts. That it is used specially in Homer as an epithet of the virgin Artemis (cf. Eustath. 1528, ἀγνήν δὲ τὴν Ἀρτεμιν ὡς παρθένον καλεῖ, ὅπερ ἡ Ἀφροδίτῃ οὐκ ἂν ἔχοι) can hardly be explained by supposing its primary meaning to be *pure, remote and free from touch and spot*; for it would be difficult to connect this signification with the original stem, and to explain the other use of the word as descriptive of sacrifices, places of worship, feasts,—that, *e.g.*, the atoning bath of the corpse of Polynices should be called ἀγνόν, Soph. *Ant.* 1201, τὸν Πολυνεΐκη . . . λούσαντες ἀγνὸν λούτρον; cf. Soph. *Trach.* 258, ὅθ' ἀγνός ἦν = *expiated*; that Persephone, Hom. *Od.* xi. 386, should be called ἀγνή, "*ob purificationem et lustrationem mortuorum, quae fit igne*" (Steph. *Thes.*); that, finally, a reference to sacrificial acts appears in all words derived from ἀγνός. We can, on the other hand, see how the sense passes into the signification *pure, unspotted*, if the fundamental meaning be *revered or consecrated*,

atoned for, purified, by sacrifice. The derived meaning, *pure, unspotted*, became narrowed into a special designation for *virginity* and *chastity*, and the word thus narrowed became the special epithet for Artemis. The word was now most frequently used with the signification *pure, unspotted*, when joined with the genitive and accusative, e.g. Plat. *Legg.* vi. 759 C, φόνου δὲ ἀγνὸν καὶ πάντων τῶν περὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα εἰς τὰ θεῖα ἀμαρτανομένων, also with ἀπό τινος. Then = *chaste*, Soph. *Ant.* 880, ἡμεῖς γὰρ ἀγνοὶ τοῦπὶ τήνδε τὴν κόρην. Dem. *adv. Neacr.* 1371, Ἀγιστεύω, καὶ εἰμὶ καθαρὰ καὶ ἀγνή ἀπὸ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν οὐ καθαρυνόντων καὶ ἀπ' ἀνδρὸς συνουσίας (oath of the priestesses of Bacchus).

With this meaning, *pure, chaste*, the word passed into biblical Greek in the O. T. to designate a moral and theocratic purity = ἡπῶ, Ps. xii. 7, xix. 10; cf. Prov. xx. 9, כִּי חַיִּים = καρδίαν ἀγνήν ἔχειν. See ἀγνίζω. Still it occurs very seldom in the LXX. In the N. T. with a special application, in 2 Cor. vii. 11, συνεστήσατε ἑαυτοὺς ἀγνοὺς εἶναι τῷ πράγματι (Rec. text, ἐν τῷ πρ.). Of *chastity*, in 2 Cor. xi. 2, ἡρμοσάμεν ὑμᾶς ἐντὶ ἀνδρὶ παρθένον ἀγνήν παραστήσαι τῷ Χριστῷ; cf. ver. 3, μήπως . . . φθαρῇ τὰ νοήματα ὑμῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀπλότητος τῆς εἰς τὸν Χριστόν; Tit. ii. 5; 1 Pet. iii. 2; in which latter places, however, chastity is not to be limited to bodily purity; but, as is beautifully set forth in 2 Cor. xi. 3, involves also the ἀπλότης τοῦ νοός which shows itself in the relations in question. The best rendering would perhaps be *pure* (cf. Jas. iv. 8, ἀγνίστατε καρδίας δίψυχοι), especially in the remaining passages, 1 Tim. v. 22, μηδὲ κοινωνεῖ ἀμαρτίαις ἀλλοτρίαις σεαυτὸν ἀγνὸν τήρει; Phil. iv. 8, ὅσα ἐστὶν ἀληθῆ, ὅσα σεμνά, ὅσα δίκαια, ὅσα ἀγνά . . . ταῦτα λογίσεσθε; Jas. iii. 17, ἡ ἄνωθεν σοφία πρῶτον μὲν ἀγνή ἐστίν, cf. ver. 16, ζῆλος καὶ ἐριθεία, and Phil. i. 17, s.v. ἀγνῶς. Cf. Clem. Alex. *Strom.* ii. 219, ἀγνεία γὰρ οἶμαι τελεία, ἡ τοῦ νοῦ καὶ τῶν ἔργων καὶ τῶν διανοημάτων, πρὸς δὲ τῶν λόγων εἰλικρίνεια.

Ἀγνῶς, purely, sincerely; cf. ἀγνῶς ἔχειν, Xen. *Mem.* iii. 8. 10; *vid.* s.v. ἀγνίζω. Phil. i. 17, οἱ δὲ ἐξ ἐριθείας τὸν Χριστὸν καταγγέλλουσιν οὐχ ἀγνῶς, οἰόμενοι κ.τ.λ., in saying which Paul denies the *simplicity* of the spirit in which they preached; cf. ver. 18, πλὴν παντὶ τρόπῳ, εἴτε προφάσει, εἴτε ἀληθείᾳ, Χριστὸς καταγγέλλεται. Cf. Cic. *pro leg. Man.* 1. 2, Labor meus in privatorum periculis caste integreque versatus.

Ἀγνότης, purity, sincerity, 2 Cor. vi. 6 (some codd., also 2 Cor. xi. 3, τῆς ἀπλότητος καὶ τῆς ἀγνότητος). Not quite unknown in classical Greek, "*Copulantur quoque in titulis, ut δίκαιος et ἀγνός . . . item ἀγνότης et δικαιοσύνη. Inscr. Argis reperta, Boeckh. corr. inser. Gr.* 1, p. 583, No. 1133, l. 15, Ἡ Πόλις . . . Τιβέριον Κλαύδιον . . . Φροντεῖνον . . . στρατηγὸν Ῥωμαίων, δικαιοσύνης ἕνεκεν καὶ ἀγνότητος, τὸν ἑαυτῆς εὐεργέτην." Hase in Steph. *Thes.* s.v.

Ἀγνεία, purity, e.g. Soph. *Oed. R.* 863, ἀγνεία λόγων ἔργων τε πάντων. Plut. of the *chastity* of the Vestals: ἀγνεία τριακονταέτις. In the N. T., 1 Tim. iv. 12: τύπος γίνου τῶν πιστῶν, ἐν λόγῳ, ἐν ἀναστροφῇ, ἐν ἀγάπῃ, ἐν πίστει, ἐν ἀγνείᾳ. The expression, ἐν πάσῃ ἀγνείᾳ, in 1 Tim. v. 2, may, indeed, grammatically be referred to the whole

clause, and would not be unsuitable, compare with iv. 12 and v. 22; but it may also be more closely conjoined with the last words, παρακάλει . . . νεωτέρας ὡς ἀδελφὰς ἐν π. ἄγν.;—ἀγνεία would then denote the chastity which shuts out whatever impurity of spirit or manner might be mixed up with the παρακλησις. Cf. Clem. Alex. *Strom.* iv. 219, ἀγνεία δέ ἐστι φρονεῖν ὅσια, *vid. s.v. ἄγνός*; LXX. 2 Chron. xxx. 19, ἡ ἀγνεία τῶν ἁγίων שְׁהִיָּת הַקִּדְשִׁים; Num. vi. 21, explanatory, κατὰ νόμον ἀγνείας = יְהִי כְהֵנִי לַעֲבֹד, cf. ver. 5; 1 Macc. xiv. 36, ἐμίαινον κύκλῳ τῶν ἁγίων καὶ ἐποιοῦν πληγὴν μεγάλην ἐν τῇ ἀγνείᾳ, where ἀγνεία is a designation of the sanctuary, to indicate how sacrilegiously it had been treated; cf. *s.v. ἄγνίζω*.—Phavor. ἀγνεία, καθαρότης, ἐπίτασις σωφροσύνης, ἐλευθερία παντὸς μολυσμοῦ σαρκὸς καὶ πνεύματος.

Ἀγνίζω, to consecrate, to purify. Plut., Josephus, bibl. and eccl. Greek; otherwise only isolatedly. In accordance with the fundamental meaning, the LXX. use it as *term. techn.* for the purification required in priests for the divine service; Num. viii. 21, 2 Chron. xxix. 5, and, indeed, in all who belonged to the chosen people. Ex. xix. 10, 11; Josh. iii. 5, ἀγνίσασθε εἰς αὔριον, ὅτι αὔριον ποιήσει κύριος ἐν ὑμῖν θυμαστά; 2 Chron. xxx. 17 (ver. 20, ἰάσατο κύριος τὸν λαόν, throws light on the meaning); Num. xix. 12, xxxi. 19, 23; ἀφαγνίζεσθαι, Num. xix. 12, 13, 19, 20; vi. 3, ἀπὸ οἴνου καὶ σίκερα ἀγνισθήσεται, וַיִּזְכֹּר מִיַּיִן וְיֵכָר, cf. ver. 2, ἀφαγνίσασθαι ἀγνείαν κυρίῳ, of the vow of the Nazarite; opposed to *μαίνεσθαι*. It includes καθαρίζειν and ἀγιάζειν, cf. 1 Sam. xxi. 5; 2 Chron. xxix. 5, stands in the corresponding genus for כִּי־יִקְדָּשׁ, קָדַשׁ, and קִדְּשׁ, Piel, Hiphil, Hithpael. With Num. xxxi. 23 compare Plut. *Qu. Rom.* 1: τὸ πῦρ καθαίρει καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ ἀγνίζει.—In the same relation the LXX. use ἀγνεία, ἄγνισμα (Num. xix. 9), ἀγνισμός. In the N. T. on the same ground of the Israelite's relation to God as in the O. T., cf. John xi. 55 (coll. 2 Chron. xxx. 17; Ex. xix. 10 sq.); Acts xxi. 24, 26, xxiv. 18. Otherwise, as a *term. techn.* not used in the N. T. = *purify, cleanse* (without the collateral meaning "consecrate"). Jas. iv. 8, ἀγνίσατε καρδίας δόφυχοι; 1 Pet. i. 22, τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν ἡγνικότες ἐν τῇ ὑπακοῇ τῆς ἀληθείας εἰς φιλαδελφίαν ἀνυπόκριτον; 1 John iii. 3, ἀγνίζει ἑαυτὸν, καθὼς ἐκεῖνος ἄγνός ἐστιν (where ἄγνός would seem to be put because of ἀγνίζειν, and not *vice versa*).

Ἀγνισμός, consecration, purification. Plut. *de def. or.* 15, ἀγνισμοῦ δεέσθαι; Dion. Hal. *A. R.* iii. 21, ἀγνισμὸν ποιεῖσθαι = *expiatio*. In the LXX. of the purification and consecration of the Levites, Num. viii. 7 = כִּי־יִקְדָּשׁ and כִּי־יִקְדָּשׁ, cf. xxxi. 23; ὕδωρ ἀγνισμοῦ, viii. 7 = מִי־הַמַּיִם הַחַיִּים, here explanatory for כִּי־יִקְדָּשׁ; vi. 5, of the Nazarite vow, πᾶσαι αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ ἀγνισμοῦ = כָּל־יְמֵי הַיְּהוּדָה. In the N. T., only Acts xxi. 26, ἡμέραι τοῦ ἀγνισμοῦ. The use of it by the LXX. in Jer. vi. 16 = מְרִיבָה, Neumann (*in loc.*) explains by a reference to Ex. xv. 13.

Ἀγορά, from ἀγείρω, hence originally assembly, popular assembly; then the place of meeting, a place opened to public intercourse, serving also as a court of justice. (*Il.*

xvi. 387, *Od.* xii. 439.) Acts xvi. 19, **market-place**, Matt. xi. 16, xx. 3, xxiii. 7, Mark vi. 56, xii. 38, Luke vii. 32, xi. 43, xx. 46, Acts xvii. 17. Mark vii. 4, ἀπ' ἀγορᾶς ἐὰν μὴ βαπτίσωνται οὐκ ἐσθίουσιν; cf. Winer, 547; *Ecclus.* xxxi. 30, βαπτιζόμενος ἀπὸ νεκροῦ καὶ πάλιν ἀπτόμενος αὐτοῦ. From this,—

Ἀγοράζω, to buy; with acc., Matt. xiii. 44, 46, xiv. 15, xxvii. 7, Mark vi. 36, xv. 46, xvi. 1, Luke ix. 13, xiv. 18, 19, xxii. 36, John iv. 8, vi. 5, xiii. 39, Rev. iii. 18, xviii. 11.—With accus. of the thing and genit. of the value, Mark vi. 37;—passive, 1 Cor. vi. 20, vii. 23. In the last two passages, ἡγοράσθητε τιμῆς,—buy for a price, “as the opposite of a gratis acquisition” (Meyer): by which stress is to be laid both on the right of possession and especially on the worth of the equivalent,—as we say, “a thing is worth money, it cost me money;” *Propert.* iii. 14 (*vid.* Wetst. on 1 Cor. vi. 20), *Talis mors pretio vel sit emenda mihi.*—Value assigned by ἐν with the dat., Rev. v. 9; cf. 1 Chron. xxi. 24, ἐν ἀργυρίῳ ἀξίω.—Without mention of an object, Matt. xxi. 12, xxv. 9, 10, Mark xi. 15, Luke xvii. 28 (*xix.* 45, Rec. text), 1 Cor. vii. 30, Rev. xiii. 17.—Transferred to the redemptive work of Christ, 1 Cor. vi. 20, vii. 23, ἡγοράσθητε τιμῆς; 2 Pet. ii. 1, τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς δεσπότην ἀρνούμενοι; Rev. v. 9, ἡγόρασας (ἡμᾶς, Tisch. omits) τῷ θεῷ ἐν τῷ αἵματι σου ἐκ πάσης φυλῆς κ.τ.λ.; Rev. xiv. 3, οἱ ἡγορασμένοι ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς; ver. 4, οὗτοι ἡγοράσθησαν ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀπαρχὴ τῷ θεῷ καὶ τῷ ἀρνίῳ. The negative aspect of this idea is found in the use of λύτρον, λυτροῦν, ἀπολύτρωσις, in Matt. xx. 28, 1 Tim. ii. 6; ἐξαγοράζειν, Gal. iii. 13, iv. 5. For the positive, *vid.* Acts xx. 28, ἦν περιποιήσατο διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος, Tit. ii. 14, 1 Pet. i. 18, Eph. i. 14, 2 Thess. ii. 14.—In Rev. xiv. 3, 4, ἡγορ. ἀπὸ, ἀπό is used as in *Od.* v. 40, ἀπὸ ληίδος αἴσα; Herod. vi. 27, ἀπὸ ἐκατὸν παίδων εἰς μῶνος; Thucyd. vii. 87, ὀλίγοι ἀπὸ πολλῶν.—Cf. also the idea expressed in Rom. iii. 19 by ὑπόδικος (*q.v.*) with Gal. iv. 5, γενόμενον ὑπὸ νόμον, ἵνα τοὺς ὑπὸ νόμον ἐξαγοράσῃ. See further, ἀφείλημα. The idea accordingly is, that Christ, by offering for us the satisfaction due (cf. Gal. iii. 13), freed us from our liability; we, on the other hand, are now His, *i.e.* as it were bound to Him; *vid.* 1 Cor. vii. 23, τιμ. ἡγ. μὴ γίνεσθε δοῦλοι ἀνθρώπων; vi. 19, οὐκ ἐστὲ ἐαυτῶν.

Ἐξαγοράζω, peculiar to later Greek, and there rare = to buy out, redeem, *e.g.* prisoners; *redimere*, Polyb., Diod. Sic.—So in Gal. iii. 13, iv. 5, where, however, only the negative aspect of the idea contained in ἀγοράζειν is expressed.—Also = to buy up, *i.e.* to buy all that is anywhere to be bought; Plut. *Crass.* ii., ἐξηγόραζε τὰ καιόμενα καὶ γειννῶντα ταῖς καιόμενοις. So the Middle, Eph. v. 16, Col. iv. 5, τὸν καιρόν; by Huther *in loc.* rightly taken to be = not to allow the suitable moment to pass by unheeded, but to make it one's own = χρᾶσθαι ἀκριβῶς τῷ καιρῷ. Suicer, *s.v.* καιρός: Quando jubemur ἐξαγοράζεσθαι καιρόν, *sensus est*, τῷ παρόντι καιρῷ εἰς δέον χρηστέον,—*juxta Theodoretum.* Dan. ii. 8, καιρόν ὑμεῖς ἐξαγοράζετε, 𐤒𐤍 𐤒𐤁 = seek time or delay. Cf. 1 Cor. vii. 29 and the parallels quoted by Wetstein on Eph. v. 16; M. Anton, IV. 26, κερδαντέον τὸ παρόν. Dion. Hal. *Ant.* iii. 23, ταμιερόμενος ἐμαντῷ τὸν τῆς ἐπιθέσεως καιρόν.

ἄγω, ἄξω, ἡγαγον, ἡχθην, ἀχθήσομαι; the form of aor. 1. ἦξα, see 2 Pet. ii. 5, ἐπάξας; ἐπισυνάξαι, Mark xiii. 27; Luke xiii. 24; to bear, to lead, to bring, to draw; of circumstances, to carry out, to complete, to spend, etc. It is also, though seldom, used intransitively = to go, to move; in the N. T. only in the form ἄγωμεν, Matt. xxvi. 46, Mark xiv. 42, John xi. 7, 15, 16, xiv. 31. *Epist. Diss.* iii. 22, ἄγωμεν ἐπὶ τὸν ἀνθύπατον. *Etym. M.*, ἄγω σημαίνει τὸ πορεύομαι. Winer (sec. 38) rightly declines to explain this usage by the omission of the reflective pronoun. It occurs often in verbs of motion, and may be explained by the fact that the subject independently represents the motion; cf. the German *ziehen* used trans. and intrans. Among the compounds of ἄγειν the intrans. sense occurs in ἀνάγειν (Plat. *Rep.* vii. 329 A), ἀπάγειν, ἐπανάγειν (to turn back again, Dion. Hal., Diod., Polyb., Plut.), παράγειν (very often in the N. T.), προσάγειν, ὑπάγειν, ὑπεράγειν; so, too, in the derivatives ἀγωγή, ἐξαγωγή (departure, death, not in ἐξάγειν), παραγωγή, περιαγωγή. See προσαγωγή. If we enumerated the technical expressions of military and naval usage, formed by the omission of the obvious and well-known object in each sphere, we might give a far larger number of examples.

Ἀγωγή, ἡ, in classical Greek trans. only; leading, guiding. Afterwards intrans. also (Aristotle, Sext. Emp., Polyb., Josephus), manner of life, conduct, behaviour. So in 2 Tim. iii. 10, παρηκολούθηκάς μου τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ, τῇ ἀγωγῇ. Cf. Esth. ii. 21; 2 Macc. vi. 8, xi. 24, iv. 16. *Ita apostolus vocat τὰς ὁδοὺς αὐτοῦ τὰς ἐν Χριστῷ* (Suic.). Cf. 1 Cor. iv. 17, ὃς ὑμᾶς ἀγαμνήσει τὰς ὁδοὺς μου τὰς ἐν Χριστῷ, καθὼς . . . διδάσκω. Clem. Rom. 1 Cor. 47, ἀνάξια τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ ἀγωγῆς; 48, ἀγνὴ ἀγωγή.

Προσάγω. I. Trans. to lead to or bring hither, Luke ix. 48; τινά τινι, Matt. xix. 18 (Lachm., Tisch.; Rec., προσφέρειν); Acts xvi. 20; 1 Pet. iii. 18, Χριστὸς . . . ἔπαθεν, ἵνα ἡμᾶς προσαγάγῃ τῷ θεῷ. The usage of the LXX. and classics presents no point of resemblance or affinity with this passage. In the LXX. προσάγειν is the translation of כָּרַב, כִּרְרַב, as a religious term, side by side with προσφέρειν (see προσέρχομαι), but, like the Hebrew word used, without personal object, to designate the setting up of a personal relationship. Cf. Lev. vi. 38, ὁ ἱερεὺς ὁ προσάγων ὀλοκαύτωμα ἀνθρώπου; x. 38, εἰ σήμερον προσαγήσῃ τὰ περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν καὶ τὰ ὀλοκαυτώματα αὐτῶν ἐναντίον κυρίου. On the other hand, it occurs in Ex. xxviii. 1, Num. viii. 9 = כָּרַב with personal object, but not in a religious or ethical sense. In classical Greek the Middle is used with the signification, to draw one to oneself, to attach to oneself, to make one inclined, sibi conciliare; and if the examples in Passow were right, to make oneself inclined to one, to surrender oneself to one. But it always denotes a winning and deciding of the object. We may rather appeal to προσαγωγεὺς = reconciler, mediator (Dem. 750. 22, ψηφίσματα δ' εἶπεν ἐν ὑμῖν δεινὰ καὶ παράνομα, δι' ὧν ἡργολάβει, προσαγωγῇ τούτῳ χρώμενος τῶν λημμάτων), which also occurs in Greg. Naz. *In Julian.* 43, as a name for Christ, τὸν τοῦ μεγάλου πατρὸς υἱὸν καὶ λόγον, καὶ προσαγωγέα, καὶ ἀρχιερέα καὶ συνθρόνον κ.τ.λ. That in 1 Pet. iii. 18 it denotes reconciliation, is clear from the connection, so that the reference

to the plan or custom mentioned in Xen. *Cyrop.* i. 3. 8, vii. 5. 45, where *προσάγειν* denotes admission to audience with a king, is as inappropriate as it is superfluous. Cf. *προσαγωγή*. II. Intrans. to come to, to come hither, to approach. (Here is not included the military use of the word, in which *στράτον* has to be supplied, cf. 1 Sam. vii. 10.) Plut. *Mor.* 800 A, *προσάγουσι δι' ἀπάτης τοῖς βασιλεῦσιν*. Vit. *Lycurg.* 5; *Pomp.* 46. In the LXX. Josh. iii. 9; 1 Sam. ix. 18; 1 Kings xviii. 30; Ecclus. xii. 13; Tob. vi. 14; 2 Macc. vi. 19. In the N. T., Acts xxvii. 27, *ὑπενόουν οἱ ναῦται προσάγειν τινὰ αὐτοῖς χώραν*.

Προσαγωγή, ἡ, occurs in the N. T. in Rom. v. 2, Eph. ii. 18, iii. 12, and the question is, whether in a transitive or intransitive sense, whether as a *bringing to*, *introducing*, or *access*, *approach*. In classical Greek the transitive meaning predominates in Thuc., Xen., Plut., Polyb. The passage quoted for the intransitive sense, Xen. *Cyrop.* vii. 5. 45, *ἐγὼ δὲ ἤξιον τοὺς τοιούτους, εἴ τις τι ἐμοῦ δέοιτο, θεραπεύειν ὑμᾶς τοὺς ἐμούς φίλους δεομένους προσαγωγῆς*, cf. with *Cyrop.* i. 3. 8, *προσάγειν τοὺς δεομένους Ἀστυάγους καὶ ἀποκωλύειν οὐς μὴ καιρὸς αὐτῷ δοκοίη εἶναι προσάγειν*, is only the transitive sense. Doubtful also is, I think, Herod. ii. 58, *πανηγύρις δὲ ἄρα καὶ πομπὰς καὶ προσαγωγὰς πρῶτοι ἀνθρώπων Αἰγύπτιοι εἰσι οἱ ποιησάμενοι καὶ παρὰ τούτων Ἕλληνες μεμαθήκασι*. For when Herod. here calls the temple processions *προσαγωγαί*, which in Attic Greek were termed *προσοδοί* (Xen. *Anab.* v. 9. 11), it is possible that he does so because their chief purpose was the presentation of offerings; cf. Schol. on Aristoph. *Av.* 854, *προσοδοὺς δὲ ἔλεγον τὰς προσαγομένας τοῖς θεοῖς θυσίας*.

On the other hand, *προσαγωγή* certainly occurs in an intransitive sense in Plut. *Vit. Aem. P.* 13, *ἰδρυμένος ἐπὶ χωρίων οὐδαμόθεν προσαγωγὴν ἔχόντων*; Polyb. x. 1. 6, *ἐκείνοι γὰρ θερινούς ἔχοντες ὄρμους καὶ βραχεῖαν τινὰ παντελῶς προσαγωγὴν (place of landing)*. The intransitive use of the word, indeed, is not strange; for not only does the verb occur with an intransitive meaning, but other derivations from *ἄγω* may, without difficulty, be thus rendered, e.g. *ἀγωγή*, *ἐξάγωγή*, *παραγωγή*, *περιαγωγή*. A review of the usage of compounds and derivatives of *ἄγω* shows that it depends upon mere chances that an intransitive meaning does not everywhere exist side by side with the transitive, because the ascertainable usage of the verbal substantives does not always correspond with the ascertainable usage of the verbs. Thus we find *ἀνάγειν*, *ἐπάγειν*, *ἐπανάγειν*, intrans., *ἀναγωγή*, *ἐπαγωγή*, *ἐπαναγωγή* not; *ἐξαγωγή* intrans., *ἐξάγειν* not; so *συναγωγός*, but not *συναγωγή* and *συνάγειν*.

It must accordingly be looked on as an unwarrantable, pseudo-scientific pedantry which takes the word as of necessity in a transitive sense in such texts as Eph. ii. 18, iii. 12, ii. 18, *δι' αὐτοῦ ἔχομεν τὴν προσαγωγὴν οἱ ἀμφότεροι ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι πρὸς τὸν πατέρα*; iii. 12, *ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν τὴν παρῥησίαν καὶ τὴν προσαγωγὴν ἐν πεποιθήσει διὰ τῆς πίστεως αὐτοῦ*. In the first of these passages the transitive meaning is condemned alike by the present *ἔχομεν*, by the following *ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι*, and by the object *πρὸς τὸν πατέρα*, for

St. Paul would hardly speak of an introduction or conveyance of children to the Father; in iii. 12, the co-ordination of the *προσαγωγή* with *παῤῥησία* favours, and the reference of *ἐν πεποιθήσει διὰ τῆς πίστεως αὐτοῦ* demands, the intransitive meaning. If this be established in these two passages, there remains no ground for refusing to adopt it in Rom. v. 2, *δι' οὗ καὶ τὴν προσαγωγὴν ἐσχάκαμεν* (*τῇ πίστει* is wanting in Tisch.) *εἰς τὴν χάριν ταύτην ἐν ᾗ ἐστήκαμεν*, for the transitive meaning is neither in keeping with the connection of ver. 1,—ver. 2 should add something to enlarge the declaration of ver. 1, but not to give a reason for it, as the transitive *προσαγωγή* would do,—nor is it compatible with the choice of the verb *ἐσχάκαμεν*; for if the first or only introduction to God were spoken of, *τυγχάνειν* would have been the proper word. Cf. *Athen.* v. 212, *τῶν φίλων εἰς ἐγένετο μεγίστης τυχῶν προσαγωγῆς*.

Συνάγω, to lead together, to assemble, to unite, is used only transitively in the classics, like *συναγωγή*; whereas *συναγωγός* is sometimes intrans., *coming together, a social gathering*.—Often in the LXX. for *קָבַץ*, *אַרָב, אִבְיָה, גָּבַר*, without being fixed as a *term. techn.* with any particular bias or for any special word. Occasionally = *לָקַח*, Hiphil (Num. i. 18, viii. 10, Job xi. 10), which is otherwise rendered by *ἀθροίζειν, συναθροίζειν, ἐπισυνάγειν, ἐκκλησιάζειν, ἐκλέγεσθαι*. The signification, *to take in, to lodge, to entertain* (lit. *συνάγ. εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν*, Judg. xix. 15, 2 Sam. xi. 29, Deut. xxii. 2; cf. Gen. xxix. 22, *συνήγαγε Λαβὰν πάντας τοὺς ἄνδρας τοῦ τόπου καὶ ἐποίησε γάμον*), is peculiar to the LXX. and the N. T. So Matt. xxv. 35, *ξένος ἦμην καὶ συνηγάγετέ με*. Vv. 38, 43.

Συναγωγή, ἡ, gathering, congregation. (I.) In classical Greek only transitive and active, *a leading together, a bringing together*; cf. Plato, *Theaet.* 150 A, *διὰ τὴν ἄδικον ξυναγωγὴν ἀνδρὸς καὶ γυναικὸς, ἣ δὲ προσαγωγία ὄνομα* (*coupling*). (II.) In the LXX. and N. T. passim, as often with the verbal subs. (cf. *διδασχὴ κ.τ.λ.*) = *assembly*; in the LXX. in a special sense for *קָהָל* and *לִבְיָדָה*, the two names for the congregation of the children of Israel in their theocratic or historical character in the scheme of redemption; interchangeable with *ἐκκλησία*; cf. Thuc. ii. 60, *ἐκκλησίαν συνάγειν*. For more as to the usage, see *ἐκκλησία*. As the congregation of Israel was designated by the term *συναγωγή* or *ἐκκλησία*, it becomes evident that the reference is not simply to the natural unity of the people, but to a community established in a special way (*συναγ.*) and for a special object (*ἐκκλ.*). Now, in the N. T., where *ἐκκλησία* is adopted as the name for God's church, *i.e.* the congregation of the saved (as the Hebrew *לִבְיָדָה* prevailing in the later books of the O. T.), *συναγωγή* is used to designate the fellowship spoken of only in Rev. ii. 9, iii. 9, where the unbelieving Jews as a body are called *συναγωγή τοῦ σατανᾶ* (cf. John viii. 44, *ὁμοίως ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ διαβόλου ἐστὲ κ.τ.λ.*; and for the context, Acts xiv. 2, xvii. 6, xviii. 12), manifestly in contrast with the *ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ*, which they as Jews claimed to be (*ἐκ τῶν λεγόντων Ἰουδαίους εἶναι ἑαυτοὺς καὶ οὐκ εἰσὶν*). *Συναγωγή* seems to have become quite nationalized in the language of the people and the schools instead of *ἐκκλησία*, which was distinctly stamped as the special designation of the N. T. church

of God, and thus became appropriate to include at the same time a contrast to the body of the Jews estranged from the N. T. revelation, and designated by *συναγωγή*. Cf. Epiph. *Haeres.* xxx. 18, under *ἐκκλησία*. Specially in favour of this is (III.) the use of *συναγωγή* to designate the Sabbath assemblies of the Jews, Acts xiii. 43, *λυθείσης τῆς συναγωγῆς*, cf. Jas. ii. 2, where *συναγ.* is used of the worshipping assembly of Jewish Christians; so also (IV.) *συναγ.* as the name given to the places of assembly of the Jews in all the other places in the N. T., in Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, and Acts.

Ἀποσυνάγωγος, separated from the synagogue, excommunicated. The word occurs only in the N. T., and, indeed, only in John ix. 22, *ἤδη συνετέθειντο οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἵνα ἐάν τις αὐτὸν ὁμολογήσῃ Χριστὸν, ἀποσυνάγωγος γένηται*; xii. 42, *διὰ τοὺς Φαρισαίους οὐχ ὁμολόγουν, ἵνα μὴ ἀποσυνάγωγοι γένωνται*; xvi. 2, *ἀποσυνάγωγους ποιήσουσιν ὑμᾶς*. It has been asked what kind of ban is meant, because there are supposed to have been three degrees of excommunication or ban among the Jews, *נָדִי*, *חֶרֶם*, *שְׁמִתָּה*. The supposition of the third degree, *שְׁמִתָּה*, by which was said to be expressed an entire cutting off from the congregation and the decree of irrevocable curse and ruin, arises from a mistake now generally acknowledged, *שְׁמִתָּה* being a general designation for a ban, a common name for the two classes of excommunication traceable in post-biblical Judaism. (See Levy, *Chald. Wb.* חרם.) The first step, the *נָדִי*, was only a temporary exclusion from the congregation, and a restriction upon intercourse with others for thirty days. The second step, *חֶרֶם*, was an exclusion from the congregation and from all intercourse with others for an indefinite period, or for ever. Now, apart from the fact that it is doubtful whether this distinction between *נָדִי* and *חֶרֶם* had already been made in the time of Christ, or during the first centuries after the destruction of Jerusalem,—according to Gildemeister, *Blendwerke des vulgären Rationalismus* (Bonn, 1841), the Mishnah recognises only one ban, *נָדִי*, the duration of which depended upon the results,—John xvi. 2, in particular, hardly allows us to suppose a merely temporary exclusion such as the first step involved, which, upon any refractoriousness shown towards the doctors of the law or the judges, might be proposed and even decreed by the injured person without consultation with the Sanhedrim. That it does not simply mean, as Vitranga (*De Synag. Vet.* 741) thinks, exclusion from attendance on and participation in the synagogue worship, but exclusion from the congregation (Selden, *De synedr.* I. 7), is clear; for the former was only substituted after the destruction of Jerusalem (cf. Tholuck on John ix. 22); and that it does signify excommunication not merely from the particular congregation, but from the fellowship of the Israelitish people, from their blessings and reversionary privileges, is evident from the nature of that fellowship itself, and is in keeping with the importance which must have been attached to the act of recognising Jesus as the Messiah. **Ἀποσυνάγωγος** accordingly denotes one who has been excommunicated from the commonwealth of the people of God, and is given over to the curse; and there is no ground for rejecting the parallel of Ezra x. 8, *πᾶς ὃς ἂν μὴ ἔλθῃ . . . ἀναθεματισθήσεται πᾶσα ἡ ὑπαρξίς αὐτοῦ, καὶ αὐτὸς*

διασταλήσεται ἀπὸ ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἀποικίας, or for not finding in Luke vi. 22, μακάριοι ἐστε ὅταν μισήσωσιν ὑμᾶς οἱ ἄνθρωποι, καὶ ὅταν ἀφορίσωσιν ὑμᾶς καὶ ὀνειδίσωσιν καὶ ἐκβάλωσιν τὸ ὄνομα ὑμῶν ὡς πονηρὸν ἕνεκα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, a synonymous expression.

Ἐπισυνάγω, aor. 1, ἐπισυνάξει, Mark xiii. 27, Luke xiii. 34. Aor. 2, ἐπισυναγαγεῖν, Matt. xxiii. 37, to gather thereto, or near, to bring together, to a place; also in a hostile sense, to assemble together against, Mic. iv. 11, Zech. xii. 3. Only in later Greek (Polyb. Plut.). In the LXX. = $\eta\sigma\kappa$, Isa. lii. 2, Mic. iv. 11, Hab. ii. 5; $\sigma\eta\tau$, Ps. cxlvii. 2; $\gamma\sigma\rho$, 1 Kings xviii. 20, Ps. cii. 23, cvi. 47; $\lambda\eta\rho$, 2 Chron. xx. 27. In the N. T., Mark i. 33, ἥν ὅλη ἡ πόλις ἐπισυνηγμένη πρὸς τὴν θύραν; Luke xii. 1. The connection regulates the choice of ἐπισυναγ. instead of the simple συναγ., as even in Matt. xxiii. 37, ποσάκις ἠθέλησα ἐπισυναγαγεῖν τὰ τέκνα σου, ὃν τρόπον ὄρνις ἐπισυνάγει τὰ νοσσία ὑπὸ τὰς πτέρυγας αὐτῆς; Luke xiii. 34. With Matt. xxiv. 31, ἐπισυνάξουσιν τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων κ.τ.λ., and Mark xiii. 27, cf. Ps. cxlvii. 2, τὰς διασπορὰς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ ἐπισυνάξει; Ps. cvi. 47, ἐπισυνάγαγε ἡμᾶς ἐκ τῶν ἐθνῶν, and 2 Thess. ii. 1, ὑπὲρ τῆς παρουσίας τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ἡμῶν ἐπισυναγωγῆς ἐπ' αὐτόν.

Ἐπισυναγωγῆ, ἡ, a gathering together to; wanting in classical Greek. In 2 Macc. ii. 7, ἕως ἂν συναγάγῃ ὁ θεὸς ἐπισυναγωγὴν τοῦ λαοῦ (cf. ver. 18; Ps. cxlvii. 2), of the return of Israel into the land of his sanctuary. In two places in the N. T., 2 Thess. ii. 1, ὑπὲρ τῆς παρουσίας τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ἡμῶν ἐπισυναγωγῆς ἐπ' αὐτόν, with reference to Matt. xxiv. 31, Mark xiii. 27, 1 Thess. iv. 17. In the other place, Heb. x. 25, it stands, like συναγωγή, in a passive sense, μὴ ἐγκαταλείποντες τὴν ἐπισυναγωγὴν ἑαυτῶν, καθὼς ἔθος τισὶν ἀλλὰ παρακαλοῦντες κ.τ.λ. Here it is said to denote the worshipping assembly of the church, from which some were wont to absent themselves. But the preceding and following antithesis does not harmonize with this, κατανοῶμεν ἀλλήλους εἰς παροξυσμὸν ἀγάπης καὶ καλῶν ἔργων, . . . ἀλλὰ παρακαλοῦντες, which obliges us rather to understand in ἐγκαταλείπειν τὴν ἐπισ. ἑαυτ. a range of conduct embracing the entire church life, and not a single act or expression thereof merely. Moreover, ἐγκαταλείπειν, "to leave in the lurch," to leave neglected, to give up or abandon (used of betrayers), is too strong an expression for the mere avoidance of assembling for religious worship (cf. xiii. 5; 2 Cor. iv. 9; 2 Tim. iv. 10, 16),—a reference (this last) supposed to be favoured especially by the καθὼς ἔθος τισὶν. This addition forbids certainly our understanding the word of a desertion of, or secession from, the Christian church; it denotes a course of conduct which had become habitual within the fellowship. The contrast given in the connection of the text leads us to conclude that the author is condemning that forsaking of the ordinances which some practised through fear of man and dread of persecution, separating themselves from sharing the weal or woe of the Christian community,—a shrinking avoidance which was the sign that faith and profession (ver. 23) were waxing cold. Ἐπισυναγωγῆ must therefore denote the Christian community itself, and we must take

ἐπί as referring to the Lord, as in 2 Thess. ii. 1, or (as Menken thoughtfully and profoundly observes) that the Christian fellowship within the range of the Jewish people is here spoken of as a synagogue within a synagogue, both on account of its nature, and in unpretending recognition of its outward position. It is not, however, absolutely necessary to seek any special object for the ἐπί in ἐπισυναγωγή, for it may just as well be taken to refer to the church-relation of the Christians towards one another. It is worthy of note that Theodoret *in loc.* explains ἐπισυναγ. by συμφωνία, and therefore, at least, does not think of the assemblies for divine worship.

Ἀδελφός, ὁ, brother, ἀδελφή, sister, from α copulative and δελφύς, Hesych. ἀδελφοί, οἱ ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς δελφύος γεγονότες· δελφὺς γὰρ ἡ μήτρα λέγεται. The Hebrew פֶּן is also used of more distant relatives, *e.g.* Gen. xiv. 16, xxix. 12, 15; and some think this circumstance ought to be taken into consideration where brothers and sisters of Jesus are referred to, Matt. xii. 46, 47, xiii. 55; Mark iii. 31, 32, vi. 3; Luke viii. 19, 20; John ii. 12, vii. 3, 5, 10; Acts i. 14. But the conjoined mention of the mother of Jesus (besides John vii. 3, 5, 10) appears to imply that children of the same mother are meant (cf. Ps. l. 20), against which no argument is furnished by John xix. 26, which ought rather to be explained by Matt. xix. 29 and parallels. The answer to this question depends, indeed, on the view taken of the relation between James the son of Alphaeus and James the brother of the Lord; cf. Mark xv. 47, John xix. 25, with Matt. xiii. 55.—Ἀδελφός denotes further, in general, a fellowship of life based on identity of origin, as also the Hebrew פֶּן is also applied to members of the same tribe, countrymen, etc.; so in Acts iii. 22, vii. 23; Rom. ix. 3, ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου τῶν συγγενῶν μου κατὰ σάρκα; cf. Plat. *Menexen.* 239 A, ἡμεῖς δὲ καὶ οἱ ἡμέτεροι, μιᾶς μητρὸς πάντες ἀδελφοὶ φύντες,—in this sense, however, expressly only figuratively and rarely in classical Greek. As community of life brings also community of love, the “neighbour” is regarded as a “brother,” Matt. v. 22, 23, 24, 47, etc., and ἀδελφός thus becomes the designation of a *community of love equivalent to or bringing with it a community of life*, Acts xxii. 13, etc. Of this sort are our Lord’s words in Matt. xii. 50, ὅστις γὰρ ἂν ποιῇ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρὸς μου τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς, αὐτός μου ἀδελφός καὶ ἀδελφή καὶ μήτηρ ἐστίν; as also Mark x. 29, 30, οὐδεὶς ἐστὶν ὃς ἀφήκεν οἰκίαν ἢ ἀδελφούς ἢ ἀδελφάς ἢ μητέρα . . . ἐὰν μὴ λάβῃ ἑκατονταπλασίονα νῦν ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ οἰκίας καὶ ἀδελφούς κ.τ.λ. Cf. Matt. xxiii. 8, εἰς γὰρ ἐστὶν ὑμῶν ὁ διδάσκαλος, πάντες δὲ ὑμεῖς ἀδελφοὶ ἐστε. Christ thus speaks of His brethren in Matt. xxv. 40, xxviii. 10; John xx. 17; cf. Heb. ii. 11, 17. Rom. viii. 29, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν πρωτότοκον ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς, has to do with community or fellowship of *life*. In classical Greek it is a designation of an intimate friend, Xen. *Anab.* vii. 2. 25, ὑπισχνούμενός σοι φίλῳ χρήσεσθαι καὶ ἀδελφῷ; *ibid.* 38, καὶ ἀδελφούς γε ποιήσομαι καὶ ἐνδιφρίους καὶ κοινωνοὺς ἀπάντων ὧν ἂν δυνάμεθα κτήσασθαι. Also as an adjectival of things connected with each other, *e.g.* Plat. *Rep.* iii. 404 B, ἡ βελτίστη γυμναστικὴ ἀδελφὴ τις ἂν εἴη τῆς ἀπλῆς μουσικῆς. Thus often, *e.g.* Aesch. ii. 145 (Pape,

Wörterb.). Herewith is connected also its use as a designation of the members of the Christian community, of the οἰκεῖοι τῆς πίστεως, Gal. vi. 10; οἰκεῖος, syn. συγγενής, opp. ἀλλότριος; cf. 1 Cor. vii. 12, v. 11, εἰάν τις ἀδελφὸς ὀνομαζόμενος ἢ πόνος κ.τ.λ., so that οἱ ἀδελφοί, Acts ix. 30, John xxi. 23, Rom. xvi. 11, etc., denotes those who are united by faith in Christ into one fellowship of life and love; the latter especially urged as a duty in 1 John. Ἀδελφή in this sense, Rom. xvi. 1, 1 Cor. vii. 15.—For the import of the designation, 1 Tim. vi. 2, is important, where, instead of ἀδελφοί in 2a, πιστοὶ καὶ ἀγαπητοὶ οἱ τῆς ἐνεργείας ἀντιλαμβανόμενοι is substituted in 2b. Cf. also ψευδά-δελφοι, 2 Cor. xi. 26, Gal. ii. 4.

Ἀδελφότης denotes brotherhood, a brotherly or sisterly relation. The word seems to be altogether unknown in classical Greek. It begins to appear more frequently in the Byzantine writers. In Jos. *Macc.* ix. 10, 13, of brothers and sisters by birth, who seal their common kinship in a common behaviour as martyrs; c. 13, τὰ τῆς ἀδελφότητος φίλτρα συναυξάνειν; e.g. ἡ τῆς εὐψυχίας ἀδελφότης. Transferred to a relationship of friendship in 1 *Macc.* xii. 10, τὴν ἀδελφότητα καὶ φιλιὰν ἀνανεώσασθαι (also v. 17).—Then, especially in the N. T. and eccl. Greek,—transferred to the community in which this relation is realized,—the circle of the Christian ἀδελφοί, as in German the words *Freundschaft*, *Verwandschaft*, *Herrschaft* denote both the relationship and the persons spoken of. So 1 Pet. ii. 17, τὴν ἀδελφότητα ἀγαπᾶτε; v. 9, ἡ ἐν κόσμῳ ὑμῶν ἀδελφότης. Cf. Nestor. *ad Cyrill. in act. erphesin.* c. 11 (in *Suic.*), πᾶσαν τὴν σὺν σοι ἀδελφότητα ἐγὼ τε καὶ οἱ σὺν ἐμοὶ προσαγορεύομεν. The corresponding relationship is expressed by φιλαδελφία, Rom. xii. 10, 1 Thess. iv. 9, Heb. xiii. 1, 1 Pet. i. 22, 2 Pet. i. 7 (cf. φιλάδελφος, 1 Pet. iii. 8),—a word which in the classics is used only to denote the love to each other of brothers and sisters by birth; and thus the N. T. meaning of the words, ἀδελφός, ἀδελφότης, φιλάδελφος, φιλαδελφία, is a valuable contribution to the reformation wrought in ethics by Christianity.

Ἄδης, ου, ό, from α privative and ἰδεῖν = αἶδης, as the reading is in Hom. = the invisible, the invisible land. Plut. *Is. et Osir.* lxxix. 382 F, τὸ ἀειδὲς καὶ ἀόρατον. Originally only the name of the god of the nether world, who holds rule over the dead; hence εἰς or ἐν ᾧδου, sc. οἴκῳ, οἴκον, δώματα, in poetry and prose, as also in the LXX.; cf. Acts ii. 27, 31. Then, also especially later, the place of the dead. Cf. Lucian. *de luct.* 2, ό μὲν δὴ πολὺς ὄμιλος,—Ὁμήρῳ τε καὶ Ἡσιόδῳ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις μυθοποιοῖς περὶ τούτων πειθόμενοι καὶ νόμον θέμενοι τὴν ποίησιν αὐτῶν τόπον τινὰ ὑπὸ τῇ γῇ βαθὺν Ἄδην ὑπειλήφασιν, μέγαν δὲ καὶ πολύχωρον τοῦτον εἶναι καὶ ζόφερον καὶ ἀνήλιον κ.τ.λ., where the ideas in question are found in the connection; Plut. *l.c.* Cf. Nägelsbach, *Homerische Theologie*, vii. 28. 405 sq.; *Nachhomerische Theologie*, vii. 26. 413 sq. "The idea connected therewith recurs with tolerable unanimity of import amongst the heathen, so far as the faith in personal immortality was able to gain recognition. Hades, taken in its most general sense, would thus be the place of assembly and residence for all who depart from the present world,—in a word, the world beyond." See Güder's article in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.* v

440 sqq. The LXX. borrowed the word to render the Hebrew לֵאָוֶשׁ , which also denotes quite in general the *place of the dead*; according to Hupfeld (*Comm. Ps. vi. 6*, and *Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, 1839, 462), to be derived from "the fundamental idea of the entire family of לֵאָוֶשׁ (לֵאָוֶשׁ , לֵאָוֶשׁ , לֵאָוֶשׁ , etc., whose germ is לֵאָוֶשׁ , signifying here, as in all languages, what is loose, relaxed, gaping) in its two aspects and manifestations, viz. that of sinking down and that of going asunder (as in χάω , *hio*, χαλάω , etc.); whence for לֵאָוֶשׁ we have both the idea of a *sinking, an abyss, a depth*, as in its poetical synonym $\text{תְּהוֹמֹת הַמָּוֶת}$, and the idea equally appearing therein of *cleft, cavity, or empty space*, as in the word *hell* (Germ. *Hölle*), and in χάσμα , χάος (also used for hell)."

לֵאָוֶשׁ receives *all* the dead, Gen. xxxvii. 35, xlii. 38, 1 Sam. ii. 6, xxviii. 19, 1 Kings ii. 6, 9, Ps. lxxxix. 49, Hab. ii. 5; and concentrates in itself whatever terrors death has and brings for man, 2 Sam. xxii. 6, Ps. xviii. 5, 6, cxvi. 3, lxxxviii. 4, Job vii. 9, xvii. 13, Isa. v. 14, 15, xxxviii. 10, 18; especially remoteness from God the source of life, Ps. xxxvi. 10, vi. 6, xxx. 10, cxv. 17. Hence is it specially the place to which the ungodly belong, Ps. xlix. 13–15, lv. 16, Prov. v. 5, vii. 27, ix. 18, xv. 11, Isa. xiv. 9, 11, 15, xxviii. 15, 18, Ezek. xxxii. 27, Num. xvi. 30, 33, seeing that in it the wrath of God is revealed, Deut. xxxii. 22. Hence the glimpses of light caught by the righteous, as in Ps. xlix. 15, 16. See Stier on Luke xvi. 23, "In borrowing the word Ἄδης from heathenism, both the LXX. and the N. T. writers adopted also in full its main idea,—which is based on an inner consciousness,—and thus confirmed its identity with the O. T. Sheol." Cf. Delitzsch on Ps. vi. 6: "The ideas of the Hebrews on this subject did not differ from those of other ancient nations. In such doctrines as the creation, the fall, etc., the difference is that between an original and a caricatured copy; whereas on this point even the variety of the mythical inventions has not obliterated the essential unity, even in matters of detail: from which we conclude that the idea of Hades is the product of the common consciousness of humanity, and for that very reason cannot be without objective truth." The O. T. view is distinguished from the corresponding profane views by "a chaste sobriety, due to the earnest sternness of monotheism" (Güder in Herzog's *Encycl.*). Ἄδης, accordingly, is the **realm of the dead**, in which are concentrated all the dead, and all that death brings with it; it is, in particular, the place for sinners, where they find the result of their life. Hence $\text{ὁ θάνατος καὶ ὁ Ἄδης}$, Rev. xx. 13, 14; cf. vi. 8, . . . $\text{ὁ θάνατος, καὶ ὁ Ἄδης ἀκολουθεῖ μετ' αὐτοῦ}$, that is, Hades in the train of death, as its consequence. Christ as the Redeemer, $\text{ἔχει τὰς κλεῖς τοῦ θανάτου καὶ τοῦ ἄδου}$, Rev. i. 18. The redeemed say, $\text{ποῦ σου, θάνατε, τὸ κέντρον; ποῦ σου, ἄδη (al. θάνατε), τὸ νῆκος;}$ 1 Cor. xv. 55, thus celebrating the redemption realized in Christ, *vid.* Acts ii. 27, 31, $\text{οὐκ ἐγκατελείφθη εἰς ἄδην}$, from Ps. xvi. 8–11. When, therefore, it is said to Capernaum, $\text{ἡ ἕως οὐρανοῦ ὑψώθη, ἕως ἄδου καταβήσῃ, or καταβιβασθήσῃ}$, Matt. xi. 23, Luke x. 15, it is the same idea as in Isa. xiv. 11, 12, Ezek. xxxii. 27, and elsewhere, based on the conception of Hades as the proper place for sinners, where they and all their glory are brought to shame. The promise, on the contrary, in Matt. xvi. 18, $\text{οἰκοδομήσω μου τὴν}$

ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ πύλαι ἄδου οὐ κατισχύουσιν αὐτῆς, refers to the eternal duration of the church of Christ, which is not, like all other things in the world, to come to an end in the realm of the dead; cf. Ezek. xxxii. 18–32; Isa. xxviii. 15–18. On the expression πύλαι ἄδου, cf. Job xxxviii. 17; Ps. ix. 14, cvii. 18; Isa. xxxviii. 10; Wisd. xvi. 13, σὺ γὰρ ζωῆς καὶ θανάτου ἐξουσίαν ἔχεις καὶ κατάγεις εἰς πύλας ἄδου καὶ ἀνάγεις.—Inasmuch now as the idea of Hades is everywhere that of a joyless, painful, terrible place, in which especially the joy and glory of the godless come to an end, what we read in Luke xvi. 23, καὶ ἐν τῷ ἄδῃ ἐπάρας τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ, ὑπάρχων ἐν βασάνοις, is not a special feature, but one that at once falls in and combines with the general idea of Hades. As Hades is for all a joyless place, but a place of torture especially for the godless, it is natural to perceive that the dwelling-place of the righteous departed, though they also are received into the one great abode of the dead is separated from that of the wicked. In this place they await the end hinted at in Ps. xlix. 15, 16, which is brought about by the accomplishment of redemption. Cf. Isa. lvii. 2; Gen. xix. 18, 33. Hence Luke xvi. 23, ὁρᾷ Ἀβραὰμ ἀπὸ μακρόθεν καὶ Λάζαρον ἐν τοῖς κόλποις αὐτοῦ. The promise, Luke xxiii. 43 (coll. Acts ii. 27, 31; Rev. ii. 7), contains a new element. See my work, *Jenseits des Grabes*, Gütersloh 1868.

Αἷμα, ατος, τό, the blood of the human or animal body; Mark v. 25, 29; Luke viii. 43, 44, xiii. 1, xxii. 44; John xix. 34; Acts xv. 20, 29, xxi. 25, ii. 19, 20; Rev. vi. 12, viii. 7, 8, xi. 6, xiv. 20, xvi. 3, 4, 6, xix. 13. (I.) Blood as the substantial basis of the individual life, Acts xvii. 26, ἐποίησεν ἐξ ἐνὸς αἵματος πᾶν ἔθνος ἀνθρώπων κατοικεῖν κ.τ.λ.; John i. 13, ἐξ αἱμάτων γεννηθῆναι (cf. Eur. *Ion*. 705 [693], ἄλλων τραφεῖς ἀφ' αἱμάτων; Winer, 159). Cf. Hom. *Il*. xix. 105, οἷθ' αἵματος ἐξ ἐμεῦ εἰσίν, and often; Aeschyl. *Sept*. 128, ἐξ αἵματος γίγνεσθαι. Though the O. T. contains nothing parallel to these two passages (cf. Delitzsch, *bibl. Psychol*. iv. 12), the expression corresponds to the idea contained in Lev. xvii. 11, הַחַיִּים בְּדָם הֵם וְהַבְּשָׂר הֵם, etc., “for the life of the flesh is the blood.” Cf. Heb. xii. 4, οὐπω μέχρις αἵματος ἀντικατέστητε κ.τ.λ.—Αἷμα as the substantial basis of the individual life, conjoined with σὰρξ (*q.v.*), by which the possession of human nature is brought about, Heb. ii. 14, ἐπεὶ οὖν τὰ παῖδιά κεκοινώνηκεν αἵματος καὶ σαρκός (Rec. text, *σαρκ. κ. αἷμ.*, supported by few authorities), serves to designate mankind, so far as they owe their distinctive character to this material aspect of their being, Eph. vi. 12, οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμῖν ἡ πάλῃ πρὸς αἷμα καὶ σάρκα. On the contrary, σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα, Matt. xvi. 17, σ. κ. αἷμα οὐκ ἀπεκάλυψεν σοί; 1 Cor. xv. 50, σ. κ. αἷμα βασιλείαν θεοῦ κληρονομήσαι οὐ δύνανται; Gal. i. 16, οὐ προσανεθέμην σάρκι καὶ αἵματι. In John vi. 53–56 also this must be taken into consideration. As this expression gives prominence to the material phenomenal aspect of the individual, with the liability to death peculiar to it (Heb. ii. 14), in contrast to its spiritual nature (Eph. vi. 12), it would seem that just that which is characteristic of the σὰρξ, *i.e.* the limitation of human nature as alien to what is higher, spiritual, divine, is hinted at in the position of the words σὰρξ καὶ

αἷμα, Matt. xvi. 17, Gal. i. 16, 1 Cor. xv. 50. Cf. Ecclus. xiv. 18, ὡς φύλλον θάλλον . . . οὗτος γενεὰ σαρκὸς καὶ αἵματος· ἡ μὲν τελευτᾷ, ἑτέρα δὲ γεννᾶται; xvii. 30, πονηρὸς ἐνθυμήσεται σάρκα καὶ αἷματα. ׀׀׀ ׀׀׀ occurs oftener in post-bibl. Heb., Lightf. *Hor. Hebr.* on Matt. xvi. 17, *infinita frequentia hanc formulam adhibent scriptores judaici eaque homines Deo opponunt*.—(II.) **Αἷμα** by itself serves to denote life passing away in bloodshed, and generally *life taken away by force*, Matt. xxiii. 30, 35, xxvii. 4; Luke xi. 50, 51; Matt. xxvii. 6, τιμὴ αἵματος; ver. 8, ἀγρὸς αἵματος; Acts i. 19, χωρίον αἵματος; Matt. xxvii. 24, ἀθῶός εἰμι ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος τούτου; ver. 25, τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ ἐφ' ὑμᾶς; Acts v. 28, βούλεσθε ἐπαγαγεῖν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς τὸ αἷμα τοῦ ἀνθρ. τούτου; xviii. 6, τὸ αἷμα ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν ὑμῶν; xx. 26, καθαρὸς ἐγὼ ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος πάντων. Cf. Ezek. iii. 18–20; Rev. vi. 10, ἐκδικεῖς τὸ αἷμα ἡμῶν; xvii. 6, xviii. 24, xix. 2. Plat. *Legg.* ix. 872 B, αἱμάτων δίκη; Dem. *adv. Mid.* xxi. 105, ἐφ' αἵματι φεύγειν. The expression **αἷμα ἐκχέειν**, Matt. xxvi. 28, Mark xiv. 24, Luke xxii. 20, 1 Cor. xi. 27, Rom. iii. 15, Rev. xvi. 6, Luke xi. 50, Matt. xxiii. 35, Acts xxii. 20, emphasizes not so much the manner of slaying, but rather the fact of the forcible taking away of life, whether produced by, or only accompanied with, the shedding of blood; cf. Acts xxii. 20, of the stoning of Stephen, ὅτε ἐξεχύννετο τὸ αἷμα Στεφάνου.—(III.) Akin to this is the use of **αἷμα** to denote life given up or offered as an atonement, since, in the ritual of sacrifice, special emphasis is laid upon it as the material basis of the individual life. The *life* of the animal offered for propitiation appears in the blood separated from the flesh, Lev. xvii. 11–14; Heb. ix. 15, 18, 19, 21, 22, 25, x. 4, xiii. 11; which life is, on the one hand, in the blood, presented to God; on the other, by sprinkling, appropriated to man; cf. Heb. ix. 7, xix. 20, by which this blood becomes τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης ἧς ἐνετείλατο πρὸς ὑμᾶς ὁ θεός, ix. 20. The same is true of the blood of Christ, Heb. x. 29, τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης, cf. xiii. 20; Matt. xxvi. 28; Mark xiv. 24; cf. Luke xxii. 20, ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματι μου. 1 Cor. xi. 25; 1 Pet. i. 2, ῥαντισμὸς αἵματος; Heb. xii. 24, αἷμα ῥαντισμοῦ. It is the *life of Christ* offered for an atonement, and is contrasted with the blood of beasts slain in sacrifice, Heb. ix. 12, οὐδὲ δι' αἵματος τράγων καὶ μόσχων, διὰ δὲ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος εἰσῆλθεν ἐφάπαξ εἰς τὰ ἅγια; cf. ver. 14, τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὃς διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου ἑαυτὸν προσήνεγκεν τῷ θεῷ, coll. ver. 25, ὁ ἀρχιεὺς εἰσέρχεται εἰς τὰ ἅγια . . . ἐν αἵματι ἁλλοτρίῳ, only that τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ does not, perhaps, denote the substance of the blood as separated from the body (against Bengel on Heb. xii. 24, who represents it as blood separated from the body, and as such eternally present and efficacious; likewise against Delitzsch on Heb. ix. 12, who understands it of the substance of the blood shed at the first, and then renewed in the heavenly corporeity of Christ at the resurrection, upon the basis of the residue of the blood remaining therein! Cf. what is said above on **αἷμα ἐκχέειν**.—Beck, *Lehrwissensch.* i. 624 εϩϩ.; Riehm, *Lehrbegriff des Hebr. Briefes*, § 61). Cf. Heb. ix. 25, οὐδ' ἵνα πολλάκις προσφέρῃ ἑαυτὸν, parallel with ἐν αἵματι ἁλλοτρίῳ; ver. 7, οὐ χωρὶς αἵματος ὃ προσφέρει, coll. ver. 14, ἑαυτὸν προσήνεγκεν τῷ θεῷ; cf. ver. 26, διὰ τῆς θυσίας αὐτοῦ πεφανέρωται. In other passages, too, of the N. T., where

the blood of Christ is spoken of, the reference is not to the *substance*, but to the *life offered for atonement*; and αἷμα is the designation of the *accomplished and offered sacrifice*. So 1 John i. 7, τὸ αἷμα Ἰησοῦ καθαρίζει ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης ἁμαρτίας; v. 6, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἐλθὼν δι' ὕδατος καὶ αἵματος,—ἐν τῷ ὕδατι καὶ αἵματι; cf. ver. 8 (for the construction with διὰ, cf. Heb. ix. 12; with ἐν, Heb. ix. 25, Matt. xvi. 27, 28 = 𐤀 𐤍𐤁, Ps. lxvi. 13, etc.); Rom. iii. 25, ὃν προέθετο ὁ θεὸς ἱλαστήριον διὰ πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι; v. 9, δικαιωθέντες ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ; Eph. i. 7, ἔχομεν τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ; ii. 13, ἐγγὺς ἐγενήθητε ἐν τῷ αἵμ. τοῦ Χριστοῦ (Col. i. 14, Rec. text); Col. i. 20, εἰρηνοποιήσας διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ σταυροῦ αὐτοῦ; Heb. x. 19, xiii. 12; Acts xx. 28, ἣν περιποιήσατο διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ ἰδίου; 1 Pet. i. 19, ἐλυτρώθητε τιμῇ αἵματι Χριστοῦ; Rev. i. 5, v. 9, vii. 14; Matt. xxvi. 28; Mark xiv. 24; Luke xxii. 20; 1 Cor. xi. 27; ἡ πρόσχυσις τοῦ αἵματος, Heb. xi. 28, cf. Ex. xii. 7, corresponds to the rite observed at the Passover prior to the exile, 2 Chron. xxx. 16, xxxv. 11. 𐤀𐤏𐤏𐤏𐤏 𐤏𐤏, LXX. = προσχέειν τὸ αἷμα, Ex. xxiv. 6.

Αἱματεκχυσία, ἡ, *shedding of blood*. Only in Heb. ix. 22, χωρὶς αἱματεκχυσίας οὐ γίνεται ἄφεσις, and in patristic Greek. According to Tholuck, de Wette, Hofmann, it is supposed to signify, in Heb. ix. 22, *the bringing of the blood to the altar, the application of the blood* for objective expiation (2 Kings xvi. 15; Ex. xxix. 16; Deut. xii. 27; Lev. viii. 15, ix. 9), whose correlative is *ῥαντισμός*, the application of the atonement to the object of it. According to Bleek, Lünemann, Delitzsch, Kurtz, it signifies *shedding of blood*, or *slaying* of a victim; and this is the only true meaning. For, first, the question dealt with, Heb. ix. 22, is not the *manner*, but the *means*, of atonement, αἷμα; cf. vv. 18, 19, 22a, 23, 25. Thus αἱματεκχ. in the former sense, as a *term. tech.*, would denote only a part of the act of atonement, and as such would exclude the sprinkling of the people, ver. 19; it could not include this, and at the same time the sprinkling of the holy vessels, ver. 21. To this it may be added, that αἷμα ἐκχέειν denotes only the shedding of the blood as the act of killing; but the ritualistic act of blood-outpouring always requires an addition, πρὸς τὸ θυσιαστήριον; πρὸς τὴν βάσιν τοῦ θυσ., Lev. viii. 15, ix. 9; ἐπὶ τῷ θυσ., 2 Kings xvi. 15; προσχέειν also is commonly used. Further, in favour of the signification *blood-shedding*, and not the actual *pouring out of blood*, the expression employed concerning the blood of Christ, Luke xxii. 20, τὸ αἷμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον, tells. (Cf. the parallels.) And finally, the word occurs in patristic Greek—where it is not generally used in any specially ritualistic or Christian sense—simply with the meaning *blood-shedding, slaying, murder*. Georg. *Alex. vita Chrys.* t. viii. p. 184, 26, φοβηθεὶς μήπως καὶ αἱματεκχυσίαι γένωνται εἰς τὸν λαόν. *Antioch. hom.* xxxix. p. 1090 C, τὸ γὰρ ἐκκόψαι τὸ ἴδιον θέλημα αἱματεκχυσία ἐστί, *perinde est ac si proprium sanguinem fundas*. (Hase in Steph. *Thes.* s.v.)

Αἰτέω, to ask, beg, implore, claim. It differs from the synonyms δέομαι, ἔρωταω, ἐπιθυμέω, in that it denotes the desire of the will; ἐπιθυμέω, the desire of the affections;

δέομαι, the request of need; while ἐρωτάω designates the *form* of the request, as also εὔχεσθαι, which in classical Greek is the proper term for request directed to the gods, embodying itself as prayer. As to the literal meaning of αἰτέω, we may compare the compounds, and e.g. Xen. *Anab.* ii. 1. 8, βασιλεὺς κελεύει τοὺς Ἕλληνας παραδόντας τὰ ὄπλα. § 10. θαυμάζω πότῃ ὥς κρατῶν βασιλεὺς αἰτεῖ τὰ ὄπλα ἢ ὥς διὰ φιλίαν καὶ δῶρα. Εἰ μὲν γὰρ ὥς κρατῶν τὶ δεῖ αὐτὸν αἰτεῖν, ἀλλ' οὐ λαβεῖν ἐλθόντα; all the synonyms are used of prayer in the N. T. excepting ἐπιθυμέω, αἰτεῖν also with the addition ἐν προσευχῇ, Matt. xxi. 22; cf. with προσεύχεσθαι, Mark xi. 24, Col. i. 9. Phil. iv. 6, τῇ προσευχῇ καὶ τῇ δεήσει τὰ αἰτήματα ὑμῶν γνωρίζεσθω. Bengel (followed by Trench), on John xi. 22, lays stress upon the fact that Jesus does not use αἰτεῖν or αἰτεῖσθαι of Himself, though Martha does. Jesus Himself says, ἐδεήθην, Luke xii. 33; ἐρωτήσω, John xiv. 16; cf. ver. 13, xvi. 26, xvii. 9, 15, 20. Bengel says, "αἰτεῖσθαι videtur verbum esse minus dignum, quanquam, LXX. Deut. x. 12, habent, τί κύριος ὁ θεός σου αἰτεῖται παρὰ σοῦ." Trench wrongly limits the use of αἰτεῖν when he says that, like the Latin "peto," it is submissive and suppliant, "the constant word by which is expressed the seeking of the inferior from the superior (Acts xii. 20), of the beggar from him that should give alms (Acts iii. 2), of the child from the parent (Matt. vii. 9; Luke xi. 11), of the subject from the ruler (Ezra viii. 22), of man from God (1 Kings iii. 11; Matt. vii. 7; Jas. i. 5; 1 John iii. 22; cf. Plato, *Eutyphr.* 14, εὔχεσθαι [ἔστιν] αἰτεῖν τοὺς θεούς)." As many examples of the opposite might be quoted, cf. Xen. as above; Deut. x. 12; Acts xvi. 29, etc. Αἰτεῖν is simply *to wish to have something*, a desire expressed according to circumstances, as a *demand*, an *entreaty*, a *prayer*. Equally erroneous is Trench's observation, that ἐρωτάω is the word for an inquiry directed to one's equal, "an asking upon equal terms." An examination of N. T. usage rather shows that ἐρωτάω only characterizes the *form* of the request; it is the nicest, finest, most delicate term for "to ask;" 1 John v. 16. (In classical Greek and the LXX., ἐρωτάω, in the sense *to request*, is wholly unknown.) This sufficiently explains the circumstance noted by Bengel.

Αἰτεῖν is construed with the accusative both of the thing asked for and of the person asked. The former, Matt. vii. 10, xxi. 22; Luke i. 63, xi. 12; John xiv. 13, 14, xvi. 24; Acts xvi. 29; 1 Cor. i. 22; 1 John iii. 22. The latter, Matt. v. 42, vi. 8; Luke vi. 30, xi. 13; John iv. 10. Also παρὰ τινος, Jas. i. 5. With two accusatives, Matt. vii. 9, 11; Mark vi. 22, 23 (x. 35, Lachm. Tisch.); Luke xi. 11; John xi. 22, xv. 16, xvi. 23; 1 Pet. iii. 15; τὴν παρὰ τινος, Matt. xx. 20; John iv. 9; Acts iii. 2; 1 John v. 15. Without object, Matt. vii. 7, 8; Luke xi. 9, 10; John xvi. 24; Jas. i. 6, iv. 3; 1 John v. 16.

The middle, often in prose, from Herod. onwards, signifies literally, *to ask for something for oneself*,—cf. Acts vii. 46, ἠτήσατο εὔρεῖν κ.τ.λ.; Mark vi. 24, 25, xv. 8; Jas. iv. 2, 3; Matt. xx. 22,—but the reflective element is not always to be maintained or emphasized. According to Bekk. *Anecd. Graec.* 81, the use of the middle was limited thus: αἰτεῖσθαι

τὸν ἀποδιδόντα, τὸν δὲ μὴ ἀποδώσοντα αἰτεῖν. But even this does not always hold good. It is construed like the active with τί, Matt. xiv. 7, xviii. 19, xxvii. 20, 58; Mark vi. 24, x. 38, xi. 24, xv. 6, 43; Luke xxiii. 25, 52; John xv. 7; Acts xii. 20, xxv. 3, 15; Eph. iii. 20; 1 John v. 14, 15. Acc. with inf., Luke xxiii. 23; Acts iii. 14. With inf. following, Acts vii. 46, ἤτήσατο εὐρεῖν (Matthiae, § 53b; Krüger, lv. 4. 1),—a combination explained by the reflective force of the middle. Eph. iii. 13, αἰτούμαι μὴ ἐγκακεῖν ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσίν μου ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, is to be regarded in the same manner as a prayer of the apostle for himself; for we are hardly justified in supposing the omission of ὑμᾶς as the subject. With ἵνα following, Col. i. 9. With two acc., Acts xiii. 28. τὶ παρά τινος, Acts ix. 2.

Αἶτημα, τό, a request, like the German *Forderung*, in a passive sense, that which I have to ask for, from which αἴτησις (not in the N. T.; LXX. Judg. viii. 24; 1 Kings ii. 16, 20; Job vi. 8) does not differ; for, as is often the case with verbal subs. in -σις, it passes over into the passive meaning. But though αἴτησις often means the same as αἶτημα, αἶτημα never, like αἴτησις, signifies the act merely of requesting, but always the subject-matter of request. Αἴτησις sometimes means the act simply; cf. Plato, *Euth.* 14 C: ἐπιστήμη αἴτησεως καὶ δόσεως θεοῖς ἢ ὁσιότης ἂν εἴη. This fully explains Phil. iv. 6, ἐν παντὶ τῇ προσευχῇ καὶ τῇ δέήσει μετὰ εὐχαριστίας τὰ αἰτήματα ὑμῶν γνωρίζεσθω πρὸς τὸν θεόν, where the relation between δέησις and αἶτημα involves difficulty if we do not take αἶτημα strictly in a passive sense, "what ye have to ask." The meaning is not that the αἰτήματα are to be presented as prayer and request before God in the form of δέησις, but that they are to be presented μετὰ εὐχαριστίας. As the emphasis lies upon μετὰ εὐχ., δέησ. and αἶτ. differ respectively as form and subject-matter. Also in Luke xxiii. 24; 1 John v. 15.—LXX. Ps. xx. 6, xxxvii. 4 = פָּקֹדֶיךָ; 1 Sam. i. 17, 27; Esth. v. 7; Ps. cvi. 16 = פָּקֹדֶיךָ.

Ἀπαίτέω, to recall, to demand back, of legal exaction of a demand, or of legitimate claim, cf. Deut. xv. 2, ἀφήσεις πᾶν χρέος ἰδίου ὃ ὀφείλει σοι ὁ πλησίον, καὶ τὸν ἀδελφὸν σου οὐκ ἀπαιτήσεις. Ver. 3, τὸν ἀλλότριον ἀπαιτήσεις ὅσα ἐὰν ᾖ σοι παρ' αὐτῷ. With two acc., or τὶ ἐκ τινός, Aesch. *Cho.* 398. In the N. T. Luke vi. 30, ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵροντος τὰ σὰ, μὴ ἀπαίτει; Luke xii. 20, τὴν ψυχὴν σου ἀπαιτοῦσιν ἀπὸ σοῦ. Cf. Wisd. xv. 8, τὴς ψυχῆς ἀπαιτηθεὶς χρέος.—Andoc. p. 126; Reisk., ταῦτα ὑμᾶς, εἰ μὲν βούλεσθε, αἰτῶ εἰδὲ μὴ βούλεσθε, ἀπαιτῶ.

Ἐξαίτέω, to claim back, to require something to be delivered up (to re-claim), Diod. Sic. iv. 79, ἐξήτει τὸν Δαίδαλον εἰς τιμωρίαν. Middle, to re-claim for oneself, cf. αἰτέω. Luke xxii. 31, ὁ σατανᾶς ἐξητήσατο ὑμᾶς, τοῦ σινιάσαι ὡς τὸν σίτον.

Ἐπαίτέω, urgently to ask, to beg for, Luke xvi. 3, xviii. 35 (Rec. προσαιτῶν).

Παραιτέομαι, active unused; to try to obtain by asking, to beg a person's release, the person addressed being regarded as reluctant, or the thing asked for difficult to obtain.

Xen. *Mem.* ii. 2. 14, παραιτήσῃ τοὺς θεοὺς σοι συγγνώμονας εἶναι. Then *to beg to be excused, to decline, or refuse* the thing spoken of. Chiefly in later Greek, especially in Plut., yet also in Herod., Xen., Dem., and Tragedians. In the N. T. = *to decline, to refuse, to avoid*, with accusative following. Acts xxv. 11, οὐ παραιτοῦμαι τὸ ἀποθανεῖν; Heb. xii. 25; 1 Tim. iv. 7, v. 11; 2 Tim. ii. 23; Tit. iii. 10. Cf. Polyb. v. 27. 3, τοὺς ἄρχοντας παραιτεῖσθαι, "to decline the summons of the authorities." Plato, *Mor.* 206 A, γυναῖκα παραιτ., *to divorce* one's wife. With following μή with the infin., Heb. xii. 19.—*To excuse oneself*, Luke xiv. 18, 19, ἔχε με παρητημένον. Cf. Plut. *Mor.* 868.

Προσαιτέω, *to ask besides, to ask importunately, to beg*, John viii. 9; Rec. Mark x. 46; Luke xviii. 35, syn. ἐπαιτεῖν.

Προσαιτής, *a beggar* (in later Greek, especially Plut.), Lachm., Tisch., in John ix. 8; Mark x. 46.

Αἰών, ὄνως, ὅ, connected with αἰέ, αἰές, αἰέν, *always* (not, as in the first edition, with ἄω, ἄημι); hence = *duration*. Cf. Aristot. *de coel.* i. 9, τὸ γὰρ τέλος τὸ περιέχον τὸν τῆς ἐκάστου ζωῆς χρόνον, οὐ μὴθὲν ἔξω κατὰ φύσιν, αἰὼν ἐκάστου κέκληται. κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν δὲ λόγον καὶ τὸ τοῦ παντὸς οὐρανοῦ τέλος καὶ τὸ τὸν πάντα χρόνον (cf. χρόνος δὲ ἀριθμὸς κινήσεως, *Id. ibid.*) καὶ τὴν ἀπειρίαν περιέχον τέλος αἰὼν ἐστὶν ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰέ εἶναι εἰληφὼς τὴν ἐπωπυμίαν, where the linguistic usage is rightly presented. In early Greek especially, and still also in the Attic, αἰὼν signifies the duration of human life as limited to a certain space of time, and this is clearly closely connected with the conception; hence = *the duration of life, course of life, term of life, lifetime, life in its temporal form*. So in Homer, Hesiod, Pindar. Cf. Hom. ii. 24. 725, ἄνερ, ἀπ' αἰῶνος νέος ὦλεο, καὶ δὲ μεχέρην λείπεις; Pind. *Ol.* ii. 120, ἄδακρυν νέμονται αἰῶνα; Hom. *Il.* xvi. 453, αὐτὰρ ἐπειδὴ τὸν γε λῖπη ψυχὴ τε καὶ αἰὼν. Likewise Tragg., Plat., Xen., Herodt., Plut.—Soph. *El.* 1085, πάγκλαυτον αἰῶνα εἶλον; Plat. *Legg.* iii. 701 C, χαλεπὸν αἰῶνα διάγοντας μὴ λῆξαι ποτε κακῶν, etc.; Herodt. iii. 40, οὕτω διαφέρειν τὸν αἰῶνα; Xen. *Cyrop.* ii. 1. 7, διὰ παντὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος ἀμνηχανοῦντες βιοτεύειν. Hence explained by Eustath. = τὸ μέτρον τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης ζωῆς; by Hesych., ὁ τῆς ζωῆς χρόνος. From this original limitation of the conception to human life, it may be explained how it sometimes denotes the *space* of a human life, *a human generation* (whence, perhaps, the remark of Jerome on Ezek. xxvi., that it means a period of seventy years), so that αἰὼν denotes an age or generation from the point of view of duration of time, as γενεά does from that of duration of race; (cf. Luke xvi. 8; Eph. ii. 7; Col. i. 26; Eph. iii. 21, εἰς πᾶσας τὰς γενεὰς τοῦ αἰῶνος τῶν αἰώνων, etc.); and hence that it passes over into the more general and wider signification, *age*. Diod. iii. 73, ἐν τῷ πρότερον αἰῶνι; Dion. Hal. *A. R.* i. 3, χρόνον ὅσον ἂν ὁ θνητὸς αἰὼν ἀντέχῃ; vii. 55, ὅσας ὁ μακρὸς αἰὼν μεταβολὰς φέρει. Accordingly, the expansion of the conception to time unlimited (*eternity a parte ante* and *a parte post*) was easy, for it simply involved the abstraction of the idea of limitation, and thus the word came to

signify *unlimited duration*. The expressions, ἐξ αἰώνος, ἀπ' αἰώνος, εἰς αἰῶνα, δι' αἰώνος (Arist. *de mundo*, c. 5, ταῦτα δὲ πάντα ἔοικεν αὐτῇ (sc. τῇ γῇ) πρὸς ἀγαθοῦ γινόμενα τὴν δι' αἰώνος σωτηρίαν παρέχειν), belong to later Greek. It is interesting to observe the connection of the word, as traced by Curtius, 354 sq., with the Sanscrit *évas*, "course," "walk;" in the plural, *habit, custom*; Old High German, *éwa*, "eternity;" then, in a derived sense, *law, contract, marriage*; see R. v. Raumer, *Einwirkung des Christenthums auf die althochd. Sprache*, 1845, p. 329.

Inasmuch, therefore, as αἰών may denote either the duration of a definite space of time, or the (unending) duration of time in general, both future and past, according to the context, it was the proper term for rendering the Hebrew עוֹלָם,—for which the LXX. use it constantly,—the only distinction being that the Hebrew word meant *primarily*, a remote, veiled, undefined, and therefore unlimited time, past or future, and only *secondarily*, a definite (especially a future) period whose limits must be ascertained from the context. Deut. xv. 17, ἔσται σοι οἰκέτης εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα; Isa. xxxii. 14, 15, ἔσονται αἱ κῶμαι σπῆλαια ἕως τοῦ αἰώνος . . . ἕως ἂν ἔλθῃ ἐφ' ὑμᾶς πνεῦμα ἀφ' ὑψήλου; cf. ver. 17, καὶ κρατήσῃ ἡ δικαιοσύνη ἀνάπαυσιν καὶ πεποιθότες ἕως τοῦ αἰώνος; *vid.* Lexica, s.v. עוֹלָם. Specially often do we find ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰώνος, ἀπ' αἰώνος, δι' αἰώνος, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, also the plural εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, which latter use arose probably from the meaning "age," and according to Steph. *Thes.* (Paris ed.), occurs indeed, though very rarely, in classical writers. Ps. lxi. 5, lxxvii. 8, μὴ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας ἀπόσεται κύριος; Dan. ii. 44, vi. 26, etc.; πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων, Ps. lv. 20.

The N. T. use of the word is not quite accounted for by a reference to the LXX.; for they employed it, on the whole, in substantially the same way as the classical writers. Not only expressions like εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, Matt. xxi. 19; Mark iii. 29, xi. 14; John iv. 14, vi. 51, 58, viii. 35, 51, 52, x. 28, xi. 26, xii. 34, xiii. 8, xiv. 16; 1 Cor. viii. 13; 2 Cor. ix. 9; Heb. v. 6, vi. 20, vii. 17, 21, 24, 28; 1 Pet. i. 25; 1 John ii. 17; 2 John 2; εἰς αἰῶνα, 2 Pet. ii. 17 (omitted by Lachm. and Tisch.); Jude 13; εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰώνος, Heb. i. 8, after Ps. xlv. 7; εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, Matt. vi. 13, Rec. text in Luke i. 33; Rom. i. 25, ix. 5, xi. 36, xvi. 27; 2 Cor. xi. 31; Heb. xiii. 8; εἰς πάντας τοὺς αἰῶνας, Jude 25; εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων (the addition of gen. strengthens the idea; it is a periphrasis for the superlative, Matthiae, § 430; in the O. T. the sing. εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰώνος only in a few passages, Hebrew עוֹלָם לְעוֹלָם, עוֹלָם וָעוֹלָם), Gal. i. 5; Phil. iv. 28; 1 Tim. i. 17; 2 Tim. iv. 18; Heb. xiii. 21; 1 Pet. iv. 11, v. 11; Rev. i. 6, 18, iv. 9, 10, v. 13 (14, Rec. text), vii. 12, x. 6, xi. 15, xiv. 11, xv. 7, xix. 3, xx. 10, xxii. 5; ἀπ' αἰώνος, Luke i. 70; Acts iii. 21, xv. 18; ἐκ τοῦ αἰώνος, John ix. 32; ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων, Eph. iii. 9; πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων, 1 Cor. ii. 7,—but also others like ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος, μέλλων, ἐρχόμενος, ἐκείνος, συντέλεια τοῦ αἰώνος, occur, in which another influence is traceable, namely, a post-biblical and rabbinical usage, so that we have here an example of School expressions being adopted into the language of Holy Scripture. In O. T. prophecy occurs occasionally the expression בְּאַחֲרִית הַיָּמִים, Gen. xlix. 1; Num. xxiv. 14; Deut. iv. 30, xxxi. 29; Isa.

ii. 2; Jer. xxiii. 20, xxx. 24, xlviii. 17, xlix. 39; Ezek. xxxviii. 16; Hos. iii. 5; Mic. iv. 1; בְּאַחֲרִית הַשָּׁנִים, Ezek. xxxviii. 8, not to signify the latest future, "further than which the eye cannot penetrate" (Hitzig on Mic. iv. 1); nor "the end of this world's history, which seems to the eye of the speaker to lie at the extreme limit of his horizon" (Delitzsch on Heb. i. 1); but *the last days* in general (opp. רֵאשִׁית, Eccles. vii. 8; Isa. xlvi. 10; Deut. xi. 12; not, however, as contrasted with the time of the speaker), the *last period* of historical development, *vid.* Num. xxiv. 14; Deut. iv. 30, xxxi. 29; Ezek. xxxviii. 8; Jer. xxiii. 20, xxx. 24, xlviii. 47, xlix. 39; Hos. iii. 5, in which both the threatened curses and the Messianic salvation (*vid.* Isa. ii. 2; Mic. iv. 1, etc.) are to be revealed; in a word, the *time of final decision*, the *time of settlement*;—hence the term is always taken by Jewish interpreters (and rightly so) in a Messianic sense. Kimchi on Isa. ii. 2, *Ubicunque leguntur haec verba בְּאַחֲרִית הַיָּמִים, ibi sermo est de diebus Messiae.* (*Vid.* also Drechsler, Knobel on Isa. ii. 2; Hengstenberg on *Balaam*, p. 158 sq., *Christology*, i. on Mic. iv. 1.) We need not be surprised that the prophets compress much into this time, for they conceive the *history* of the final decision as taking place in it. *Vid.* Deut. iv. 30; Hos. iii. 5; Isa. ii. 2 sq., etc. Possibly, therefore, the occupation of Canaan described in Gen. xlix. is placed in this time, so far as it is to be regarded as the beginning of the fulfilment of prophecy, while the actual entrance of the final end into the present shifts itself further on. The LXX. render this expression by ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν, ἐπ' ἐσχάτου, ἐσχάτῳ τῶν ἡμερῶν, ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμεραῖς (*vid.* ἐσχατος); cf. Heb. i. 1, etc. Chald. = בְּסוֹף יוֹמָא, בְּסוֹף הַיּוֹמָן, post-biblical synagogal = קִין הָעוֹלָם (Delitzsch on Heb. ix. 26), for which in the N. T. συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος, Matt. xiii. 39, 40, 49, xxiv. 3, xxviii. 20; συντέλεια τῶν αἰώνων, Heb. ix. 26, *close of time*, of the present development of the world, of the course of the world; cf. Paul's words in 1 Cor. x. 11, ταῦτα δὲ τύποι συνέβαινον ἐκείνοις, ἐγράφη δὲ πρὸς νοουθεσίαν ἡμῶν, εἰς οὓς τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰώνων κατήντηκεν, as also τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου, in Gal. iv. 4. Between Heb. ix. 26, 1 Cor. x. 11, on the one hand, and Matt. xiii. 39 sq. on the other, there is a difference, so far as the latter marks the end as still future, whilst the former characteristically describes the present. Looked at in relation to the past, the Messianic age is the συντέλεια τῶν αἰώνων; considered in relation to the future, the συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος is still to come, in so far as the existing course of the world has not yet found its final termination. This is clear from the mode in which the idea suggested by בְּאַחֲרִית הַיָּמִים is further carried out. The ἐσχαταὶ ἡμέραι give us the view of a future, which owes its entire character to the fulfilment of the Messianic prophecies,—a future designated הַיָּמִים הַבָּאִים, αἰὼν ἐρχόμενος, μέλλον, ἐκείνος; whereas the past and present, down to that time, were denoted by הַיָּמִים הָעוֹלָם, αἰὼν οὗτος. The question now is, to which of these times belong the יְמֵי מְשִׁיחָא? In Schabbath, fol. 63, we read: Dixit R. Chijja, Bar Abba: omnes prophetae omnino non sunt vaticinati nisi de diebus Messiae, sed הָעוֹלָם הַבָּא, oculus non vidit praeter te, o Deus, Isa. lxiv. 4. In this and many other passages, therefore, agreeably to the expression אַחֲרִית הַיָּמִים, the time of the Messiah is reckoned in the עוֹלָם הַבָּא, like all that is viewed as belonging to the end

of days. See Bleek on Heb. i. 1. So, *e.g.*, the resurrection promised in Dan. xii. 2, on which R. Saadiah Gaon, in Emunoth, fol. 36. 1, says regarding those who rise again: "God will transfer them from the days of the Messiah to the joys of the עולם הבא." On the other hand, however, αἰὼν μέλλων also is sometimes described as the time of the Messiah, *e.g.* Targ. on 1 Kings iv. 33: בעלמא דהין ובעלמא דהין ומשיחא, *in seculo hoc et in seculo futuro Messiae*. Beracoth, cap. 1 (in Lightfoot on Matt. xii. 32): *Diebus vitae tuae innuitur hoc saeculum; omnibus diebus vitae tuae superinducuntur Dies Messiae*. Cf. also Oehler, art. "Messias" in Herzog's *Realencycl.* ix. 434, who quotes also Tosephot on Bab. Sanh., fol. 110b: "the future world, that is, the days of the Messiah." Finally, however, the days of Messiah are elsewhere separated from and placed between the two ages of the world;—affirmed by Oehler (in Herzog) to be a modification of the first view, which may perhaps be described as the one that has at last gained exclusive recognition; *ὁ αἰὼν μέλλων* would then denote *the time of the new world*.

The expression *ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος* and *μέλλων* then passed over into the N. T., being used there also in the first instance to distinguish the present from the future which follows on the final decision, and in which retribution takes place. So in Mark x. 30; Luke xviii. 30, *ὅς οὐχὶ μὴ ἀπολάβῃ πολλαπλασίονα ἐν τῷ χαίρῳ τούτῳ καὶ ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τῷ ἐρχομένῳ ζῶνι αἰώνιον*. In the parallel passage, Matt. xix. 28, we read, *ἐν τῇ παλιγγενεσίᾳ ὅταν καθίσῃ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπὶ θρόνου δόξης αὐτοῦ*; and in Luke xx. 35, *οἱ δὲ καταξιοθέντες τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐκείνου καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τῆς ἐκ νεκρῶν τυχεῖν* are contrasted with the *υἱοῖς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου*. *Ὁ αἰὼν μέλλων*, therefore, is the new age of the world that commences with the *palíngenesia* (cf. Rev. xxii. 5; *vid. s.v. παλιγγενεσία*), and which is inaugurated and conditioned by the resurrection of the dead—by the second coming of Christ (Matt. xiii. and xxiv.). Accordingly, *αἰὼν οὗτος* embraces the entire period of the world till the *συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος* (in which expression reference to a further future is still wanting), whose close will be the *τέλη τῶν αἰώνων*, 1 Cor. x. 11; *συντέλεια τῶν αἰώνων*, Heb. ix. 26. We find here *αἰὼν* used in the plural to denote the past, just as elsewhere for the future (Eph. iii. 21, *εἰς γενεὰς τοῦ αἰῶνος τῶν αἰώνων*; Heb. xiii. 8, *εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας*), for the purpose of giving it a more general character,—like *χρόνοι*, *e.g.*, in 1 Pet. i. 20; Acts i. 6; *Lat. tempora*. Riehm (*Lehrbegriff des Hebräer-Br.* i. 209) thinks that *συντέλεια τῶν αἰώνων*, in Heb. ix. 26, implies that the turning-point of both ages, the *αἰὼν μέλλων*, had already commenced with the first advent of Christ,—in opposition to Heb. i. 6, ii. 5–8, xi. 40; 1 Cor. xv. 20–28. Cf. Heb. vi. 5 with iv. 9, 11, x. 35, 36. That expression means, however, nothing more than *ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμέρων τούτων* in Heb. i. 1 (cf. 1 Pet. i. 20); and as the latter is drawn from biblical usage, so the former from that of the Schools and social life. The final portion of *αἰὼν οὗτος* commenced when Christ appeared;—*ἔσχατον τῶν χρόνων*, *ἔσχ. ἡμέρα*, Acts ii. 17; 1 Pet. i. 20; Heb. i. 1; which last-mentioned expression is elsewhere limited to the time immediately preceding the *παρουσία*, 2 Tim. iii. 1; cf. 1 Tim. iv. 1; 1 Pet. i. 5. As the *αἰὼν μέλλων* derives its *moral* value from the decision arrived at in the *συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος* (Matt. xiii. 39, 40, 49; cf. Luke

xx. 25, οἱ δὲ καταξιοθέντες τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐκείνου τυχεῖν), an opposite moral character is attributed to αἰὼν οὗτος, as a course of time alienated from the revealed truth of God Matt. xiii. 22, ἡ μέριμνα τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου (Lachm., Tisch. omit τούτου) συμπνίγει τὸν λόγον, cf. ver. 24 sq., 40; Luke xvi. 8, οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου φρονιμώτεροι ὑπὲρ τοὺς υἱοὺς τοῦ φωτός. Stress is laid on this, especially in the Pauline writings, Rom. xii. 2, μὴ συσχηματίζεσθε τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ, ἀλλὰ μεταμορφούσθε τῇ ἀνακαινώσει τοῦ νοὸς εἰς κ.τ.λ.; 2 Tim. iv. 10, ἀγαπήσας τὸν νῦν αἰῶνα. Cf. Tit. ii. 12, where ἀσέβεια and the κοσμικαὶ ἐπιθυμίαι are taken as answering to the νῦν αἰὼν. Eph. ii. 2, ἐν ἀμαρτίαις περιπατήσατε κατὰ τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, *vid.* κόσμος. Hence Gal. i. 4, ὅπως ἐξέλθῃ ἡμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ ἐνεστώτος αἰῶνος πονηροῦ (see concerning this passage, ἐνίστημι); 1 Cor. ii. 6, σοφία τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, opposed to θεοῦ; iii. 18, ii. 6, 8, ἄρχοντες τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου; 2 Cor. iv. 4, ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου ἐτύφλωσεν τὰ νοήματα τῶν ἀπιστῶν, εἰς τὸ μὴ ἀνγάζειν τὸν φωτισμὸν τοῦ εὐαγγ.; cf. Luke xvi. 8.—Heb. vi. 5 may perhaps also be adduced, καλὸν γενεσάμενους θεοῦ ῥῆμα δυνάμεις τε μέλλοντος αἰῶνος; cf. Eph. iii. 30; Heb. vii. 16.—The expression occurs, besides, in Eph. i. 21; 1 Tim. vi. 17; Eph. ii. 7, ἐν τοῖς αἰῶσιν τοῖς ἐπερχομένοις. Syn. with ὁ καιρὸς οὗτος, ὁ νῦν καιρὸς, ὁ κόσμος οὗτος, which see. It does not occur in John's writings, in the Gospel, the Epp., the Rev., nor in James and Jude. Its use in 2 Pet. iii. 18, αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς ἡμέραν αἰῶνος, is peculiar; see ἡμέρα, ἡμέρα ἀπολυτρώσεως, σωτηρίας, κυρίου, where the genitive specifies what is characteristic of the Day,—because it serves to make it manifest. Accordingly, ἡμέρα αἰῶνος opposed to νῦν denotes the Day on which eternity will become manifest, and that in the sense in which the expression is used in Ecclus. xviii. 10, ὡς σταγὼν ὕδατος ἀπὸ θαλάσσης καὶ ψῆφος ἄμμου, οὕτως ὀλίγα ἔτη ἐν ἡμέρᾳ αἰῶνος.

Akin to post-biblical rabbinical usage is also Heb. xi. 3, κατηρτίσθαι τοὺς αἰῶνας ῥήματι θεοῦ, syn. τὸ βλέπομενον; ver. 2, δι' οὗ καὶ ἐποίησεν τοὺς αἰῶνας, where οἱ αἰῶνες = עוֹלָמוֹת. So Wisd. xiii. 9, εἰ γὰρ τοσοῦτον ἴσχυσαν εἰδέναί ἵνα δύνωνται στοχάσασθαι τὸν αἰῶνα, τὸν τούτων δεσπότην πῶς τάχιον οὐχ εὔρον,—“ words suggested probably by the Jewish formula with קִיָּה עוֹלָם, and often referring less to the idea of time than to the totality of that which has outward existence during time—to the world itself so far as it moves in time” (Bleek). So also, though in a somewhat bombastic manner, Delitzsch says: “The worlds which constitute the immeasurable contents of immeasurable time, thus naming *pluraliter* that which *singulariter* is called ὁ κόσμος.” עוֹלָם, עוֹלָמוֹת, in post-biblical Hebrew, often signifies *the world as it presents itself in the course of time*, as it appears to us,—a meaning derived from the import of the word in the School formula above named, but without further reference to the conception of time. See κόσμος. Αἰῶνες in this sense occurs in the N. T. only in the Epistle intended for Jewish-Christians, that to the Hebrews. Cf. the synonymous expressions ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος and ὁ κόσμος οὗτος.

Αἰώνιος, *on*, fem. αἰωνία. 2 Thess. ii. 16, παράκλησις αἰωνία; Heb. ix. 12, αἰωνία λύτρωσις. In the first passage, codices F G read αἰώνιον. Besides also C, 2 Pet. i. 11,

αἰωνία βασιλεία; B, Acts xiii. 48, ζωὴ αἰωνία. Also in single passages in the classics, Plat. *Tim.* 38 B, αἰωνία φύσις, doubtful; Diod. Sic. i. 1. *Belonging to the αἰών, to time in its duration*—constant, abiding, eternal. Plat. *Rep.* ii. 363 D, ἡγησάμενος κάλλιστον ἀρετῆς μισθὸν μέθην αἰώνιον; *Legg.* x. 904 A, ἐπειδὴ κατείδεν ἡμῶν ὁ βασιλεὺς . . . ἀνώλεθρον ὃν γινόμενον ἄλλ' οὐκ αἰώνιον ψυχὴν καὶ σῶμα; Philem. 15, ἐχωρίσθη πρὸς ὧραν ἵνα αἰώνιον αὐτὸν ἀπέχης. Most frequently in biblical and ecclesiastical Greek. LXX. instead of the subst. αἰών. In the N. T. mostly conjoined with ζωή, ζωὴ αἰώνιος, Matt. xix. 16, 29, xxv. 46; Mark x. 17, 30; Luke x. 25, xviii. 18, 30; Acts xiii. 46, 48; Rom. ii. 7, v. 21, vi. 22, 23; Gal. vi. 8; 1 Tim. i. 16, vi. 12, 19; Tit. i. 2, iii. 7; Jude 21; John iii. 15, 16, 36, iv. 14, 36, v. 24, 39, vi. 27, 40, 47, 54, 68, x. 28, xii. 25, 50, xvii. 2, 3; 1 John i. 2, ii. 25, iii. 15, v. 11, 13, 20, for which in 1 Tim. vi. 19, Lachm., Tisch., read ἡ οὕτως ζωή, answering to ζῆν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, opposed to πρόσκαιρος; 2 Cor. iv. 18, τὰ γὰρ βλέπομενα πρόσκαιρα, τὰ δὲ μὴ βλέπομενα αἰωνία, and, indeed, this ζωὴ αἰώνιος belongs to the αἰὼν μελλ. ; cf. Luke xviii. 30, ὃς οὐχὶ μὴ ἀπολάβῃ πολλαπλασίονα ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ καὶ ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τῷ ἐρχομένῳ ζῶν αἰώνιον; Mark x. 30; John xii. 25, ὁ μισῶν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ τούτῳ εἰς ζῶν αἰώνιον φυλάξει αὐτήν. In the Gospel and first Epistle of John it occurs only in this connection; where ζωὴ αἰώνιος is represented as both future (vi. 27, xii. 25, iv. 14, 36) and also for the most part as already present (John xvii. 3, and the other passages; cf. xi. 26, 27, viii. 51); akin is the view contained in Hebrews, according to which the δυνάμεις μέλλοντος αἰῶνος may be tasted even now. *Vid.* ζωή. Cf. Weiss, *Der Johann Lehrbegr.*, sec. 1; opposed to τὸ πῦρ τὸ αἰώνιον, Matt. xxv. 41, xviii. 8, Jude 7; κόλασις αἰώνιος, Matt. xxv. 46; 2 Thess. i. 9, ὀλεθρος αἰώνιος. Cf. also Mark iii. 29, αἰώνιος κρίσις (where Lachm., Tisch., ἀμάρτημα); Heb. vi. 2, κρίμα αἰώνιον. Conjoined with σωτηρία, Heb. v. 9; λύτρωσις, Heb. ix. 12; κληρονομία, ix. 15; διαθήκη, xiii. 20; δόξα, 2 Tim. ii. 10, 1 Pet. v. 10; βασιλεία, 2 Pet. i. 11. Αἰώνιος is specially predicated of the saving blessings of divine revelation, by which is denoted their not belonging to what is transitory; cf. 2 Cor. v. 1; syn. ἄφθαρτος, 1 Pet. i. 23, cf. ver. 25; ἀκατάλυτος, Heb. vii. 16, ἱερεὺς . . . κατὰ δύναμιν ζωῆς ἀκαταλύτου, cf. ver. 17, and ix. 14, ὃς διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου ἑαυτὸν προσήνεγκεν τῷ θεῷ. The expression, χρόνοι αἰώνιοι, Rom. xvi. 25, κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν μυστηρίου χρόνοις αἰωνίοις σεσιγημένου, φανερωθέντος δὲ νῦν; Tit. i. 2, ἣν (sc. ζῶν αἰώνιον) ἐπηγγείλατο ὁ θεὸς πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων; 2 Tim. i. 9, κατὰ χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσαν ἡμῖν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων, is meant to embrace *all the periods hitherto expired*, all belonging to the αἰὼν *a parte ante*, like ἀπ' αἰῶνος, Luke i. 70, Acts iii. 21, or Col. i. 26 (coll. Rom. xvi. 25), τὸ μυστήριον τὸ ἀποκεκρυμμένον ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν γενεῶν, νυνὶ δὲ ἐφανερώθη. On 2 Tim. i. 9, cf. Eph. i. 4, 11; 1 Pet.—Further, Rom. xvi. 26; 2 Cor. iv. 17, v. 1; 1 Tim. vi. 16; Rev. xiv. 6.

Ἀκολουθέω, from κέλευθος, a *going, journey, path, way* (perhaps connected with the German *gleiten*, “to glide or slide,” which is not to be confounded with the compound

geleiten, whence *Begleiter*) ; ἀκόλουθος, "attendant" (a copulative), accordingly = to be an attendant, to accompany, to go with or follow, as brothers in arms (Xen. *Hell.* v. 3. 26 and often, parallel to σύμμαχος εἶναι), as soldiers, in contrast with πολεμαρχεῖν, as servants (Plut. *Alc.* 3) ; cf. Matt. xxvii. 55, αἵτινες ἠκολούθησαν τῷ Ἰησοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, διακονοῦσαι αὐτῷ. John xii. 26, ἐὰν ἐμοὶ τις διακονῇ, ἐμοὶ ἀκολουθεῖτω. Opposed to προάγειν, Matt. xxi. 9, Mark xi. 9 ; ἡγοῦμαι, ἄρχομαι, Plat. *Rep.* v. 474 C ; Plut. *Publ. et Sol.* 3 ; *Moral.* 1008 B. (1) Literally, to accompany, follow, follow after, Matt. iv. 20, 22, 25, and often in the ev., Acts, and Rev. On 1 Cor. x. 4, πνευματικὴ ἀκολουθοῦσα πέτρα, see πνευματικός. Construed with the dative ; also μετά τινος = to accompany, go with, Luke ix. 49, Rev. vi. 8, xiv. 13,—a combination not sanctioned by Phrynichus, though vindicated by Lobeck, *Phryn.* 353 sq., and confirmed by examples from Demosth., Isoc., and others ; ὀπίσω τινος, Matt. x. 38, Mark viii. 34 ; cf. 1 Kings xix. 20 ; Isa. xlv. 14. Also with reference to time, to follow thereupon, Rev. xiv. 8, 9. Cf. *Ecclus. Prolog.*, πολλῶν καὶ μεγάλων ἡμῖν διὰ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων κατ' αὐτοὺς ἠκολουθηκότων δεδομένων ; Strabo, iii. 165 ; Theophr. *De caus. plant.* iv. 11. 9. Cf. 2 Macc. iv. 17, ταῦτα ὁ ἀκόλουθος καιρὸς δηλώσει ; 3 Esdr. viii. 16, τὰ τοῦτοις ἀκόλουθα ; Dem. c. *Phil.* 51, δεῖ τοὺς ὀρθῶς πολέμῳ χρωμένους οὐκ ἀκολουθεῖν τοῖς πράγμασιν, ἀλλ' αὐτοὺς ἔμπροσθεν εἶναι τῶν πραγμάτων. In this passage it is used (2) figuratively, of spiritual or moral relations : to follow whither one is told, to obey. So often in classical Greek, e.g. Andoc. c. *Alc.* xxxi. 35, οὐκ αὐτὸς τοῖς νόμοις τοῖς τῆς πόλεως, ἀλλ' ὑμᾶς τοῖς αὐτοῦ τρόποις ἀκολουθεῖν ἀξιῶν ; 2 Macc. viii. 36, διὰ τὸ ἀκολουθεῖν τοῖς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ προτεταγμένοις νόμοις ; Marc. Ant. vii. 31, Ἀκολουθήσον θεῷ. In Demosth. and Polyb., τοῖς καιροῖς ἀκολουθεῖν, to serve the time, to act according to circumstances. (The passage cited by Pape from Thuc. iii. 38, ἀκ. τῇ γνώμῃ, is perhaps wrongly explained, for τῇ γνώμῃ here is the *dat. instr.* ; cf. K. W. Krüger *in loc.*) Akin is the usage of the Gospels and Rev. xiv. 4, with reference to the scholars and disciples of Christ, not, however, because in ancient times instruction was given *ambulando*, as is stated in all lexicons hitherto without any confirmatory examples. The only place in ante-Christian Greek where the word is thus used, is 1 Kings xix. 20, of the relation of Elisha to Elijah. The remembrance of this fact as it stands makes the representation significantly expressive. Distinguishing between the occasional and temporary following of Jesus by the ὄχλοι πολλοί, Matt. iv. 25, viii. 1, and the following Him to which Jesus calls individuals (Matt. ix. 9, xix. 21) or people generally (Matt. x. 38, xvi. 24 ; John viii. 12, xii. 26), or which was undertaken by individuals (Matt. viii. 19 ; Luke ix. 57, 61),—this much, in the first place, is clear, that it denotes an abiding fellowship with Jesus, not only for the sake of learning, as a scholar from his teacher (Matt. viii. 19, διδάσκαλε, ἀκολουθήσω σοι, ὅπου ἐὰν ἀπέρχῃ), but for the sake of the salvation known or looked for, which presented itself in this fellowship ; cf. Luke ix. 62, οὐδεὶς ἐπιβαλὼν τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἐπ' ἄροτρον, καὶ βλέπων εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω, εὐθετὸς ἐστὶν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ ; Matt. xix. 21, δεῦρο ἀκολουθεῖ μοι, in answer to the question of ver. 16, τί ἀγαθὸν ποιήσω, ἵνα ἔχω ζῶν αἰώνιον ; cf. what is

added in Mark x. 21, ἔξεις θησαυρὸν ἐν οὐρανῷ; Matt. xix. 27, ἰδού, ἡμεῖς ἀφήκαμεν πάντα, καὶ ἠκολουθήσαμεν σοι τί ἄρα ἔσται ἡμῖν; Matt. x. 38, ὃς οὐ λαμβάνει τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀκολουθεῖ ὀπίσω μου, οὐκ ἔστιν μου ἄξιος; Matt. viii. 22, ἀκολουθεῖ μοι, καὶ ἄφες τοὺς νεκροὺς θάψαι τοὺς ἐαυτῶν νεκρούς. Hence also the necessity of πάντα ἀφιέναι for the sake of fellowship with Jesus, Matt. ix. 9, xix. 21, 27, 28; Mark ii. 14, x. 21, 28; Luke v. 11, 27, 28, xviii. 22, 28 (cf. Phil. iii. 7 sqq.). For this very reason, following Jesus implies a trustful and hopeful cleaving to Him, following His guidance, as is particularly clear from John viii. 12, ὁ ἀκολουθῶν ἐμοί, οὐ μὴ περιπατήσῃ ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ, ἀλλ' ἔξει τὸ φῶς τῆς ζωῆς; John x. 4, τὰ πρόβατα αὐτῷ ἀκολουθεῖ, ὅτι οἶδασιν τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ; ver. 5, ἄλλοτρίῳ δὲ οὐ μὴ ἀκολουθήσουσιν, ἀλλὰ φεύγονται ἀπ' αὐτοῦ; x. 27, 28, τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἐμὰ τῆς φωνῆς μου ἀκούει καὶ γινώσκω αὐτὰ καὶ ἀκολουθοῦσίν μοι καὶ γὰρ ζωὴν αἰώνιον δίδωμι αὐτοῖς. Cf. John i. 37, 38, 41, 44. The first thing involved in following Jesus is accordingly a cleaving to Him in believing trust and obedience. Those cleaving to Him also follow His lead, act according to His example; and this is the next thing included, as is mainly evident from the stress laid by Jesus upon the need of self-denial, and fellowship in the cross, in His followers; cf. Matt. viii. 19 with ver. 20, αἱ ἀλώπεκες φωλεοὺς ἔχουσιν . . . ὁ δὲ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρ. οὐκ ἔχει, ποῦ τὴν κεφαλὴν κλίνῃ. Mark viii. 34, and parallels, ὅστις θέλει ὀπίσω μου ἀκολουθεῖν, ἀπαρνησάσθω ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἀράτω τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀκολουθείτω μοι, where the twice-repeated ἀκολουθεῖν (in Matthew and Luke (the first passage) the words are added, ὀπίσω μου ἔρχεσθαι) manifestly divides itself, the first = *to cleave trustfully and believingly to Christ*; the second = *to follow His lead and example*. Matt. x. 38. Cf. John xiii. 36, ὅπου ὑπάγω οὐ δύνασαι μοι νῦν ἀκολουθήσαι, ἀκολουθήσεις δὲ ὕστερον; John xii. 26, ἐὰν ἐμοί τις διακονῇ, ἐμοί ἀκολουθείτω, cf. with ver. 25. Thus following Jesus denotes a fellowship of faith as well as a fellowship of life, i.e. of suffering with Him; and if, in the Gospels especially, fellowship of life seems the element mainly dwelt upon, it is because true cleaving to Jesus was quite impossible without this outward fellowship; and almost always in the synoptical Gospels this outward adhesion to Jesus is the visible act whereby following Him became known; cf. Matt. viii. 19, ix. 9, xix. 21, etc. But as the outward life and experience of Jesus was the embodiment of His inner nature, and of the relation subsisting between Him and the world, outward fellowship with Him could not continue without inner moral and spiritual fellowship, without a life resembling His, in a self-denying sharing of His cross. It is, however, an error in Patristic exegesis, continued down to Thomas à Kempis and onwards, to represent self-denial and sharing of the cross as the one and only element in following Jesus; for thus, the first and main element, fellowship of faith, is sometimes put in the background, and sometimes utterly excluded from its due place.—It is further to be observed, that, with the exception of Matt. x. 38 and parallels, including xvi. 24, the ἀκολουθεῖν αὐτῷ everywhere in the synoptical Gospels expresses and includes outward adhesion to Jesus; but in St. John's Gospel (except i. 37–41) the expression appears only in viii. 12, x. 4, 5, 27, xii. 26, as an independent conception,

apart from any outward act or momentary circumstances of time and place which union with Jesus might involve. In the Acts and Epistles the expression does not once occur; but it is one of those inimitably fine and delicate indications of the coincidence between the Gospel of John and the Revelation, that it reappears in Rev. xiv. 4, οἱ ἀκολουθοῦντες τῷ ἄρνίῳ.

Ἀκούω, to hear. Construed with the genitive, and with the accusative. The former denotes the sensational perception, the accus. expresses the thing perceived. Cf. John v. 24, 25, viii. 47, ix. 27, x. 3, 8, 27, and elsewhere.

Ἀκοή. I. Active. (1) Hearing as a *sense* and *organ*, Matt. xiii. 14, Acts xxviii. 26, ἀκοῇ ἀκούσετε; 2 Tim. iv. 3, 4, Heb. v. 11, 2 Pet. ii. 8, βλέματι καὶ ἀκοῇ. 1 Cor. xii. 17, conjoined with ὀφθαλμός and ὁσφρησις. When it denotes the *organ*, usually in the plural, Mark vii. 35; Luke vii. 1; Acts xvii. 20; Heb. v. 11. (2) *Hearing*, e.g. ἀκοῆς ἄξιος, Plat., etc.—II. Passive. *What is heard, what has got abroad, news, fama*; specially, tradition, particularly in Plat., e.g. Tim. 20 C, ὁ δ' οὖν ἡμῖν λόγον εἰσηγήσατο ἐκ παλαιᾶς ἀκοῆς; 21 A, κατὰ τὴν Σόλωνος ἀκοήν; 23 D, ἀκοήν παραδέχεσθαι. Also Thuc., Paus. So LXX. = נִשְׁמָע, 1 Sam. ii. 26, οὐκ ἀγαθὴ ἡ ἀκοή, ἣν ἐγὼ ἀκούω; 2 Sam. xiii. 30 (*al.* ἀγγελία), Ps. cxii. 7, ἀκοή πονηρά. With the genitive ἀκοή τινός, what one hears said about any one, Matt. iv. 24, xiv. 1, Mark i. 28, xiii. 7; Gal. iii. 2, 5, ἡ ἀκοή πίστεως, what is heard (said) of the faith. With the genitive of the subject, John xii. 38, Rom. x. 16, ἡ ἀκοή ἡμῶν, the news that we have heard; cf. Obad. 1; Jer. xlix. 14. Now נִשְׁמָע denotes that which is given to be heard, the *message*, Isa. xxviii. 9, 19, xxxvii. 7, lii. 7, εὐαγγελίζεσθαι ἀκοήν εἰρήνης; LXX. elsewhere = ἀγγελία, and so also Isa. liii. 1. Now, as this passage is quoted in Rom. x. 16, we can scarcely take ver. 17, ἄρα ἡ πίστις ἐξ ἀκοῆς, ἡ δὲ ἀκοή διὰ ῥήματος θεοῦ, to mean the *actus audiendi*; cf. Num. xxiv. 4; ἀκοή signifies, therefore, the *message heard*, the *communication received*; ῥήμα, the word containing the message. So also Heb. iv. 2, ὁ λόγος τῆς ἀκοῆς; Eccclus. xli. 23; 1 Thess. ii. 13, παραλαβόντες λόγον ἀκοῆς, which passages show at the same time that ἀκοή is *term. techn.* for the *proclamation of redemption* (cf. Isa. liii. 1, xxviii. 9; Jer. xlix. 14, "what the prophet has heard from Jehovah, and causes the people to hear;" as Delitzsch explains, in order to account for the passive import of ἀκοή, which in his opinion cannot be satisfactorily proved by classical usage. But see above). Syn. κήρυγμα, —the latter in view of the κηρύσσοντες, the former in view of the ἀκούσαντας, and, indeed, probably of such as are mentioned in Heb. ii. 3 and in iv. 2; so that this usage held a middle place between the Hebrew נִשְׁמָע and the ἀκοή of classical Greek. Cf., however, Eccclus. xli. 23.

Παρακοή (from παρακούειν, in the sense of *not to hear, not obeying*, only in Matt. xviii. 17) = *disobedience*, used only by later and by ecclesiastical writers. (Otherwise = *what is heard amiss*.) Syn. παράβασις, Heb. ii. 2, opp. ὑπακοή, Rom. v. 19, 2 Cor.

x. 16. It corresponds to the Hebrew עָרָב; cf. 1 Sam. xv. 23; Deut. xxxi. 27; Ezek. ii. 5, 8, xii. 2, 3, 9; Num. xvii. 25, etc.; by the LXX. rendered ἀπειθής, ἀδικία, ἀντιλογία (*rebellion*), etc., and denotes, like the last-mentioned word, *rebellious conduct* towards the revealed will of God; cf. the contrast between ὑπακοή and ἁμαρτία in Rom. vi. 16, v. 19, so far as that had not been done which duty to God required; cf. *ibid.* διὰ τῆς ὑπακοῆς . . . δίκαιοι. Heb. ii. 2, *disobedience*, so far as it is disregard of the law; *vid.* ver. 3, 2 Cor. x. 6, opposed to the ὑπακοή τοῦ Χριστοῦ; *vid.* ὑπακοή.

Ἑπακούω, to listen to something, to hearken, Acts xii. 13; mostly = to obey, give heed, follow, yield, of servants, soldiers, pupils; frequent in Plat., Thuc., Xen.; Matt. viii. 27; Mark i. 27, iv. 41; Luke viii. 25, xvii. 6; Eph. vi. 1, 5; Col. iii. 20, 22; 1 Pet. iii. 6; Rom. vi. 16, δοῦλοί ἐστε ᾧ ὑπακούετε; ver. 17, ὑπηκούσατε . . . εἰς ὃν παρεδόθητε τύπον διδαχῆς; Rom. vi. 12, ὑπ. ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις. Then of the manifestation of faith, so far as it consists in the humble acceptance of the gospel message; cf. Rom. vi. 17; x. 16, οὐ πάντες ὑπήκουσαν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ; cf. *ibid.* τίς ἐπίστευσεν τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν; both with specification of the object; 2 Thess. i. 8, τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ; iii. 14, τῷ λόγῳ; Acts vi. 7, τῇ πίστει (*vid.* πίστις); cf. Heb. v. 9, τῷ Χριστῷ; xi. 8, πίστει καλούμενος Ἀβρ. ὑπήκουσεν ἐξελθεῖν, as also alone to denote the continuous subjection of faith under the preached word, the keeping of the word in believing obedience; so in Phil. ii. 12, καθὼς πάντοτε ὑπηκούσατε . . . μετὰ φόβου καὶ τρόμου τὴν ἑαυτῶν σωτηρίαν κατεργάζεσθε, cf. 2 Cor. vii. 15.

Ἑπήκοος, heedful of, obedient to, the will of God, Acts vii. 39. Like ὑπακούειν, of the obedience required in believers, 2 Cor. ii. 9, ἔγραψα, ἵνα γνῶ τὴν δοκιμὴν ὑμῶν, εἰ εἰς πάντα ὑπήκοοί ἐστε. Of Christ, Phil. ii. 8, ἐταπεινώσεν ἑαυτὸν γενόμενος ὑπήκοος μέχρι θανάτου, to be explained probably of the obedience to the law, which he, ὡς ἄνθρωπος, had to render, cf. Gal. iv. 4, Heb. v. 8 (see δούλος), and only with more remote reference to John x. 18, ταύτην τὴν ἐντολὴν ἔλαβον παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς μου.

Ἑπακοή, obedience, unknown in classical Greek; in LXX. only in 2 Sam. xxii. 36; N. T., and ecclesiastical writers. (1) In general = obedience, Rom. vi. 16, ᾧ παριστάνετε ἑαυτοὺς δούλους εἰς ὑπακοήν. Elsewhere always (2) in a special sense of obedience to God's will, of willing subjection to that which, in the sphere of divine revelation, is right, as immediately after, *ibid.* δοῦλοί ἐστε ᾧ ὑπακούετε, ἥτοι ἁμαρτίας εἰς θάνατον, ἢ ὑπακοῆς εἰς δικαιοσύνην. So in Rom. v. 19, διὰ τῆς ὑπακοῆς . . . δίκαιοι κατασταθήσονται. In Heb. v. 8, of Christ, ἔμαθεν ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθεν τὴν ὑπακοήν. (3) More specially still of subjection to the saving will of God, revealed in Christ, ὑπακοή τῆς ἀληθείας, 1 Pet. i. 22; *vid.* ἀλήθ.; ὑπακοή πίστεως, Rom. i. 5, xvi. 26; cf. Acts vi. 7, ὑπήκουον τῇ πίστει; 2 Cor. x. 5, ὑπακοή τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Also standing alone, as a mode of the manifestation of Christian faith, Rom. xv. 18; xvi. 19, ἡ γὰρ ὑμῶν ὑπακοή εἰς πάντας ἀφίκετο; 2 Cor. vii. 15, x. 6, ὅταν πληρωθῇ ὑμῶν ἡ ὑπακοή. Philem. 21; 1 Pet. i. 2, 14, τέκνα ὑπακοῆς.

Ἀληθής, *és*, gen. *έος*, adv. *άληθώς*, *true*, from *λήθω*, *λανθάνω*, therefore primarily = *unconcealed, unhidden, manifest*; cf. Matt. xxvi. 73, *άληθώς καὶ σὺ ἐξ αὐτῶν εἶ, καὶ γὰρ ἡ λαλία δῆλόν σε ποιεῖ*, hence = *real, actual*. *Vid.* Acts xii. 9, *οὐκ ἤδει ὅτι άληθές ἐστιν τὸ γινόμενον ὑπὸ τοῦ άγγελου, ἐδόκει δὲ ὄραμα βλέπειν*; cf. ver. 11, *νῦν οἶδα άληθώς ὅτι ἐξαπέστειλεν κύριος τὸν άγγελον αὐτοῦ*. That, therefore, is *άληθές* whose appearance is not mere show: *that which is the reality it appears to be*, 1 Pet. v. 12, *ἐπιμαρτυρῶν ταύτην εἶναι άληθῇ χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ, εἰς ἣν ἐστήκατε*, *real grace of God* (Bengel: *alteram non esse expectandam*); 1 John ii. 27, *ὡς τὸ αὐτοῦ χρίσμα διδάσκει ὑμᾶς περὶ πάντων, καὶ άληθές ἐστιν, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ψεύδος*, so it is in reality,—*ψεύδος* = *deception, lie*. (The neuter in classical Greek, especially since Herod., as an adv.) 1 John ii. 8, *ὃ ἐστὶν άληθές ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν*, according to Huther = *actually realized*; better merely = *actual, manifest*. In John vi. 55 it makes no difference whether we read *άληθής βρώσις, πόσις*, or *άληθώς*: it is actual food, food which shows itself to be such, or is really food. Ἀληθής always says emphatically that something is what it professes to be, and as it professes to be.

Thus *άληθής* designates the object of a statement or testimony as conformable to the reality, as not disguising the reality. So in John iv. 18, *τοῦτο άληθές εἶρηκας*; John x. 41, *πάντα ὅσα εἶπεν Ἰωάννης περὶ τούτου άληθῇ ἦν*. The witness itself, *ἡ μαρτυρία*, is in this case *άληθινή*, *coincident with the reality*. Cf. John xix. 35, *άληθινῇ αὐτοῦ ἐστὶν ἡ μαρτυρία, καὶ κείνος οἶδεν ὅτι άληθῇ λέγει*. When not unfrequently the witness itself is designated *άληθής*, it is owing to a weakened use of *άληθής* in the sense of *άληθινός*, as is clear from classical Greek and the LXX. Cf. Herod. v. 41. 1, *άληθεί λόγῳ πυθόμενοι* for which we find in vi. 68, *ὀρθῷ λόγῳ*; Plato, *De Rep.* i. 330 E, *άληθεῖς μῦθοι*. Still it is possible, cf. John xix. 35, that in the passages cited it is intended to lay stress upon the fact that the witness is really a witness—that which deserves the name, and which may fairly claim the authority and value of a witness, John v. 31, 32, viii. 13, 14, 17, xxi. 24; 3 John 12; Titus i. 13. Cf. 2 Pet. ii. 22, *άληθής παροιμία*; Soph. *Aj.* 664, *ἀλλ' ἔστ' άληθής ἡ βροτῶν παροιμία*. In John viii. 16, the Received text has *ἡ κρίσις ἡ ἐμὴ άληθής ἐστιν*, where Lachm. Tisch. read *άληθινῇ*. The latter reading appears more suitable to the context (*ὅτι μόνος οὐκ εἰμὶ κ.τ.λ.*). But *άληθής* also gives a good sense, so far as Christ's judgment, in contrast with that previously mentioned, *ὑμεῖς κατὰ τὴν σάρκα κρίνετε*, appears as unassailable = *my judgment answers to its idea*, is *άληθής*, syn. *δίκαιος*; cf. John vii. 18; Rom. i. 18, ii. 8; 1 Cor. xiii. 16; 2 Thess. ii. 10, 12; cf. John vii. 24, *μὴ κρίνετε κατ' ὄψιν, ἀλλὰ τὴν δικαίαν κρίσιν κρίνατε*. *δίκαιος* = *what is as it ought to be—normal*; *άληθής*, *what is as it pretends or claims to be*. Cf. Thuc. iii. 56, *εἰ γὰρ τῷ αὐτίκα χρησίμῳ ὑμῶν τε καὶ ἐκείνων πολεμίῳ τὸ δίκαιον λήψεσθε, τοῦ μὲν ὀρθοῦ φανείσθε οὐκ άληθεῖς κριταὶ ὄντες*; Plat. *Conviv.* 212 A, *τίκτειν οὐκ εἰδωλα ἀρετῆς . . . ἀλλ' άληθῇ; ἰδιδ. ἀρετῇ άληθής*, and often; Eur. *Or.* 414, *άληθής δ' ἐς φίλους ἔφυν φίλος*. Hence τὸ *άληθές*, τὰ *άληθῇ*, *the true, in opposition to all pretence and hypocrisy*. Phil. iv. 8, *ὅσα ἐστὶν άληθῇ, ὅσα σεμνὰ κ.τ.λ.*

Of persons, according to the nature of the case only seldom, and usually only when

something predicated concerning them has to be ratified, as *e.g.* ἀληθὴς φίλος; cf. Wisd. xii. 27, ὃν πάλαι ἡρνοῦντο εἰδέναι θεὸν ἐπέγνωσαν ἀληθῆ. Wisd. i. 6. Then also = *sincere, open*; cf. Wisd. vi. 17, ἡ ἀληθεστάτη παιδείας ἐπιθυμία; *he who is as he professes to be, e.g.* Hom. Il. xii. 433, γυνὴ ἀληθής = *a guileless, pure, and true wife*. Hence opposed to πλάνος = one who does not deceive, nor awaken false impressions, whether in relation to himself or another object; cf. 2 Cor. vi. 8, ὡς πλάνοι καὶ ἀληθεῖς; Matt. xxii. 16; Mark xii. 14, οἶδαμεν ὅτι ἀληθὴς εἶ καὶ τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ διδάσκεις; cf. Luke xx. 21, οἶδαμεν ὁρθῶς λέγεις καὶ διδάσκεις καὶ οὐ λαμβάνεις πρόσωπον. Hence also syn. δίκαιος opposed to ἄδικος, John vii. 18, ὁ ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ λαλῶν, τὴν δόξαν τὴν ἰδίαν ζητεῖ ὁ δὲ ζητῶν τὴν δόξαν τοῦ πέμψαντος αὐτόν, οὗτος ἀληθὴς ἐστίν, καὶ ἀδικία ἐν αὐτῷ οὐκ ἐστίν. Of God, ὁ θεὸς ἀληθὴς ἐστίν, John iii. 33; Rom. iii. 4, *He is as He reveals Himself*. Cf. Eur. Ion. 1537, ὁ θεὸς ἀληθὴς, οὐ μάτην μαντεύεται; Plat. Pol. 382 E, Κομιδῇ ἄρα ὁ θεὸς ἀπλοῦν καὶ ἀληθὴς, ἐν τε ἔργῳ καὶ ἐν λόγῳ, καὶ οὔτε αὐτὸς μεθίσταται, οὔτε ἄλλους ἐξαπατᾷ κ.τ.λ.

The fundamental idea of the corresponding Hebrew word is different. LXX. ἀληθὴς = אֱלֹהִים, Deut. xiii. 14; 2 Chron. xxxi. 20; Tisch., τὸ καλὸν καὶ τὸ εὐθές, *al.* ἀληθές, Heb. אֱלֹהִים אֱלֹהִים אֱלֹהִים.—Deut. xvii. 4, ἀληθῶς γέγονε τὸ ῥῆμα; Prov. xxii. 21, διδάσκω οὖν σε ἀληθῆ λόγον (so frequently in Plat., *e.g.* Phaedr. 270 C, Gorg. 508 B); Isa. xlii. 3, εἰς ἀληθῆ ἐξοίσει κρίσιν; Tisch. εἰς ἀλήθειαν; cf. John vii. 24; Matt. xii. 20, εἰς νίκος; Isa. xliii. 9, εἰπάτωσαν ἀληθῆ.—אֱלֹהִים, Gen. xli. 32, ἀληθὲς ἐστὶν τὸ ῥῆμα τὸ παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ. To the fundamental idea of *firm, sure*, that is, *reliable*, ἀληθινός would correspond better; as a general rule, also, it is employed to render it, along with πιστός, ἀξιόπιστος, and similar words.—So far as we can ascertain, ἀληθὴς is only used where classical writers would have used it, so that its meaning has not been expanded by the Hebrew idea.

The adv. ἀληθῶς, *really*, with reference to a predicate noun, Matt. xiv. 33, xxvi. 73, xxvii. 54; Mark xiv. 70, xv. 39; John i. 48, iv. 42, vi. 14, 55 (*al.* ἀληθὴς), vii. 26 (Rec.), vii. 40, viii. 31; 1 Thess. ii. 13. To a verb, 1 John ii. 5, ἀληθῶς ἐν τούτῳ ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ τετελείωται; Acts xii. 11, νῦν οἶδα ἀληθῶς (cf. Luke xxiii. 47, οὕτως, with Matt. xxvii. 54); cf. ver. 9; John vii. 26, μήποτε ἀληθῶς ἔγνωσαν = *can they really have recognised?* John xvii. 8. In Luke (Luke ix. 27, xii. 44, xxi. 3, ἀληθῶς λέγω ὑμῖν) it is the Greek expression for the common affirmative formula, ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, which refers to the entire statement. Cf. Mark xii. 43; Matt. xxiv. 47, xvi. 28.

Ἀληθινός, ἡ, ὄν, *real, genuine*; cf. Krüger, § xli. 11. 19, “The endings *ινός* and *ενός* denote that the quality, as a fundamental idea, exists in abundance, *πειδινός, ὀρεινός*.” Accordingly, ἀληθινός is related to ἀληθής as form to contents or substance; ἀληθής denotes the reality of the thing; ἀληθινός defines the relation of the conception to the thing to which it corresponds = *genuine*. (1) = *genuinus, legitimus*. Plat. Rep. vi. 499 C, ἀληθινῆς φιλοσοφίας ἀληθινός ἔρως; Theaet. 176 C, σοφία καὶ ἀρετὴ ἀληθινή. Of genuine materials, as silver, colour, etc., Xen. Oec. x. 3. So John i. 9; 1 John ii. 8, τὸ φῶς τὸ

ἀληθινόν; John iv. 23, οἱ ἀληθινοὶ προσκυνηταί; vi. 32, ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ἀληθινός; John xvii. 3, ὁ μόνος ἀληθινὸς θεός; cf. 1 John v. 20. On the contrary, ὁ θεὸς ἀληθής ἐστιν, God—i.e. He who is already recognised, known as God—is as He reveals Himself. 1 Thess. i. 9, θεῷ ζῶντι καὶ ἀληθινῷ, as Lachm. reads in Heb. ix. 14, according to Cod. A.—Heb. viii. 2, τῆς σκηνῆς τῆς ἀληθινῆς; ix. 24, ἀντίτυπα τῶν ἀληθινῶν; John xv. 1, ἡ ἄμπελος ἡ ἀληθινή; cf. Jer. ii. 21. Then (2) = reliable, that which does not deceive, which bears testing, e.g. Xen. *Anab.* i. 9. 17, στρατεύματι ἀληθινῷ ἐχρήσατο, καὶ γὰρ στρατηγοὶ καὶ λοχαγοὶ οὐ χρημάτων ἕνεκα πρὸς ἐκείνων ἐπλευσαν, ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ ἔγνωσαν κερδαλεώτερον εἶναι Κύρῳ καλῶς πειθαρχεῖν ἢ τὸ κατὰ μῆνα κέρδος; Luke xvi. 11, τὸ ἀληθινόν, opp. τῷ ἰδίοῳ μαμμωνᾷ, which is not as it ought to be, which does not correspond to the requirements made of it, to the δίκη. The main idea is, ver. 1, τὰ ὑπάρχοντα; hence τὸ ἀληθινόν, *the genuine reliable possession* (cf. ver. 12; Heb. x. 34, τὴν ἀρπαγὴν τῶν ὑπαρχόντων ὑμῶν . . . προσεδέξασθε, γινώσκοντες ἔχειν ἑαυτοῖς κρείττονα ὑπαρξιν καὶ μένουσαν). Plat. *Rep.* vii. 522 A, ὅσοι μυθώδεις τῶν λόγων καὶ ὅσοι ἀληθινώτεροι ἦσαν. So John iv. 37, ὁ λόγος ὁ ἀληθινός; Rev. xix. 9, xxii. 6; John xix. 35, ἀληθινὴ αὐτοῦ ἐστὶν ἡ μαρτυρία, κακέινος οἶδεν ὅτι ἀληθὴ λέγει. Syn. δίκαιος, Rev. xv. 3, δίκαιαι καὶ ἀληθιναὶ αἱ ὁδοί σου; xvi. 7, xix. 2, αἱ κρίσεις σου = *according to truth*,—the truth considered as an objective norm,—full of truth; whereas in the case of ἀληθής, the subject of which it is predicated, or that which the subj. represents, the reality in question, is itself the norm. Sometimes this distinction is less clear, according to the subject, e.g. ἀληθὴς παροιμία, 2 Pet. ii. 22; ὁ λόγος ὁ ἀληθινός, John iv. 37.—Syn. πιστός, Rev. xxi. 5, xxii. 6, iii. 14, xix. 11. Conjoined with ἅγιος, Rev. iii. 7, vi. 10. LXX., see ἀληθής.

Ἀλήθεια, as, ἡ, truth, as the unveiled reality lying at the basis of, and agreeing with, an appearance; the manifested, veritable essence of a matter; accordingly, further, the *reality* appertaining to an appearance or manifestation; *vid.* ἀληθής. Plat. *Phaed.* 99 E, ἔδοξε δὴ μοι χρῆναι εἰς τοὺς λόγους καταφυγόντα ἐν ἐκείνοις σκοπεῖν τῶν ὄντων τὴν ἀλήθειαν, in order that it may not happen to him, as to those who look at the sun and injure their eyes, εἰ μὴ ἐν ὕδατι ἢ τινι τοιούτῳ σκοπῶνται τὴν εἰκόνα αὐτοῦ.—Rom. i. 25, μετήλλαξαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν τῷ ψεύδει; cf. ver. 19, τὸ γνωστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ φανερόν ἐστιν ἐν αὐτοῖς κ.τ.λ.; hence = *the manifest, real essence of God*.—Od. xi. 506, 507, αὐτὰρ τοι παιδὸς γε Νεοπτολέμοιο φίλοιο πᾶσαν ἀληθείην μυθήσομαι, ὥς με κελεύεις; Plat. *Phaed.* 275 B, σοφίας τοῖς μαθηταῖς δόξαν οὐκ ἀλήθειαν πορίζεις; Palaeph. *de incred.* iv. 2, ἡ ἀλήθεια ἦδε = *res ita se habet*. So also in the adverbial combinations, τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, ἐπ' ἀληθείας, μετ' ἀληθείας, etc. = *re vera, actually, really, in very deed*; Plat. *Prot.* 339 D, ἄνδρα ἀγαθὸν γενέσθαι ἀληθείᾳ; *Rep.* 426 D, ὅσοι οἴονται τῇ ἀληθείᾳ πολιτικοὶ εἶναι. Ἀλήθ. accordingly denotes the reality lying or clearly to be laid before our eyes, as opposed to a mere appearance, without reality; the reality, so far as an appearance or setting forth thereof is in question. Plat. *Phaed.* 65 B, ἅρα ἔχει ἀληθείαν τινα ὄψις τε καὶ ἀκοή τοῖς ἀνθρώποις; Mark v. 33, εἶπεν αὐτῷ πᾶσαν τὴν ἀλ.; Acts xxvi. 25, οἱ

μαίνομαι, ἀλλὰ ἀληθείας καὶ σωφροσύνης ῥήματα ἀποφθέγγομαι; John v. 33, μεμαρτύρηκεν τῇ ἀλ., xvi. 7; Rom. ix. 1; 2 Cor. xii. 6; Eph. iv. 25; 1 Tim. ii. 7.—ἐπ' ἀληθείας = *in very deed, evidently, veritably*; Acts iv. 27, x. 34; Luke xxii. 59; John xvii. 19, ἡγιασμένοι ἐν ἀλ., in which passage, however, ἀληθ. is more precisely defined by the connection, *vid. infra*, Col. i. 6; 1 John iii. 18, μὴ ἀγαπῶμεν λόγῳ, μηδὲ τῇ γλώσσῃ, ἀλλ' ἐν ἔργῳ καὶ ἀληθείᾳ. Τῷ λόγῳ and τῇ ἀληθείᾳ are frequently contrasted in classical Greek; so also λόγῳ and ἔργῳ, especially in Plato; in the poets, γλώσσα and ἔργον; *vid. Ast, Lex. Plat. s.v. ἀλήθεια, λόγος, and Düsterdieck in loc.* Ἀγαπᾶν ἐν ἀλ., *really, truly to love, with a love which is veritably love*, 2 John 1; 3 John 1. Then = *corresponding to the truth, the reality*, Rom. ii. 2, τὸ κρίμα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστὶν κατὰ ἀλήθειαν ἐπὶ τοὺς κ.τ.λ. So, where it refers to the object of the verb, as in Xen. *Mem.* ii. 1. 27, τὰ ὄντα διηγήσομαι μετ' ἀληθείας (cf. *supra*, Plat. *Phaed.* 99 E); 2 Cor. vii. 14, ὡς πάντα ἐν ἀληθείᾳ ἐλαλήσαμεν ὑμῖν, οὕτως καὶ ἡ καύχσις ἡμῶν ἡ ἐπὶ Τίτου ἀλήθεια ἐγενήθη; Matt. xxii. 16, ἐν ἀλ.; Mark xii. 14; Luke xx. 21, ἐπ' ἀληθείας διδάσκεις; Mark xii. 32, ἐπ' ἀλ. εἶπας; Luke iv. 25, ἐπ' ἀλ. λέγω; Phil. i. 18, εἴτε προφάσει εἴτε ἀληθείᾳ Χριστὸς καταγγέλλεται.

As ἀληθής means *really, corresponding to the reality*, syn. *δίκαιος, normal, corresponding to the requirements*, so does ἀλήθεια also denote the *truth*, not merely as the representation of that which is, but as the *representation, realization, of that which ought to be, which alone has a right to be, and to appear*. So Xen. *Anab.* ii. 6. 25, τοῖς δ' ὁσίοις (opp. ἐπιόροις) καὶ ἀλήθειαν ἄσκουσιν (opp. ἀδίκους); 26, ἀγάλλεται ἐπὶ θεοσεβείᾳ καὶ ἀληθείᾳ καὶ δικαιοσύνῃ. So also in the N. T., especially in St. Paul's writings; Rom. i. 18, ἀσέβεια καὶ ἀδικία ἀνθρώπων τῶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐν ἀδικίᾳ κατεχόντων; ii. 8, τοῖς ἀπειθοῦσιν μὲν τῇ ἀλ., πειθόμενοι δὲ τῇ ἀδικίᾳ. The same combination occurs in Gal. v. 7 (iii. 1, Rec. text), where, however, as in most of the passages to be adduced, ἀληθ. is more precisely defined in accordance with the peculiar import to which we shall refer below; cf. 2 Thess. ii. 10, 12; 1 Cor. xiii. 6, οὐ χαίρει ἐπὶ τῇ ἀδικίᾳ, συγχαίρει δὲ τῇ ἀλ.; v. 8, μηδὲ ἐν ζύμῃ κακίας καὶ πονηρίας, ἀλλ' ἐν ἀζύμοις εἰλικρινείας καὶ ἀλ.; 2 Cor. xi. 10; 1 Pet. i. 22, τὰς ψυχὰς ἡγνικότες ἐν τῇ ὑπακοῇ τῆς ἀλ.; Jas. v. 19, πλανᾶσθαι ἀπὸ τῆς ἀλ. Hence combined δικαιοσύνη κ. ἀλ., Eph. v. 9; cf. iv. 24, τὸν κατὰ θεὸν κτισθέντα ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ ὁσιότητι τῆς ἀλ., in contrast with ver. 22, τὸν φθειρόμενον κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τῆς ἀπάτης; vi. 14, περιζωσάμενοι τὴν ὁσφὺν ἐν ἀλ., καὶ ἐνδυσάμενοι τὸν θώρακα τῆς δικ. If δικαιοσύνη designates the state, which formally corresponds to the claims of justice, and, indeed, in the first instance negatively, freedom from guilt (*vid. δικαιοσύνη*), ἀληθεία expresses the positive side, and denotes the realization of that which alone ought to be and can abide, — the contents, as it were, of δικαιοσύνη. Cf. John iii. 21; 1 John i. 6; and Rom. ii. 2. — In Pilate's question, τί ἐστὶν ἀλ. (John xviii. 38), ἀληθ. signifies that which really is and abides, which therefore has validity, and not merely a show of existence. Ἀληθ. has the same force as used by our Lord, ver. 37, μαρτυρήσω τῇ ἀληθείᾳ . . . πᾶς ὁ ὢν ἐκ τῆς ἀλ., "whose characteristic it is to let himself be governed by the truth." The word

is used thus in John iv. 23, 24, προσκυνεῖν ἐν πνεύμ. καὶ ἀλ., iii. 21; 1 John i. 6, ποιεῖν τὴν ἀλ. In this sense also the contents of the revelation of God, the object of Christian faith and knowledge, may be designated ἀληθ.,—nay more, ἡ ἀληθ., so far as this revelation brings to light that which alone has or can claim reality and validity. Used thus, ἀληθ. may take the place of δίκη. Cf. 2 Thess. ii. 10, ἐν πάσῃ ἀπάτῃ ἀδικίας τοῖς ἀπολυμένοις, ἀνθ' ὧν τὴν ἀγάπην τῆς ἀληθείας οὐκ ἐδέξαντο εἰς τὸ σωθῆναι αὐτούς; ver. 12, οἱ μὴ πιστεύσαντες τῇ ἀλ., ἀλλ' εὐδοκήσαντες ἐν τῇ ἀδικίᾳ; 2 Tim. ii. 25, ἐπὶ γνῶσιν ἀληθείας; iii. 7; Titus i. 1; Heb. x. 26, μετὰ τὸ λαβεῖν τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τῆς ἀλ. To this sense of ἀληθ. corresponds its use by later classical writers to denote the ultimate ground; e.g. Dion. H. *de Thucyd. jud.* 3, τῆς φιλοσόφου θεωρίας σκοπὸς ἐστὶν ἡ τῆς ἀληθείας γνῶσις; cf. John xviii. 38; in general, to denote that which in the last instance has reality, and can therefore claim validity; e.g. Plut. *de aud. poet.* 36 E, κεκραμένης μύθοις ἀληθείας, of the truth that remains after abstracting the poetical garb. Otherwise, though similarly in 2 Tim. iv. 4, Titus i. 14; Plut. *Gryll.* 986 A, κενὸν ἀγαθὸν καὶ εἰδωλὸν ἀντὶ τῆς ἀληθείας διώκων. The N. T. usage was anticipated by Philo, who says, e.g., concerning the proselyte, μεταναστὰς εἰς ἀλήθειαν, *de creat. princ.* 726 D; *de vita Mos.* 694 C, εὐαγέστατον κρίναν τὸ ἔργον ὑπὲρ ἀληθείας καὶ θεοῦ τιμῆς; cf. Rom. ii. 20, ἔχοντα τὴν μόρφωσιν τῆς γνώσεως καὶ τῆς ἀλ. ἐν τῷ νόμῳ. — Ἀληθ. is that which, as having permanent existence and validity, has become manifest—has been revealed in Christ; Eph. i. 13, ὁ λόγος τῆς ἀληθείας, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς σωτηρίας ὑμῶν; Jas. i. 18; 2 Cor. vi. 7; 2 Tim. ii. 15; Col. i. 5, ὁ λόγος τῆς ἀλ. τοῦ εὐαγγελίου; cf. ἀλ. τοῦ εὐ., Gal. ii. 5; ἀληθ. describes the contents of the gospel as a reality. — Ἀλ., as the object of πίστις, is at the same time its correlative. 1 Tim. ii. 7, διδάσκαλος ἐθνῶν ἐν πίστει καὶ ἀληθείᾳ; cf. Titus i. 1, οἱ κατὰ πίστιν ἐκλεκτοὶ θεοῦ καὶ ἐπὶ γνῶσιν ἀληθείας τῆς κατ' εὐσεβείαν. — Briefly summed up, therefore, the Christian salvation comes to be designated ἀλήθεια; so far as being an unique and eternal reality, it has become manifest, and is set forth as the object of knowledge or faith. 2 Cor. iv. 2, μὴδὲ δολοῦντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀλλὰ τῇ φανερώσει τῆς ἀληθείας συνιστῶντες ἑαυτούς; comp. ver. 6, πρὸς φωτισμὸν τῆς γνώσεως τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν προσώπῳ Χριστοῦ; 2 Pet. i. 12, ἡ παρούσα ἀλ.; 2 Pet. ii. 2, ἡ ὁδὸς τῆς ἀλ.; 2 Cor. xiii. 8, οὐ γὰρ δυνάμεθά τι κατὰ τῆς ἀλ., ἀλλὰ ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀλ.; 1 Tim. iii. 15, στυλὸς καὶ ἐδραῖωμα τῆς ἀλ.; vi. 5, ἀπεστερημένοι τῆς ἀλ.; 2 Tim. ii. 18, περὶ τὴν ἀλ. ἡστούχησαν; iii. 8, ἀνθίστανται τῇ ἀλ.; iv. 4, ἀπὸ μὲν τῆς ἀλ. τὴν ἀκοὴν ἀποστρέφουσιν, ἐπὶ δὲ τοὺς μύθους ἐκτραπήσονται; Titus i. 14; Jas. iii. 14. — The expression ἡ ἀλήθεια τοῦ θεοῦ, Rom. iii. 7, xv. 8, corresponds to γινέσθω ὁ θεὸς ἀληθής, Rom. iii. 4; *vid. s.v. ἀληθής*.

In John's usage also, which would seem, according to John i. 14, 17, to have been suggested by the Heb. נֶאֱמָר, *firmness, reliability*, ἀληθ. is the designation of the salvation revealed in Christ, marking it as the realization or reality of that which ought to be (cf. 3 John 12). Hence over against νόμος, i. 17, i. 14, πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀλ., נֶאֱמָר is applied to God revealing Himself, Ex. xxxiv. 6; 2 Sam. ii. 6; Ps. xxv. 10, xl. 11, 12, lxxxvi. 15, 25, xcvi. 3, cxv. 1, cxxxviii. 2; and נֶאֱמָר ascribes to this revelation unchange-

ableness, and therefore reliableness. Ἀλήθ. answers to πῶς in agreement with the meaning of ἀληθινός. But that ἀλήθ. denotes something more, viz. the realization of that which ought to be, as the blessing of salvation, is clear from its being contrasted with νόμος, John i. 17; as also from the following connections, in which it is represented as the object of knowledge, John viii. 32, xvi. 13; 1 John ii. 21, οἶδατε τὴν ἀλ. . . πᾶν ψεῦδος ἐκ τῆς ἀλ. οὐκ ἔστιν; 2 John 1. Christ thus designates Himself in John xiv. 6, where the conjunction with ἡ ζωή is very significant. The promised Paraclete is accordingly described, after the analogy of the salvation, as τὸ πν. τῆς ἀληθ., the Spirit who represents what has substance and validity (cf. Rom. v. 5), John xiv. 17, xv. 26, xvi. 13; 1 John iv. 6. Hence 1 John v. 6, τὸ πν. ἔστιν ἡ ἀλ. In accordance herewith must be explained John xvii. 17, ἀγιάσον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ ἀλ. σου· ὁ λόγος ὁ σὸς ἀληθείᾳ ἔστιν; cf. John viii. 40, 45, 46. The usage of John, however, goes somewhat further than that of Paul. This ἀλήθ. appears as the power which rules the man, 1 John iii. 19, ἐκ τῆς ἀληθ. ἐσμέν,—it is remarkable that though the form ἐκ τινὸς εἶναι is a favourite one of Paul's, he never uses the phrase just cited from John; cf. v. 18, ἀγαπῶμεν ἐν ἀληθ.; *vid. supra*. Then as having entered into the man, 1 John i. 8, ii. 4, ἐν τούτῳ ἡ ἀλήθ. οὐκ ἔστιν. In 2 John 2, cf. John viii. 44, to be in turn set forth, embodied by him, ποιεῖν τὴν ἀλήθ.; 1 John i. 6; cf. 3 John 3, 8, συνεργοὶ τῇ ἀλ.; 2 John 3, the sphere in which the walk and conversation moves; περιπατεῖν ἐν ἀληθ., 2 John 4; 3 John 3, 4; so that truth is exhibited in all circumstances. The word does not occur in 1 Thess. nor in Rev.

Ἀληθεύω, to be an ἀληθής, and to act as such, cf. δουλεύω, θεραπεύω, therefore = to answer to the truth, to make it one's study; cf. Plut. *Them.* 18, ἀληθεύων λέγεις. So in Eph. iv. 15, ἀληθεύοντες δὲ ἐν ἀγάπῃ; cf. ver. 14 and 1 Cor. xiii. 6, ἡ ἀγάπη οὐ χαίρει ἐπὶ τῇ ἀδικίᾳ, συγχαίρει δὲ τῇ ἀληθείᾳ. Then specially, to speak the truth. Plat., Xen., Aristot.; Gal. iv. 16, ἀληθεύων ὑμῖν.

Ἄλλος, η, ο, the other, denotes numerical difference, while ἕτερος denotes the other qualitatively, difference of kind. Cf. Gal. i. 6, 7, εἰς ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον, ὃ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλο, "another gospel, which, however, is not another gospel."

Ἀλλάσσω, 1st aor. ἥλλαξα, 2d fut. pass. = ἀλλαγίσσομαι, from a form of the 2d aor. common in prose ἡλλάγην, from ἄλλος = to change, Acts vi. 14, ἀλλάξει τὰ ἔθνη; Gal. iv. 20, τὴν φωνήν, referred by Meyer to ver. 16, the language which Paul used during his second stay in Galatia (Acts xviii. 23). But though this explanation is possible, usage and the context seem to commend another. From ὅτι ἀποροῦμαι ἐν ὑμῖν it is clear that Paul did not know how he ought to speak to them, and what *tone* was suited to the circumstances. Wetstein refers to 1 Cor. iv. 21, 2 Cor. x. 1, 10, and quotes as parallels of classical usage Artemid. ii. 20, κόραξ δὲ μοιχῶ καὶ πλέπτη προσεικάζουτ' ἄν . . . διὰ τὸ πολλάκις ἀλλάσσειν τὴν φωνήν; iv. 59, τὰ πολλαῖς χρώμενα φωναῖς . . . ὡς κόραξ κ.τ.λ. From these passages it is clear that the addition πρὸς τὴν χρεῖαν, said to be requisite for such an explanation, and which is not sustained by Acts xxviii. 10, is unnecessary; so

also πρὸς τὸ σύμφερον, 1 Cor. xii. 7. — To transform, 1 Cor. xv. 51, 52; Heb. i. 12; to exchange, Rom. i. 23, τὴν δόξαν τοῦ ἀφθάρτου θεοῦ ἐν ὁμοιώματι εἰκόνος φθαρτοῦ ἀνθρώπου κ.τ.λ.; cf. Jer. ii. 11; Ps. cvi. 20, ἠλλάξαντο τὴν δόξαν αὐτῶν ἐν ὁμοιώματι μύσχου = 𐤀𐤓𐤁𐤍. With ἐν in Soph. *Antig.* 936; elsewhere dat., cf. Ex. xiii. 13, and often in classical Greek. The genit. is frequent, also in Plato and Eurip. τὶ ἀντί τινος. If the object remain the same, and only alters its appearance, εἰς is for the most part used; cf. Plat. *Rep.* ii. 380 D.

Ἀντάλλαγμα, from ἀνταλλάσσω, to exchange, to barter; hence, that which is given in exchange, the price for which something is bartered. Ecclus. vi. 15, φίλου πιστοῦ οὐκ ἔστιν ἀντάλλαγμα; xxvi. 14, οὐκ ἔστιν ἀντάλλαγμα πεπαιδευμένης ψυχῆς. So also Matt. xvi. 26, τί δώσει ἄνθρωπος ἀντάλλαγμα τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ; therefore here the price at which the exchange is effected, compensation, ransom, Mark viii. 37; cf. Ecclus. xlv. 17, Νῶε εὗρέθη τέλειος δίκαιος, ἐν καιρῷ ὀργῆς ἐγένετο ἀντάλλαγμα· διὰ τοῦτο ἐγενήθη κατὰ λειμμα τῇ γῇ, διὰ τοῦτο ἐγένετο κατακλυσμός. In both the N. T. texts (Matt. xvi. 26; Mark viii. 37), like λύτρον, the word is akin to the conception of atonement; cf. Ps. xlix. 8, οὐ δώσει τῷ θεῷ ἐξίλασμα ἑαυτοῦ = 𐤁𐤓𐤁, which, in Isa. xliii. 3, Amos v. 12, is = ἄλλαγμα. Isa. xliii. 3, ἐποίησα ἄλλαγμα σου Ἀὔγουπτον καὶ Αἰθιοπίαν, καὶ Σοῦνην ὑπὲρ σου, cf. ver. 4. This is a confirmation of the fact that satisfaction and substitution essentially belong to the idea of atonement. Cf. λύτρον, ὑπόδικος.

Ἀπαλλάσσω, aor. 1 ἀπήλλαξα, perf. pass. ἀπήλλαγμαi, originally either to transfer from one state to another, that is, primarily, merely a stronger form of ἀλλάσσω, or it is related to ἀλλάσσω, as to turn away, turn aside, is to turn. Strictly, to change by separating, therefore to break up an existing connection, and set the one part into a different state, a different relation. Very frequently in the classics, where it = to lay aside, lay away, make loose, move away, set free. Middle = to turn oneself away, to escape, Acts xix. 12, ὥστε . . . ἀπαλλάσσεσθαι ἀπ' αὐτῶν τὰς νόσους (in Hippocr. often ἀπαλλάσσω τὴν νόσον or τῆς νόσου). Active = to set free, Heb. ii. 15, ἵνα ἀπαλλάξῃ τοὺτους ὅσοι φόβῳ θανάτου ἐνοχοὶ ἦσαν δουλείας. So frequently in classical Greek in the connections ἀπαλλάττειν φόβον, δέους, etc. Passive = to be freed, to get loose; Luke xii. 58, ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ δὸς ἐργασίαν ἀπηλλάχθαι ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, sc. τοῦ ἀντιδίκου. Ἀπαλλάττειν is also a term. tech. to denote the satisfaction of the complainant by the defendant, especially of the creditor by the debtor. The pass., however, is also applied to the guilty party so far as, by an arrangement with his accuser, he gets free from him before judgment is pronounced; vid. Kypke in loc. Vid. Matt. v. 25, ἴσθι εὐνοῶν τῷ ἀντιδίκῳ σου; ver. 24, διαλλάγηθι τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου. Cf. especially, Xen. *Mem.* ii. 9. 6, where it is applied in both relations, Ὁ δὲ συνειδῶς αὐτῷ πολλὰ καὶ πονηρὰ παντ' ἐποίει, ὥστε ἀπαλλαγῆναι τοῦ Ἀρχεδήμου. ὁ δὲ Ἀρχέδημος οὐκ ἀπηλλάττετο, ἕως τὸν τε Κρίτωνα ἀφῆκε. Ἀφίεναι denotes to dismiss from confinement, to absolve. — Zeun. in loc., “ἀπαλλάττειν, vel, ut h. l. ἀπαλλάττεσθαι, dicitur accusator qui actionem deponit et accusationem non persequitur; ἀφίεναι idem dicitur accusator, cum reum criminibus objectis liberat et absolvit: quod majus est.” So, under

appeal to Harpocration, in Suidas, ἀφείς καὶ ἀπαλλάξας· τὸ μὲν ἀφείς, ὅταν ἀπολύσῃ τις τινα τῶν ἐγκλημάτων, ὧν ἐνεκάλει αὐτῷ· τὸ δὲ ἀπαλλάξας, ὅταν πείσῃ τὸν ἐγκαλοῦντα ἀποστῆναι καὶ μηκέτι ἐγκαλεῖν.

Διαλλάσσω, aor. 2 pass. διηλλάγην, to effect an alteration, to exchange, in the same connections as ἀλλάσσειν, e.g. χώραν, ἐσθῆτα, etc., fully τινί τι ἀντί τινος. Secondly, τινά τινι, πρὸς τινα, to reconcile; e.g. Thuc. viii. 89, ἐλπίδας ὅτι πολλὰς ἔχει κάκεινους τὸ στράτευμα διαλλάξεν; Plut. Them. 6, διαλλάξαι τὰς πόλεις ἀλλήλαις; Xen. de Vect. v. 8, ἔστι μὲν γὰρ πειρᾶσθαι διαλλάττειν τὰς πολεμούσας πρὸς ἀλλήλας πόλεις, ἔστι δὲ συναλλάττειν, εἴ τινες ἐν αὐταῖς στασιάζουσιν. Also τινὰ καὶ τινα, Xen. Hell. i. 6. 7, διαλλάξεν Ἀθηναίους καὶ Λακεδαιμονίους. As well in a two-sided as in a one-sided quarrel; cf. Thuc. l.c., as in Eur. Hel. 1235, διαλλάχθητί μοι; 1236, μεθίημι νεῖκος τὸ σόν. Isocr. Nicocl. 33 D, διαλλάττομαι πρὸς σε περὶ τούτου. Cf. Tholuck on Matt. v. 24, διαλλάγηθι τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου (medial pass., *vid.* Krüger, lii. 6); cf. ver. 23, ὁ ἀδελφός σου ἔχει τὸ κατὰ σοῦ; 1 Sam. xxix. 4, ἐν τίνι διαλλαγήσεται οὗτος τῷ κυρίῳ αὐτοῦ = נִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה, to show oneself obliging. Cf. Luke xii. 58, s.v. ἀπαλλάσσω.

Μεταλλάσσω, aor. 1 μετήλλαξα, to exchange, convert, Rom. i. 25, τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν τῷ ψεύδει; ver. 26, τὴν φυσικὴν χρῆσιν εἰς τὴν παρὰ φύσιν.

Καταλλάσσω, aor. 1 κατήλλαξα, aor. 2 pass. κατηλλάγην, to change, to exchange; then like διαλλάσσειν, συναλλάσσειν = to reconcile (e.g. Aristot. Oec. ii. 15, κατήλλαξεν αὐτοὺς πρὸς ἀλλήλους), both in onesided and mutual enmity; in the former case the context must show on which side is the active enmity, e.g. Xen. Anab. i. 6. 1, Ὀρόντης . . . ἐπιβουλεύει Κύρῳ, καὶ πρόσθεν πολεμήσας, καταλλαγεῖς δέ. On the contrary, Soph. Aj. 743, θεοῖσι ὡς καταλλαχθῇ χόλου; 1 Cor. vii. 11, τῷ ἀνδρὶ καταλλαγήτω. Possibly it is here uncertain who is guilty, and that the apostle only requires in general that the marriage be re-established; the probability, however, is that a change of feeling is required on the part of the wife, for we must suppose that ver. 10, γυναῖκα ἀπὸ ἀνδρὸς μὴ χωρισθῆναι, implies behaviour on the part of the woman as truly as ver. 11, ἄνδρα γυναῖκα μὴ ἀφιέναι, on that of the man. Cf. also Harless, *Ehescheidungsfrage*, p. 78. Herod. i. 61, καταλλάσσετο τὴν ἔχθρην (*sc. his* hostility) τοῖσι στασιωτῇσι. In Rom. v. 10 and 2 Cor. v. 18-20, where καταλλάσσειν is used of the divine work of redemption, the context must show whether God is to be regarded as the antagonist of man, or man of God. Neither the word in and by itself, nor the grammatical connection, can here decide; cf. the passages quoted, Xen. Anab. i. 6. 1, and Soph. Aj. 743. Nor does the designation of men as ἐχθροί, Rom. v. 10, settle the question, for that word may equally well be taken actively (Rom. viii. 7; Col. i. 21; Jas. iv. 4) or passively (Rom. xi. 28; Col. ix. 13). But Rom. v. 11, δι' οὗ νῦν καταλλαγὴν ἐλάβομεν, is decidedly opposed to the supposition that either a change of feeling on the part of man, brought about by the divine redemption, is referred to, or an alteration in his relation to God to

be accomplished by man himself. Cf. also Rom. xi. 15. It is God who forms the relation between Himself and humanity anew; the part of humanity is to accept this reinstatement; cf. 2 Cor. v. 20, *καταλλάγητε τῷ θεῷ*; cf. Acts iv. 40, *σώθητε ἀπὸ κ.τ.λ.* This appears to be the only yet conclusive reason obliging us to take *καταλλάσσειν ἡμᾶς, τὸν κόσμον ἑαυτῷ* in the sense of Eph. i. 6, *ἐχαρίτωσεν ἡμᾶς, i.e.* God establishes a relationship of peace between Himself and us, by doing away with that which made Him our *ἀντίδικος*, which directed His anger against us; cf. the mention of *ὀργή*, Rom. v. 9 (*vid.* 2 Macc. v. 20), and 1 Sam. xxix. 4, *ἐν τίνι διαλλαγήσεται οἷτος τῷ κυρίῳ αὐτοῦ*. Matt. v. 24, *διαλλάγηθι τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου*. This is the most striking parallel, as the relations of the parties to each other are decidedly the same; cf. *μὴ λογιζόμενος αὐτοῖς κ.τ.λ.*, 2 Cor. v. 19. Correspondent thereto is Acts x. 34, *δεκτὸς τῷ θεῷ ἐστίν*; cf. ver. 15, *ὁ θεὸς ἐκαθάρισεν σὺ μὴ κοινοῦ*. Cf. Josephus, *Ant.* iii. 15. 2, *Μωϋσῆν παρεκάλει καταλλάκτῃν αὐτῶν γενέσθαι πρὸς τὸν θεόν*. Thus alone does it answer to the Pauline train of thought, in which *καταλλαγέντες*, Rom. v. 10, appears completely parallel to *δικαιωθέντες*, ver. 9; *δικαιωθέντες σωθησόμεθα . . . καταλλαγέντες σωθησόμεθα*, and accordingly *καταλλαγήναι* may be used to explain *δικαιωθείς σώζεσθαι*, which it could not be if *καταλλαγήναι* were meant to express any change in the feelings of man. It is a relation which is changed, which God changes, in that He desists from His claims. 2 Cor. v. 19, 21; cf. Matt. v. 23, 24. As this view is grammatically as possible as the other; as, further, there are no lexical difficulties in its way; and as, finally, it is indicated by the context of both passages,—no solid objection can be raised against it; whereas the other quits the biblical circle of thought, and has merely a hortatory character, but no force as evidence, such as is required especially in Rom. v. We find just the opposite view, borrowed from heathen ideas (see *ἰλάσκομαι*), when it is said of God, 2 Macc. i. 5, vii. 33, viii. 29, *καταλλαγήναι τοῖς δούλοις αὐτοῦ*.

Thus *καταλλάσσειν* denotes the N. T. divine and saving act of *ἀπολύτρωσις*, in so far as God Himself, by His taking upon Himself and providing an atonement, establishes that relationship of peace with mankind which the demands of His justice had hitherto prevented. It is thus the very opposite of the heathen *ἰλάσκεσθαι*, a word which, in classical Greek, is = to *reconcile*, like *καταλλάσσειν*, but wherein the relations are altogether reversed. In classical Greek the deity is the object, man the subject; in *καταλλάσσειν*, God is the subject, man the object. It practically includes, though not in and for itself, the scripture *ἰλάσκεσθαι*, to atone, to expiate; and it signifies the reconciliation brought about by expiation; cf. 2 Cor. v. 19, *θεὸς ἦν ἐν Χριστῷ κόσμον καταλλάσσων ἑαυτῷ*; ver. 21, *τὸν μὴ γνόντα ἁμαρτίαν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησεν*; Rom. iii. 25, *ὃν προέθετο ὁ θεὸς ἱλαστήριον*. While *ἰλάσκεσθαι* aims at the averting of God's wrath, *καταλλάσσειν* implies that God has laid aside or withdrawn wrath. While *ἰλάσκεσθαι* does not in itself say that it is God who has undertaken the propitiation, *καταλλάσσειν* exactly and emphatically expresses this; and it is important for the scientific apprehension of N. T. facts of saving grace to realize fully the distinction between the biblical *ἰλάσκεσθαι* and *καταλλάσσειν*,

namely, that the two words respectively present to us different relations of God to man. In *καταλλάσσειν*, stress is laid upon the truth that God stands over against mankind as *ἀντίδικος*, and as such nevertheless establishes a relation of peace. The subject of *ἰλάσκεσθαι* is not God as *ἀντίδικος* towards man, but man represented by Christ, God as He in Christ represents the world. The unity of the two terms thus differing as to their subject becomes apparent in the fact that in both God is the remoter object; *ἰλάσκεσθαι ἐναντὶ κυρίου κ.τ.λ.*; cf. Heb. ii. 17, *τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν*; see *ἰλάσκομαι*; *καταλλάσσειν κόσμον τῷ θεῷ*. Thus the difference of object is always important; *καταλλάσσειν* admits of a personal object only, because it has to do with personal relations; *ἰλάσκεσθαι*, in Scripture usage, besides a personal object, the sinner, is joined also with an impersonal object, viz. *τὰς ἀμαρτίας*. *Καταλλάσσειν* denotes the removal of the demands of God's justice; *ἰλάσκεσθαι*, that satisfaction of them whereby their removal is attained; and as *καταλλάσσειν* practically signifies the removal of the demands of justice by God's taking upon Himself the expiation,—thus embracing the two elements expressed in 1 John iv. 10, *αὐτὸς ἡγάπησεν ἡμᾶς καὶ ἀπέστειλεν τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἰλασμὸν περὶ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν*,—it is particularly appropriate as a comprehensive dogmatic expression. It is, like *ἰλάσκομαι*, the presupposition of justification (cf. Rom. iii. 25, 26 with Rom. v. 9, 10), but it gives expression to the connection between expiation and justification.

Καταλλαγή, ἡ, the *exchange effected*; then the *reconciliation*, for which *διαλλαγή* and *συναλλαγή* are generally used. In 2 Macc. v. 20, opp. to *ἀργή*. Agreeably to the use of *καταλλάσσειν*, it denotes the *result* of the divine act of salvation, to wit, the new moulding of the relation in which the world stands to God, so far as it no longer remains the object of His wrath, and He no longer stands to it as an *ἀντίδικος*. Rom. v. 11, *τὴν καταλλαγὴν λαβεῖν*; 2 Cor. v. 18, *ἡ διακονία τῆς καταλλαγῆς*; ver. 19, *ὁ λόγος τῆς καταλλ.*; Rom. xi. 15, *καταλλαγὴ κόσμου*,—where the new change in the relation of the world to God is traced back to the *ἀποβολή* of Israel, because God turned away from Israel to the world of the *ἔθνη*. The reference here is not so much to the accomplishment of the *καταλλαγή*, as to the relation assumed by the *κόσμος* to God in the place of Israel, to the transference of God's saving revelation from Israel to the *κόσμος*. Cf. ver. 12, *πλοῦτος κόσμος*.—In the eccl. writers *καταλλ.* denotes the admission, or readmission of penitents to church fellowship, or to the Lord's Supper; it is commonly explained as *ἡ λύσις τῶν ἐπιτιμίων*, *vid.* Suiceri *Thes.* s.v.

Ἀποκαταλλάσσω, aor. 1 *ἀποκατήλλαξα*, a stronger form of *καταλλάσσω*, cf. Winer, *to reconcile again*; not of course to reconcile repeatedly, but = *to restore friendship*, to reunite, *ἀπό* referring to the state to be left, and *κατά* to the state to be sought after; cf. *ἀποκαταλλ.* . . . *εἰς αὐτόν*, Col. i. 20, as in Thuc., Aristot., *καταλλάσσειν πρὸς τινα*; cf. *ἀπαλλοτριῶν εἰς*, Hos. ix. 12; Isa. i. 4. It differs from *καταλλάσσειν* apparently in this: *καταλλ.* is the setting up of a relationship of peace not before existing; *ἀποκαταλλ.* is the restoration of a relationship of peace which has been disturbed; cf. *ἀπο-*

καθίστημι, ἀποκατορθόω. It is therefore a carefully chosen, or perhaps a more advanced and later expression of Pauline thought, cf. Col. i. 20 with ver. 16. It occurs only in Eph. and Col. and in patristic Greek. Steph. *Thes.*: "*gratiam diremptam, et solutam, sarcire et amicitiam reducere.*" Eph. ii. 16, ἵνα ἀποκαταλλάξῃ τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους τῷ θεῷ; cf. ver. 17, καὶ ἐλθὼν εὐηγγελίσατο εἰρήνην,—a significant confirmation of our remarks on καταλλάσσω. That the subjection under consideration is not the "reconciliation of the uncircumcision with the circumcision," is clear, on the one hand, from the words τῷ θεῷ; on the other hand, from the design of the apostle, which is to show from what had been done for both (vv. 15–18, comp. Gal. iii. 28), that there can no longer exist any difference between them. Col. i. 20, εὐδόκησεν δι' αὐτοῦ ἀποκαταλλάξαι τὰ πάντα εἰς αὐτόν . . . εἰρηνοποιήσας; ver. 21, ὑμᾶς . . . ἀπηλλοτριωμένους καὶ ἐχθροὺς . . . ἀποκατήλαξεν . . . παραστήσαι ὑμᾶς ἁγίους καὶ ἀμώμους καὶ ἀνεγκλήτους ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ, which shows again that the matter in question is the satisfaction of the ἀντίδικος. Cf. Chrys. on Eph. ii. 16, τὴν ὀφειλομένην δίκην αὐτὸς ὑποστὰς διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ.

Ἀλλότριος, ἰα, ἰον, of or belonging to another, foreign, opp. to ἴδιος and οἰκεῖος. —(1) Opp. to ἴδιος, not one's own, not belonging to one; τὰ ἀλλότρια, others' goods; *Od.* xvii. 462, ἀλλοτρίων χαρίσασθαι, to give the property of others. Cf. Luke xvi. 52, εἰ ἐν τῷ ἀλλοτρίῳ πιστοὶ οὐκ ἐγένεσθε, τὸ ὑμέτερον τίς ὑμῖν δώσει. Heb. ix. 25, ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς εἰσέρχεται εἰς τὰ ἅγια κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν ἐν αἵματι ἀλλοτρίῳ, in antithesis with προσφέρειν ἑαυτόν. Rom. xiv. 4, ἀλλότριος οἰκέτης. John x. 5, ἀλλοτρίῳ δὲ οὐ μὴ ἀκολουθήσουσιν, cf. ver. 4, ὅταν τὰ ἴδια πάντα ἐκβάλῃ; ver. 8, κλέπται καὶ λησταί; ver. 12, ὁ μισθωτὸς, οὗ οὐκ ἔστιν τὰ πρόβατα ἴδια. *Pind. Ol.* x. 107, ἀλλότριον ποιμένα. 2 Cor. x. 15, ἐν ἀλλοτρίοις κόποις; ver. 16, οὐκ ἐν ἀλλοτρίῳ κανόνι; ver. 15, κατὰ τὸν κανόνα ἡμῶν. Rom. xv. 20; 1 Tim. v. 22. — Acts vii. 6, Heb. xi. 9, γῇ ἀλλοτρίᾳ, see below. (2) Opp. to οἰκεῖος, not pertaining to, foreign, in contrast with kinship, affinity, of the same country, i.e. *peregrinus*. In this latter sense, especially in the LXX. = 𐤀𐤋𐤁, 1 Kings viii. 41, τῷ ἀλλοτρίῳ ὃς οὐκ ἔστιν ἀπὸ λαοῦ σοῦ. 2 Chron. vi. 32, synonym with ξένος, as in the best Mss. we read in 2 Sam. xv. 19; ἀλλογενής, Job xix. 15, which elsewhere is = 𐤁𐤏; ἀλλόφυλος, Isa. ii. 6, opp. to ἀδελφός, the name for kinsfolk, Deut. xv. 3, τὸν ἀλλότριον ἀπαιτήσεις ὅσα ἐὰν ᾖ σοι παρ' αὐτῷ, τῷ δὲ ἀδελφῷ σου ἄφεσιν ποιήσεις τοῦ χρέους σου; Ezra x. 2, ἐκαθίσταμεν γυναῖκας ἀλλοτρίας ἀπὸ τῶν λαῶν τῆς γῆς, and often. Cf. Neh. xiii. 30, ἐκαθάρισα αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ πάσης ἀλλοτριώσεως; Ecclus. xxix. 18, xxxiii. 3, xxxix. 4, xlix. 5. Also = 𐤁𐤏, which, however, is less frequently in this particular sense rendered by ἀλλότρ.; cf. Hos. v. 7, viii. 12; Lev. x. 1; Isa. i. 7. Never = 𐤁𐤏𐤁, so that the note in Bruder's *Concordance*, "οἱ ἀλλότριοι, Heb. 𐤁𐤏𐤁, 𐤁𐤏𐤁," is quite erroneous. Not thus in the N. T., for Acts vii. 6, πάροικον ἐν γῇ ἀλλοτρίᾳ, where the LXX. Gen. xv. 13 render, ἐν γῇ οὐκ ἰδία, 𐤁𐤏𐤁 𐤏𐤁 𐤏𐤁𐤁, should more appropriately (cf. Bar. iii. 10; 1 Macc. vi. 13, but not 1 Macc. xv. 13, where γῇ ἀλλ. means a hostile country) be included under (1); for the fact of his being a stranger is expressed by πάροικος, and this is strengthened by

the addition ἐν γῇ ἄλλ.; cf. Heb. xi. 9, where both facts, the fact of being a stranger, and the fact of being without possession, are conjoined: *πίστει παρῳήκησεν εἰς γῆν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας ὡς ἄλλοτριαν*. Opp. to kinship, Matt. xvii. 25, 26, ἀπὸ τῶν υἱῶν αὐτῶν ἢ ἀπὸ τῶν ἄλλοτρίων; cf. Herod. iii. 119. For the union of both meanings, see Deut. xv. 3. It seems never to have been used in classical Greek in the sense of strangership; on the contrary, (3) of *enemies*, as in the passages, quoted by many as having the sig. *strange*, in Hom. *Od.* xvi. 102, xviii. 219, ἄλλότριος φῶς. So often in Polyb. and Diod., Hom. *Il.* v. 214; Xen. *Anab.* iii. 5. 5; Polyb. xxvii. 13. 3 = *hostile*. In the LXX. only Ps. xviii. 14, ἀπὸ ἄλλοτρίων θείσαι τοῦ δούλου σου (where the Heb. is זָלַז, "haughty," "proud"). Cf. Jer. xvii. 17, μὴ γεννηθῇς μοι εἰς ἄλλοτριώσιν, φειδόμενός μου ἐν ἡμερᾷ πονηρᾷ. Thuc. i. 35. 4, ἄλλοτριώσις = *rejection*. Often in 1 Macc. ii. 7, syn. ἐχθρός, i. 38, xv. 33, γῇ ἄλλοτρία, "hostile land." Cf. Ecclus. xi. 34, xlv. 18. In the N. T. Heb. xi. 34, παρεμβολὰς ἔκλειναν ἄλλοτρίων.

Ἀλλοτριόω, to estrange; Herod., Plato, Demosth., Thuc., and in later Greek. Gen. xlii. 7, ἡλλοτριούτο ἀπ' αὐτῶν, *he made himself strange, he kept himself strange*. 1 Esdr. ix. 4, αὐτὸς ἡλλοτριώθησεται ἀπὸ τοῦ πλήθους τῆς αἰχμαλωσίας; cf. Ezra x. 8, διασταλῆσεται ἀπὸ ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἀποικίας, חֲרִיזְתָּ בְּתַרְבִּי חֲרִיזְתָּ = *to be shut out from*. Ecclus. xi. 32, ἡλλοτριώσει σε τῶν ιδίων σου. So with the gen. Epict. *Pr.* cxviii. 106, μηδεὶς φρόνιμος ὦν τοῦ ἄρχειν ἡλλοτριούσθω. The passive in a middle sense, Gen. xlii. 7, *to turn away from, to become hostile to*; cf. Krüger, lii. 6. — 1 Macc. vi. 24, ἡλλοτριούνται ἀφ' ἡμῶν. With the dative, 1 Macc. xi. 53, ἡλλοτριάθη τῷ Ἰώναν; xv. 27, ἡλλοτριούτο αὐτῷ. Not in the N. T.

Ἀπαλλοτριόω, to estrange, to alienate, τί, τινὰ ἀπό τινος, oftener τινος; Polyb. iii. 77. 7, ἀπαλλοτριούν τῆς πρὸς Ῥωμαίους εὐνοίας; Josephus, *Antt.* iv. 1. 1, καὶ ἀπαλλοτριούν αὐτῶν Μωϋσῆς ἐθελήσειε τὸν θεόν. Often in the LXX. joined with the dative, as in Ps. lxix. 9, ἀπηλλοτριωμένος ἐγενήθη τῷ ἀδελφοῖς μου καὶ ξένος τοῖς υἱοῖς κ.τ.λ. — Ezek. xiv. 5, κατὰ τὰς καρδίας αὐτῶν τὰς ἀπηλλοτριωμένας ἀπ' ἐμοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἐνθυμήμασιν αὐτῶν. Ver. 7. Absolutely. Ps. lviii. 3, ἀπηλλοτριώθησαν οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἀπὸ μητρός, "they have fallen away from their birth," syn. πλανᾶσθαι, Heb. נָחַל. Cf. Josh. xxii. 25, ἀπαλλοτριώσουσιν οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν τοὺς υἱοὺς ἡμῶν, ἵνα μὴ σέβωνται κύριον. Jer. xix. 14, ἐγκατέλιπόν με καὶ ἀπηλλοτρίωσαν τὸν τόπον τοῦτον, καὶ ἐθυμίασαν ἐν αὐτῷ θεοῖς ἄλλοτρίοις. Hos. ix. 10, εἰσήλθον πρὸς τὸν Βεελφεγὼρ, καὶ ἀπηλλοτριώθησαν εἰς αἰσχύνην. In the N. T. Eph. ii. 12, ἀπηλλοτριωμένοι τῆς πολιτείας τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ξένοι τῶν διαθηκῶν κ.τ.λ. Here emphasis must not be placed upon the preposition prefixed to the verb, because it is not estrangement, but simply strangership that is meant,—a use of the word not elsewhere to be found. Ἀπηλλ. may be taken as the correlative of Israel's election, i.e. as signifying "excluded," and this would give the prep. its due force. The expression is obviously akin to the use of ἄλλότριος in the LXX. (see ἄλλότριος (2)); and there is no need to refer to the supposed usage of classical Greek (which cannot be proved) that

those who were not or could not be partakers of citizen rights were called ἀλλότριοι τῆς πολιτείας (Aristot. *Pol.* ii. 6 ?). Nor can the force of the prep. be much urged in Eph. iv. 18, ἀπηλλοτριωμένοι τῆς ζωῆς τοῦ θεοῦ. The word occurs absolutely in Col. i. 21, ὑμᾶς ποτὲ ὄντας ἀπηλλοτριωμένους καὶ ἐχθροὺς τῇ διανοίᾳ κ.τ.λ., where ἀπαλλ. is used as in Ps. lviii. 3, Josh. xxii. 25, of the relation of the ἔθνη not to Israel, but to God. Thus the use of this word, which in the N. T. is peculiar to the Epp. to the Eph. and Col., is akin to the usage of the LXX., not of the classics.

Ἀλληγορέω, like παρηγορέω, from ἀγορά, ἀγορέω unused, = *to speak differently from what one thinks or literally means, or to say or think differently from what the words in themselves mean, aliud verbis, aliud sensu ostendere.* The word occurs in later Greek only Plut., Porphyry., Philo, Josephus, and the Grammarians. According to Plut. ἀλληγορία signifies the same as ὑπόνοια previously meant = "the hidden sense or figurative form of a statement," except that ἀλληγορία signifies the speech itself thus qualified, ὑπόνοια the distinguishing quality of the speech. Plut. *de Aud. Poet.* 19 E, οὗς (sc. μύθους) ταῖς πάλαι μὲν ὑπονοίαις, ἀλληγορίαις δὲ νῦν λεγομέναις, παραβιαζόμενοι καὶ διαστρέφοντες. Cf. *de Is. et Os.* 363 D, where he describes as ὑπόνοια, ὥσπερ οἱ Ἕλληνες Κρόνον ἀλληγοροῦσιν τὸν χρόνον, Ἦραν δὲ τὸν ἀέρα, γένεσιν δὲ Ἡφαίστου τὴν εἰς πῦρ ἀέρος μεταβολήν. Ἀλληγορία is used in a formal sense side by side with αἰνίγμα and μεταφορά; *Cur. Pythia*, etc., 409 D, οὗτοι τὰ αἰνίγματα καὶ τὰς ἀλληγορίας καὶ τὰς μεταφορὰς, τῆς μαντικῆς ἀνακλάσεις οὕσας πρὸς τὸ θνητὸν καὶ φανταστικὸν, ἐπιποθοῦσι. It is not always a strictly technical term (see below), and it may best be rendered *figurative speaking.* Cf. Cicero, *ad Att.* ii. 20 : "*De republica breviter ad te scribam ; jam enim charta ipsa ne nos prodatur peti- timesco. Itaque posthac si erunt mihi plura ad te scribenda, ἀλληγορίαις obscurabo.*" Demetr. Phaler. *de elocut.* 100, νῦν δὲ ὥσπερ συγκαλυμματοῦ τοῦ λόγου τῇ ἀλληγορίᾳ κέχρηται ; 101, τὰ μυστήρια ἐν ἀλληγορίας λέγεται . . . ὥσπερ ἐν σκότῳ καὶ νυκτί ; 102, οἱ Λακῶνες πολλὰ ἐν ἀλληγορίαις ἔλεγον. Accordingly the *allegory* is a mode of exposition which does not, like the parable, hide and clothe the sense in order to give a clear idea of it ; on the contrary, it clothes the sense in order to hide it. Suid., ἀλληγορία ἢ μεταφορά, ἄλλο λέγον τὸ γράμμα, καὶ ἄλλο τὸ νόημα. Hesych., ἀλληγορία ἄλλο τι παρὰ τὸ ἀκουόμενον ὑποδεικνύουσα. Heraclid. *de allegor. Hom.* 412, ἄλλα μὲν ἀγορεύων τρόπος, ἕτερα δὲ ὧν λέγει σημαίνων, ἐπωνύμως ἀλληγορία καλεῖται. Artemidor. *Oneirocrit.* iv. 2, ἀλληγορικοὺς δὲ (ὀνείρους) τοὺς τὰ σημαινόμενα δι' αἰνιγμάτων ἐπιδεικνύοντας. (See Wetstein on Gal. iv. 24.)

With the Alexandrine Greeks, and through them with the Alexandrine Jews likewise, ἀλληγορεῖν, ἀλληγορία are technical names for that philosophy espoused by Aristobulus, and especially by Philo, which regards the Greek myths and the O. T. narratives, theophanies, anthropomorphisms, etc., partly as an unreal clothing, partly as an historical embodiment of moral and religious ideas. Philo's method differs from that of the Alexandrine Greeks, in that the historical clothing is not, according to him, utterly unreal and

poetical; but he is on a par with them, inasmuch as he does not hesitate in difficult cases wholly to set aside the historical element, and to treat it as merely a formal clothing of the idea. In this self-contradictory method of Philo's, we see the power of the Christian truth and character of divine revelation, which typically the history of redemption moulds. The allegorizing explanation of sacred history is nothing more than a remnant of the above-named philosophy, and a hasty inference concerning, and renunciation of, the fulfilment of types. It is a significant fact that we find in Philo but a very small *residuum* of Messianic views, and that neither the person nor even the name of the Messiah is to be found in him (see J. G. Müller, art. "Philo" in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* xi. 578 sqq.). It may therefore seem strange that (in Gal. iv. 22 sqq.) we should find an instance of this method of using Scripture,—a method more than abrogated by the N. T. revelation; for St. Paul, concerning the fact raised from Scripture, *ὅτι Ἀβραὰμ δύο υἱοὺς ἔσχευ, ἓνα ἐν τῇ παιδίᾳ καὶ ἓνα ἐκ τῇ ἐλευθέρᾳ*, says, *ἅτινά ἐστιν ἀλληγορούμενα*, ver. 24. Still there is a very essential difference between this Pauline and the Alexandrine allegorizing. It is first to be noted that Gal. iv. 22 sqq. belongs at least to that class of allegorical interpretations wherein the matter of fact is retained as an embodiment of the idea, as an embodiment which belongs to actual history, where, therefore, allegory and type meet. Whereas the Philonic method knows nothing of the type as an historical prefiguring of *future* history, and infers or abstracts only general truths, moral or religious, from the historical fact by allegorizing, the apostle's aim is to prove, by the fact he cites, a certain law in the history of redemption which underlies that history from its beginning to its close. While the Philonic allegory removes itself as far as possible from the type, the Pauline is almost identical with the type. It must not be overlooked that St. Paul does not introduce his application with the words *ἅτινά ἐστιν ἀλληγορ.* until after he had characterized in ver. 23 the fact stated in ver. 22. He purposely uses *ἀλληγορ.* instead, perhaps, of *ἀντίτυπα τῶν μελλόντων*, because he does not and cannot point out a final and complete fulfilment of the prophetic fact, but simply wishes to make an application of it possible alike for various times and other circumstances. Thus allegory and type again diverge from each other. — For the exposition, see Wieseler and Hofmann *in loc.* (The reading ver. 25, *τὸ γὰρ Ἀγαρ Σινᾶ κ.τ.λ.*, instead of the truer one, confirmed by Cod. Sin., *τὸ γὰρ Σινᾶ κ.τ.λ.*, would make a Philonic play of the Pauline allegory.) As to the meaning of *ἀλληγορεῖν*, it may apply alike to the clothing and to the import, with the signification, "*to speak what is different from the sense*," "*to speak what is different from what lies before one*;" *allegorice significare*, and *allegorice interpretari*. For the former meaning, cf. Plut. as before; for the latter, *ἀλληγορεῖν τὸν μῦθον* (synes.), is quoted in Steph. *Thes.* = *allegoriam fabulae exponere, alium fabulae sensum afferre qui sub verbis apparet*. Eust. 1392. 48, *Σημείωσαι ὅτι εἰς τὸν θυμὸν ὁ Κύκλωψ ἀλληγορεῖται*. Phil. *de Cherub.* 143. 18, *τὰ μὲν δὴ χερουβιμ καθ' ἓνα τρόπον οὕτως ἀλληγορεῖται*. Meyer is in error when, on Gal. iv. 24, he renders the passive *ἀλληγορεῖσθαι*, "*to have another sense given, which could not be inferred from the passage cited*." In Gal. iv. 24 it is to be taken in the former meaning.

Ἀμαρτάνω, ἀμάρτημα, ἀμαρτία, ἀμαρτωλός, ἀναμάρτητος, from *a* privative and *μείρομαι*, *not to become participator in, not to attain, not to arrive at the goal*, e.g. Xen. *Cyrop.* i. 6. 13, ὑγμεινοῦ στρατοπέδου οὐκ ἂν ἀμάρτοις. Of *missing the mark in shooting*, opposed to *τυχεῖν*, *Il.* xxiii. 857, ὃς δέ κε μηρίνθοιο τύχης, ὄρνιθος ἀμαρτών; Thucyd. iii. 98. 2, τῶν ὁδῶν ἀμαρτάνειν. *To lose*, Herod. ix. 7. 3, ἡμάρτομεν τῆς Βοιωτίας; Thucyd. iii. 69. 2, τῆς Λέσβου ἡμαρτήκεσαν; Plato, *Soph.*, Eurip., and later writers. In general = *to fail of the right*, Thuc. i. 33. 3, vi. 92, γνώμης ἀμ., *not to hit the right sense*. Herod. vii. 139. 3, "if some one maintained that the Athenians had saved Hellas, οὐκ ἂν ἀμαρτάνοι τῷ θεῷ." Plat. *Legg.* xii. 967 B, ἀμ. ψυχῆς φύσεως, *not rightly to apprehend the nature of the soul*, cf. *Legg.* x. 891 E. Cf. ἀμαρτίνοος, *mad, erring in mind*. Transferred to the moral sphere, from Homer downwards, universally = *to miss the right; to go wrong, to sin*; opp. to *κατορθοῦν*, Isocr. v. 35, ἅπαντες πλείω πεφύκαμεν ἐξαμαρτάνειν ἢ κατορθοῦν, as in Plat. *Legg.* i. 627 D, ὀρθότητος τε καὶ ἀμαρτίας περὶ νόμων. Plut. *Mor.* 25 C, ἐν πάσιν ἀμαρτωλὸν εἶναι τὸν ἀμαθῆ, περὶ πάντα δ' αὐτὸν κατορθοῦν τὸν ἀστέιον. Conjoined with acc., dat., *περὶ τινος, to fail in something, to sin*; *εἰς τινα, to commit an offence against some one*, e.g. Xen. *Hell.* ii. 4. 21, αἰδούμενοι καὶ θεοὺς καὶ ἀνθρώπους παύσασθε ἀμαρτάνοντες εἰς τὴν πατρίδα. This word, however, does not so fully designate sin in its moral import; for this other terms are employed, cf. Xen. *Cyrop.* viii. 8. 7, ἡ περὶ μὲν θεοὺς ἀσέβεια, περὶ δὲ ἀνθρώπους ἀδικία, although ἀμαρτάνειν may possess the full moral import, cf. Plat. *de Legg.* 318 E, οὐ γὰρ ἐστ' ὃ τι τοῦτου ἀσεβέστερόν ἐστιν, οὐδ' ὃ τι χρὴ μάλλον εὐλαβεῖσθαι, πλὴν εἰς θεοὺς καὶ λόγῳ καὶ ἔργῳ ἐξαμαρτάνειν, —but sin appears, considered in its natural course, as an action that has *failed or miscarried*; hence, as a general rule, the more remote object is subjoined; in like manner ἀμαρτάνειν is used equally to describe actions which are morally estimated (e.g. Plat. *Phaed.* 113 E, μεγάλα ἡμαρτηκέναι ἀμαρτήματα, where *sins* in our sense of the term are referred to), as also actions in which this is not the case, down to the latest writers; so e.g. in Plat. *Legg.* xii. 967 B (*vid. sup.*) and other places; Polyb., ἀμάρτημα γραφικόν, *a mistake in writing*. Primarily in this sense, i.e. *sinning regarded as mistaken action*, it is said in Xen. *Cyrop.* v. 4. 19, τὸ γὰρ ἀμαρτάνειν ἀνθρώπους ὄντας οὐδὲν θαυμαστόν, like *errare humanum est*.—Syn. ὑπερβαίνειν, e.g. Hom. *Il.* ix. 501, ὅτε κέν τις ὑπερβῇ καὶ ἀμάρτη; Plat. *Rep.* ii. 366 A, ἄδικοι . . . ὑπερβαίνοντες καὶ ἀμαρτάνοντες.

The LXX., as a rule, render $\alpha\mu\alpha\rho\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu\omega$ by ἀμαρτάνειν, more rarely by ἀδικεῖν. The participle = ἀμαρτωλός, also ἀσεβής; constantly $\alpha\mu\alpha\rho\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha$ = ἀμαρτία; $\alpha\mu\alpha\rho\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha$ = ἀμαρτία, ἀνομία; $\alpha\mu\alpha\rho\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha$, $\alpha\mu\alpha\rho\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha$, as a rule = ἀμαρτία, ἀμάρτημα, but also ἀσεβεία, πλημμελεία. $\alpha\mu\alpha\rho\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha$ is very variously rendered; also by ἀμαρτάνειν; on the contrary, the participle always by ἀνομος, παράνομος, ἀσεβής, and the substantive $\alpha\mu\alpha\rho\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha$ principally by ἀσεβεία and ἀδικία. $\alpha\mu\alpha\rho\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha$ = ἀδικεῖν, ἀνομείν. $\alpha\mu\alpha\rho\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha$ = ἀδικία, ἀνομία, παρανομία, ἀμαρτία, ἀμάρτημα, ἀνόμημα, κακία, κ.τ.λ. At the same time, it must be remembered, as Umbreit remarks in his *Die Sünde*, p. 49: "In the common intercourse of life, words easily lose their original precision—the fine distinctions they expressed are blurred or lost;" cf. Hupfeld on Ps. xxxii. 1.

Hence the variety of renderings. It may be of some importance to note that $\aleph\omega\eta$ is, as a rule, translated by ἄμαρτάνειν; $\aleph\psi\aleph$ by ἀσέβεια, ἀδικία, $\eta\gamma$ —but seldom occurring—by ἀδικεῖν and ἀνομεῖν. According to Delitzsch on Ps. xxxii. 1, “Sin is termed $\aleph\psi\aleph$, as a breaking loose from God, breach of faith, fall from the state of grace; $\eta\aleph\omega\eta$, as missing the divinely appointed goal, deviation from what is pleasing to God, doing what is opposed to God’s will; $\eta\psi$, as perversion of what is upright, misdeed, criminality;” *vid. Lexica*. In $\aleph\omega\eta$ there is the same essential idea as in ἄμαρτάνειν—*missing the goal*, opposite to $\aleph\gamma\omega$, Prov. viii. 36; cf. Judg. xx. 16; Prov. xix. 2. Accordingly $\aleph\omega\eta$ also marks sin as mistaken action; there is plainly, however, meant a missing of *the goal conformable to and fixed by God*, because human action misses its destination, and therewith the will of God. That this theocratic point of view predominates, is clear from the preponderating use of the word in the Pentateuch, especially in Leviticus, where $\eta\psi$ occurs only 18 times, $\aleph\psi\aleph$ only twice, the verbs not at all, and $\aleph\omega\eta$ and its derivatives above 100 times ($\aleph\psi\aleph$, Lev. xvi. 16, 21; $\eta\gamma$, v. 1, 17, vii. 18, x. 17, xvi. 21, 22, xvii. 16, xviii. 25, xix. 8, xx. 17, 19, xxii. 16, xxvi. 21, 39, 40, 41, 43). The three terms combined “in order to sum up and exhaust the idea of sin” (*vid. Hupfeld on Ps. xxxii.*), Ex. xxxiv. 7; Lev. xvi. 21; Ps. xxxii. 1; cf. Jer. xxxiii. 8, where LXX. in the two first passages $\eta\gamma$ = ἀνομία, $\aleph\psi\aleph$ = ἀδικία, $\eta\aleph\omega\eta$ = ἁμαρτία. If human action in ἄμαρτάνειν, in ἁμαρτία, misses its divine standard or goal, we can understand why δικαιοσύνη (“conformity to the standard,” “conformity to God”) appears, especially in the Epistle to the Romans, as its opposite; even as we read in 1 John iii. 4, ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐστὶν ἡ ἀνομία. Cf. Rom. vi. 18, ἐλευθερωθέντες δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἐδουλώθητε τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ. 2 Cor. v. 21.

Ἄμαρτάνω, to sin, fut. ἁμαρτήσω, 1st aor. ἡμάρτησα, not in classical Greek, only in later writers, “*si numeres, multi, si ponderes, leves*,” Lob. *Phryn.* 732 sq.; Matt. xviii. 15 (Luke xvii. 4, Lachm.); Rom. v. 14, 16, vi. 15; 2 Pet. ii. 4. Second aor. ἡμαρτον, perf. ἡμάρτηκα.—Ἄμ. τὶ εἰς τινα, to sin in something against some one; Acts xxv. 8, οὔτε εἰς τὸν νόμον . . . οὔτε εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν οὔτε εἰς Καίσαρά τι ἡμαρτον; cf. 1 John v. 16, ἄμαρτάνοντα ἁμαρτίαν. Without τέ, Matt. xviii. 15, 21; Luke xvii. 4; 1 Cor. viii. 12; 1 Cor. vi. 18, εἰς τὸ ἴδιον σῶμα; viii. 12, εἰς Χριστόν; Luke xv. 18, 21, εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ ἐνώπιόν σου. For εἰς τὸν οὐρ., cf. Matt. xxi. 25; 2 Esdr. ix. 6. Bengel refers ingeniously to ver. 7, χαρὰ ἐν τῷ οὐρ. ἐπὶ ἐνὶ ἁμαρτωλῷ μετανοοῦντι.—Absolutely, in Matt. xxvii. 4; Luke xvii. 3; John v. 14, viii. 11, ix. 2, 3; Rom. ii. 12, ἀνόμως ἡμαρτον, opp. ἐν νόμῳ, in possession of the law; Rom. iii. 23, v. 16, vi. 15; 1 Cor. vii. 28, 36, xv. 34, ἐκνήψατε δικαίως καὶ μὴ ἁμαρτάνετε; Eph. iv. 26; 1 Tim. v. 20; Tit. iii. 11; Heb. iii. 17; 1 Pet. ii. 20; 2 Pet. ii. 4, ἀγγέλων ἁμαρτησάντων; cf. John viii. 44, ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ οὐχ ἔστηκεν; 1 John i. 10, ii. 1, iii. 6, 8; iii. 9, ὁ γεγεννημένος ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ . . . οὐ δύναται ἁμαρτάνειν; v. 18, οὐχ ἁμαρτάνει. With regard to these last words, it must be remembered that, according to 1 John ii. 1, John cannot mean to deny sin altogether of those who are born of God. The contrast is ποιεῖν δικαιοσύνην, cf. vv. 6, 7, 10.

Accordingly they appear to relate to the general character of the actions of the regenerate, which is not set aside by single cases of sin; cf. v. 16, ἀμαρτάνειν μὴ πρὸς θάνατον, cf. ver. 18. Bengel, after Gataker, compares the regenerate with the magnetic needle, *quasi polum petit; facile dimovetur, sed semper polum repetit*. In 1 John v. 16, ἀμαρτάνειν πρὸς θάνατον, according to these presuppositions, denotes a return to the former state. Cf. Heb. x. 26, ἐκουσίως ἀμαρτανόντων ἡμῶν μετὰ τὸ λαβεῖν τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τῆς ἀληθείας, comp. ver. 29; ἐκουσίως = knowingly and intentionally; cf. Plat. *Rep.* i. 336 E, ἄκοντες ἀμαρτάνομεν (sc. ἐν τῇ τῶν λόγων σκέψει); 340 E, ἐπιλιπούσης γὰρ ἐπιστήμης ὁ ἀμαρτάνων ἀμαρτάνει; *Hipp. min.* 376 B, ἀγαθοῦ μὲν ἄρ' ἀνδρός ἐστὶν ἐκόντα ἀδικεῖν, κακοῦ δὲ ἄκοντα; *ibid.*, ὁ ἐκὼν ἀμαρτάνων; 375 A B, ἐκουσίως, ἀκουσίως ἀμαρτάνειν; Rom. v. 14, τοὺς μὴ ἀμαρτήσαντας ἐπὶ τῷ ὁμοιώματι τῆς παραβύσεως Ἀδάμ = *after the similitude*, etc.; ἐπὶ c. dat., indicating every more precise condition under which anything happens; see Pape, s.v. ἐπὶ, II. *in fin.* Hence also ver. 12, ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἡμαρτον, “under,” “agreeably to,” “which state of things.”

Ἀμάρτημα, τό, the term usually employed in classical Greek to denote the result of ἀμαρτάνειν = *fault, transgression, sinful conduct, sinful deed*. LXX. = $\pi\alpha\sigma\eta$, $\psi\psi$, $\psi\psi$. In the N. T. Mark iii. 28, 29 (iv. 12, Rec. text; Tisch. omits); Rom. iii. 25 (v. 16, Rec. text); 1 Cor. vi. 18; 2 Pet. i. 9.—The expression lays more stress on *the single deed* than ἀμαρτία.

Ἀμαρτία, ἡ, would seem to denote primarily, *not sin considered as an action*, but sin considered as the quality of action, that is, *sin generically*. Cf. Plat. *Legg.* i. 627 D, ὀρθότης τε καὶ ἀμαρτία νόμων; ii. 668 C, τὴν γε ὀρθότητα τῆς βουλήσεως ἡ καὶ ἀμαρτίαν αὐτοῦ διαγνώσεται; *Rep.* i. 442 B, οὔτε πονηρία, οὔτε ἀμαρτία. Rare in classical Greek, and less usual than ἀμάρτημα, especially where single actions are to be characterized. All the more common in bibl. Greek. LXX. = $\pi\alpha\sigma\eta$ and $\alpha\sigma\eta$, $\pi\alpha\sigma\eta$, ἡ.

In the N. T. (I.) as a generic idea, in the *singular*. It is noteworthy that in the Synoptics, where it is not used in this sense, the sing. occurs nowhere save Matt. xii. 31, πᾶσα ἀμαρτία καὶ βλασφημία; paral. in Mark iii. 28, ἀμάρτημα. Frequent, on the contrary, in Paul's writings. Rom. v. 13, ἀμαρτία ἦν ἐν κόσμῳ,—ἀμαρτία οὐκ ἐλλογεῖται μὴ ὄντος νόμου; in ver. 12, on the contrary, ἀμαρτία with the article, because the reference is not to representation of the conception, but to its *entire contents*. Cf. Kühner, § 244. 2; Krüger, § 1. 3. 3. Cf. Rom. vii. 13, ἡ ἀμαρτ. ἵνα φανῇ ἀμ. . . ἵνα γένηται καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ἀμαρτωλὸς ἡ ἀμαρτία. Hence v. 12, ἡ ἀμαρτία εἰς τὸν κόσμον εἰσῆλθεν, καὶ διὰ τῆς ἀμαρτίας ὁ θάνατος. In this sense ἡ ἀμαρτία, v. 20, ἐπλεόνασεν ἡ ἀμαρτία; ver. 21, ἐβασίλευσεν ἡ ἀμαρτία, cf. vi. 12, 14; vi. 1, ἐπιμένειν τῇ ἀμ.; vv. 2, 10, ἀποθανεῖν τῇ ἀμ.; ver. 11, νεκροὺς τῇ ἀμαρτίᾳ; ver. 6, δουλεύειν τῇ ἀμ. Cf. ver. 18, ἐλευθερωθέντες δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς ἀμ. ἐδουλώθητε τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ; vv. 17, 20, 22, 13; vii. 7, τὴν ἀμ. οὐκ ἔργων; vv. 8, 11, ἀφορμὴν δὲ λαβοῦσα ἡ ἀμαρτία; ver. 9, ἡ ἀμ. ἀνέζησεν; viii. 3, κατέκρινεν

τὴν ἄμ. ἐν τῇ σαρκί; 1 Cor. xv. 56, τὸ κέντρον τοῦ θανάτου ἡ ἄμαρτία . . . ἡ δὲ δύναμις τῆς ἄμ. ὁ νόμος; Heb. xii. 1, ἀποθέμενοι τὴν εὐπερίστατον ἄμ.; ver. 4, πρὸς τὴν ἄμ. ἀνταγωνιζόμενοι; 1 John iii. 4, 8, ὁ ποιῶν τὴν ἄμ.; cf. ver. 7, ὁ ποιῶν τὴν δικαιοσύνην (cf. Rom. vi. 18). Ver. 4, ἡ ἄμ. ἐστὶν ἡ ἀνομία. Other combinations, Rom. vi. 6, τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἄμ., the body ruled by sin, cf. ver. 12, see σάρξ; vii. 17, 20, ἡ οἰκοῦσα ἐν ἐμοὶ ἄμ., cf. Heb. xii. 1. According to this, sin is not merely the quality of an action, but a principle manifesting itself in the conduct of the subject. Rom. vii. 14, πεπραμένος ὑπὸ τὴν ἄμ., ver. 23; viii. 2, ὁ νόμος τῆς ἁμαρτίας, see νόμος. Rom. vi. 7, δεδικαίωται ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας, see δικαιοῦν. 2 Thess. ii. 3, ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῆς ἄμ., the man of sin, as the personal embodiment of sin. Rom. vi. 23; Heb. iii. 13. So also ἡ ἄμ., in John viii. 34, ὁ ποιῶν τὴν ἄμ. δοῦλός ἐστιν τῆς ἁμαρτίας; i. 29, ὁ αἶρων τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου,—the collective sin (*vid. supr.*). John viii. 21, ἐν τῇ ἄμ. ὑμῶν ἀποθανεῖσθε. Without the article, ἁμαρτία, like δικαιοσύνη, κακία, πονηρία, according to a common custom of classical writers, is used where the reference is to the conception itself (embodied in the individual manifestations), and not to the collective sum of manifestations; so in 2 Cor. v. 21, τὸν μὴ γνόντα ἄμ. ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησεν, *Him who knew no sin has He made sin.* Gal. ii. 17, Χριστὸς ἁμαρτίας διάκονος; Rom. vii. 7, ὁ νόμος ἁμαρτία; vi. 16, δοῦλοί ἐστε ᾧ ὑπακούετε, ἦτοι ἁμαρτίας . . . ἡ ὑπακοῆς; vii. 8, where first ἀφορμὴν λαβοῦσα ἡ ἄμ., then: χωρὶς γὰρ νόμου ἁμαρτία νεκρά; vii. 25, viii. 3, σάρξ ἁμαρτίας; ver. 10, τὸ σῶμα νεκρὸν διὰ ἁμαρτίαν; xiv. 23, ὃ οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως ἄμ. ἐστίν; iii. 9, πάντας ὑφ' ἁμαρτίαν εἶναι; Gal. iii. 22; Rom. viii. 3, iii. 20; Heb. iv. 15, ix. 28, 26, xi. 25; Jas. ii. 9, iv. 17; 1 Pet. ii. 22, iv. 1; 2 Pet. ii. 14; 1 John i. 8, iii. 5, 9, v. 17. Here must be reckoned also the expression περὶ ἁμαρτίας = *sin-offering*, LXX. = $\pi\eta\mu\epsilon\tau\eta$, Heb. x. 6, 8, 18 (xiii. 11, Received text; Tisch. omits). Ἄμαρτία = *sin-offering*, Lev. vi. 25.

(II.) The singular also may denote a single sinful action, inasmuch as the generic name appertains also to the individual instance; the general idea is applied to the particular case. In Paul's writings, however, only in Rom. iv. 8; 2 Cor. xi. 7. Then in Jas. i. 15; 1 John i. 7, v. 16, 17; Acts vii. 60; John xix. 11, viii. 46, ix. 41, xv. 22, 24, xvi. 8, 9. The plural also is rare in Paul: Rom. vii. 5, xi. 25, iv. 7; 1 Cor. xv. 3, 17; Gal. i. 4; Eph. ii. 1; Col. i. 14; 1 Thess. ii. 16; 1 Tim. v. 22, 24; 2 Tim. iii. 6 (Paul uses instead of ἁμαρτία in this sense, παράπτωμα, παράβασις). On the other hand, the Synoptics use only the plural, especially in the connections ἀφιέναι τὰς ἁμαρτίας, ἄφεσις τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν. Matt. ix. 2, 5, 6, xxvi. 28; Mark i. 1, ii. 5, 7, 9, 10; Luke i. 77, iii. 3, v. 20, 21, 23, 24, vii. 47, 48, 49, xi. 4, xxiv. 47; Acts ii. 38, v. 31, xiii. 38, xxvi. 18. The same combination, Col. i. 14; 1 John i. 9, ii. 12, iii. 5; John xx. 23. Other combinations, Acts iii. 19, ἐξαλειφθῆναι τὰς ἁμαρτίας; xxii. 16, ἀπόλυσαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας; Heb. x. 4, ἀφαιρεῖν ἄμ.; x. 11, περιελεῖν ἄμ.; 1 Pet. ii. 24, ταῖς ἄμ. ἀπογενόμενοι. The combination τὰς or τὴν ἄμ. αἶρειν, John i. 29, 1 John iii. 5, corresponds to the Hebrew נָשָׂא וְנָשָׂא , Lev. v. 1, xvi. 21, 22, xix. 8, xx. 17, Num. v. 31, Ezek. iv. 5, xviii. 19, where LXX. λαμβάνειν τὴν ἄμ. (cf. Ezek. xviii. 19, 20, xxxiii. 10). Isa. liii. 12, where LXX.

—ἀναφέρειν, cf. 1 Pet. ii. 24; Num. xiv. 33. But *נָשָׂא* signifies both *to bear sin*, because it is punished, and *to bear sin away*. In the latter sense only, the LXX. have αἶρειν ἐξαίρειν, 1 Sam. xv. 25, xxv. 28; cf. Ex. xxviii. 38, ἐξαίρειν τὰ ἁμαρτήματα τῶν ἁγίων. Here, however (comp. Lev. xx. 19, ἁμαρτίαν ἀποίσονται), as in those other connections, the idea of an assumption of sin for punishment or expiation (Num. xviii. 1, 23; cf. Ex. xxviii. 38) seems to lie at the basis. Cf. Isa. liii. 11, לִבִּי, and the connection there. Αἱ ἁμαρτίαι, besides Matt. i. 21, iii. 6,—Mark i. 5; John viii. 24, ix. 34 (Eph. ii. 1, Rec. text); Heb. i. 3, ii. 17, v. 1, 3, vii. 27, viii. 12, ix. 28, x. 2, 3, 12, 17, 26; Jas. v. 16, 20; 1 Pet. iv. 8; 2 Pet. i. 9; 1 John i. 9, ii. 2, iv. 10; Rev. i. 5, xviii. 4, 5. Cf. δικαιοσύνη, 1 Sam. xxvi. 23. Cf. Bernhardt, *Synt.* 62 sq.

Ἀμαρτωλός, ὁ, ἡ, only in bibl. and eccl. Greek, *peccable, sinful*, LXX. = נִשְׂיָּ, נִשְׂיָּ. As an adj., Mark viii. 38; Luke v. 8, xix. 17, xxiv. 7; John ix. 16, 24; Rom. vii. 13. As a subst., *sinner*, opp. to δίκαιος, Matt. ix. 13; Mark ii. 17; Luke v. 32; syn. ἀσεβής, 1 Tim. i. 9; Jude 15; ἄπιστος, Rev. xxi. 8. Connected with τελώνης, Matt. ix. 10, 11, xi. 19; Mark ii. 15, 16 (Luke v. 30; Tisch. omits ἄμ., Cod. Sin. ἀσεβής), vii. 34, xv. 1. The τελῶναι were in bad repute among Jews and Greeks; cf. Luc. Menipp. 11, πορνοβοσκοὶ καὶ τελῶναι. Plut. περὶ πολυπραγμ.; 518 E, τοὺς τελῶνας βαρυνόμεθα καὶ δυσχεραίνομεν κ.τ.λ.—Also in Luke vi. 32, 33, 34, vii. 37, 39, xiii. 2, xv. 2, 7, 10, xviii. 13; John ix. 25, 31 (opp. παρὰ θεοῦ, ver. 16); Rom. iii. 7, v. 8, 19; Gal. ii. 15, 17; 1 Tim. i. 15; Heb. vii. 26, xii. 3; Jas. iv. 8, v. 20; 1 Pet. iv. 18.

Ἀναμάρτητος, ὁ, not uncommonly used by classical writers in the sense, *one who has not sinned*; more rarely (Plat.) = *without error, infallible*.—John viii. 7, ὁ ἀναμάρτητος ὑμῶν.

Ἀμνός, ὁ, the lamb. After John i. 29, 36, ἰδὲ ὁ ἄμνός τοῦ θεοῦ, it became usual to designate Christ, *agnus Dei*. In Rev. τὸ ἀρνίον, τ. ἁ. τὸ ἐσφαγμένον.—ἄρνός in later Greek instead of ἄμνός. It is a question, In what sense is the name applied to Christ? The demonstrative use of the article seems to imply a well-known idea, something expected; cf. Krüger, § 1. 2. 1–3. The reference to Isa. liii. 7, 12, cf. Acts viii. 32, where the point of comparison is solely the resignation of *a lamb*, is too faintly indicated; the comparison of the servant of Jehovah to an enduring lamb is not sufficiently striking as an image of Messianic expectation to connect with it the description of Christ as the well-known Lamb of God. To the Paschal lamb, on the contrary,—ἀπὸ τῶν ἀρνῶν λήψετε, Ex. xii. 5,—with its significance for Israel (Ex. xii. 14, 27), and as the only lamb to which special significance was attached within the divinely ordered life of Israel (cf. Lev. xiv. 10 sqq.; Num. vi. 12; Ex. xxix. 38 sqq.), the expression ὁ ἄμνός τοῦ θεοῦ, the Lamb provided by God (Gen. xxii. 8), might intelligibly be referred. This view is decidedly confirmed by the coincidence of the death of Jesus with the Passover, cf. 1 Cor. v. 7; it is favoured by the nearness of the Passover in John ii. 13, and by the

significance of the deliverance of Israel out of Egypt; concerning which Crusius justly says, *Hypomm. ad theol. proph.* i. 225: "*Res quae in exitu ex Aegyp̄tia—e—venerunt—revera futurarum rerum typi fuerunt.*" Cf. Ezek. xx. 33 sqq.; Jer. xvi. 14; Hab. iii., and especially Rev. xv. 3, xiv. 1; Delitzsch on *Hab.* iii. 3–15, p. 139. Luthardt remarks on John i. 29: "We know what profound significance the deliverance of the people from Egypt had, both for Israel's history, for its knowledge of salvation, and for the entire prophetic representation of the future redemption. It was a fact so unique, that none can be compared with it save the day of the new redemption, which has in turn in no fact of the O. T. history so appropriate a type as in it. Now the Baptist knew that the day of the new and final salvation had dawned, and in Jesus he recognised the bringer in of that day. Why, then, should he not compare this salvation and the bringer in of it above all with that first typical deliverance of Israel? But the lamb was then the means of sparing the people; on account of it, destruction passed them by. In like manner Jesus will now be the means of sparing; those who are willing to use Him for the purpose shall for His sake escape the judgment of God. Now, however, all is widened. Redemption, as well as judgment, concerns the whole world." Cf. Hofmann, *Schriftbeweis*, ii. 1, 295 ff. To this is added the liturgical expression ὁ αἶρει τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, which is used only of the atoning sacrifices, and therefore indicates that ὁ ἄμνος τ. θ. is meant in the sense of a sacrifice.—According to Hofmann, the adjectives ἄμνος καὶ ἄσπιλος prove that 1 Pet. i. 19, ἐλυτρώθητε . . . τιμὴ αἵματι ὡς ἁμνοῦ ἁμώμου καὶ ἀσπίλου Χριστοῦ, also refers to the Paschal lamb, or, at all events, to a "lamb given up to death in the service of God." The designation of Christ as ἀρνίον in the Apocalypse seems at least to imply that this representation was current and common in the early Christian range of thought. *Vid. ἀρνίον.*

Ἄνθρωπος, ὁ, *man*,—generic name, in distinction from gods and the lower animals; cf. Luke ii. 15, 52; Matt. xii. 12; Mark x. 27; Matt. viii. 9, etc. LXX. = אָדָם, אִישׁ, אַנְשָׁא, אָנָשׁ, and other words. In N. T. Greek, and specially in the Pauline writings, the word has in certain connections a peculiar use.

(I.) Κατὰ ἄνθρωπον, *e.g.* λέγειν, Rom. iii. 5, Gal. iii. 15; λαλεῖν, 1 Cor. ix. 8; περιπατεῖν, 1 Cor. iii. 3; ἐθνηριομάχησα, 1 Cor. xv. 32; τὸ εὐαγγέλιον οὐκ ἔστιν κ. ἄνθρ., Gal. i. 11. For a contrast to κατὰ ἄνθρ., *vid.* 1 Cor. ix. 8, κατὰ τὸν νόμον, κατὰ τὸν θεόν; Gal. i. 12, δι' ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Cf. 1 Cor. iii. 3, σαρκικοί ἐστε, καὶ κατὰ ἄνθρωπον περιπατεῖτε; cf. ver. 4, ἄνθρωποι ἐστε. According hereto, the expression contains a reference to that peculiarity of man, by virtue of which he finds himself in a certain opposition to God and His revelation,—a reference, namely, to his carnal or corporeal (σαρκικός) character, *vid.* σὰρξ; cf. 1 Cor. iii. 3, 4, σαρκικοί ἐστε . . . ἄνθρωποι ἐστε; 1 Pet. iv. 2, ἀνθρώπων ἐπιθυμίαις . . . θελήματι θεοῦ βιώσαι. The context must show what special aspect of this sarcical determinateness is meant; *e.g.* Rom. iii. 5 refers back to ver. 4, cf. ver. 7, ἡ ἀλήθεια τοῦ θεοῦ . . . τὸ ἐμὸν ψεῦσμα. In 1 Cor. xv. 32 the

contrast would perhaps be κατὰ πίστιν, ver. 17; κατὰ ἐλπίδα τῆς ἀναστάσεως, ver. 19.—With Gal. i. 11 cf. 1 Cor. ii. 4, 5, τὸ κήρυγμά μου οὐκ ἐν πειθοῖς σοφίας λόγοις, ἀλλ' ἐν ἀποδείξει πνεύματος καὶ δυνάμεως, ἵνα κ.τ.λ. Cf. ἀνθρώπινος.

(II.) ὁ ἔσω ἄνθρωπος . . . ὁ ἔσωθεν, 2 Cor. iv. 16; ὁ ἔσω ἄνθρ., Eph. iii. 16. The same contrast in 1 Pet. iii. 3, 4, ὁ ἔσωθεν ἐμπλοκῆς τριχῶν . . . κόσμος . . . ὁ κρυπτός τῆς καρδίας ἄνθρ. ἐν τῷ ἀφθάρτῳ τοῦ . . . πνεύματος. This expression corresponds to the contrast between σῶμα and πνεῦμα, and, indeed, more exactly to that between σῶμα τῆς σαρκός and πνεῦμα, σάρξ, and καρδιά, Rom. ii. 28, 29, Eph. iii. 17, so that ὁ ἔσω ἄνθρωπος denotes not in general the inner distinctive character of the man, but the divine in him, the inner spiritual and divine nature of the man in its antagonism to the σάρξ,—cf. Rom. vii. 22, συνήδομαι τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ θεοῦ κατὰ τὸν ἔσω ἄνθρωπον,—not merely in contrast to its outward appearance. It does not, however, quite answer to the contrast between νοῦς and σάρξ in Rom. vii. 25, for ὁ ἔσω ἄνθρωπος denotes less than σάρξ. The ἔσω ἄνθρωπος embraces that which, according to various aspects, is designated in the words νοῦς, πνεῦμα, καρδιά; in such wise, however, that the reference to πνεῦμα predominates, in harmony with the use of πνεῦμα in Rom. i. 9; 1 Cor. v. 5; 2 Cor. vii. 1; cf. πνεῦμα τοῦ νοός, Eph. iv. 23. As it is the ἔσω ἄνθρωπος which experiences renewal, 2 Cor. iv. 15, strengthening by the Spirit, Eph. iii. 16, cf. Luke i. 80, and to which belongs the approval of a life devoted to God, Rom. vii. 22, we are warranted in regarding it as a synonym for πνεῦμα, as used in Matt. v. 3, Rom. viii. 10,—cf. the observations, *s.v.* πνεῦμα,—and, indeed, in such a manner that ὁ ἔσω ἄνθρωπος denotes the πνεῦμα as reflected in the νοῦς or self-consciousness. This accordingly decides the question whether the expression applies to the regenerate or unregenerate man. In the sense in which both possess πνεῦμα, ἔσω ἄνθρωπος may be applied to both. By means of this expression, this πνεῦμα is defined as the proper, true man, after deducting that which is visible to the fleshly eye, 2 Cor. iv. 16, cf. 1 Cor. v. 5. Cf. the passage quoted by Wetstein and Tholuck on Rom. vii. 22, from *Jalkut Rub.* f. x. 3: "*Spiritus est homo interior, cujus vestis corpus est.*" Plat. *Rep.* ix. 589 A, τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὁ ἐντὸς ἄνθρωπος ἐστὶ ἐγκρατέστατος = τὸ λογιστικὸν τῆς ψυχῆς; *Rep.* iv. 439 D; Plotin. *Ennead.* i. 1. 10, θηρίον δὲ ζωθὲν τὸ σῶμα, ὁ δὲ ἀληθὴς ἄνθρωπος ἄλλος. This Platonic reflection, with its identification of the intellectual and moral nature, may be regarded as the expression, in Platonic form, of a presentiment of the truth, such as readily dawns on the human mind; but we must not therefore suppose that St. Paul's expression had this basis,—it was the outcome rather of his own moral and religious experience in its harmony with the words of divine revelation, 1 Sam. xvi. 7, Ps. xl. 9, Joel ii. 13, etc., just as set forth by himself, in Rom. vii., in the autobiography of the divided ἐγώ. Nor can the passage from Philo (that adduced by Lösner on 1 Pet. iii. 4, *de Gig.* 228 D, ed. Par., 267 ed. Mang., ὁ πρὸς ἀλήθειαν ἄνθρωπος, is irrelevant), *de congr. quaer. erud. grat.* p. 533, ed. Mang., τὸν εὐεργέτην ἐπαινεῖν διδασκόμεθα . . . ἐπὶ τῷ νῷ, ὃς κυρίως εἰπεῖν, ἄνθρωπός ἐστιν ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ, κρείττων ἐν χείρονι, ἀθάνατος ἐν θνητῷ, be regarded as indicating another basis of the Pauline and Petrine

expression; for it is itself a Platonic growth, as the words immediately succeeding show, τὸ γὰρ πρῶτον καὶ ἄριστον ἐν ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς ὁ λογισμὸς ἐστὶ, καὶ ἄξιον τῆς συνέσεως καὶ ἀγχινοίας, καταλήψεώς τε καὶ φρονήσεως, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων δυνάμεων, ὅσα περὶ αὐτόν εἰσιν, ἀπαρχὰς ἀνατιθέναι τῷ θεῷ τῷ τὴν εὐφορίαν τοῦ διανοεῖσθαι παρασχόντι. Between this idea and the Pauline view there is the difference which distinguishes moral volition from intelligence. It is important, however, to find here a view in which the vague anticipations and aberrations of the heathen mind are brought back to the truth. Cf. Tholuck on Rom. vii. 22; Harless on Eph. iii. 16.

(III.) ὁ παλαιὸς, καινὸς ἄνθρωπος. This expression also is peculiar to the Pauline writings. Rom. vi. 6, ὁ παλαιὸς ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος συνεσταυρώθη, ἵνα καταργηθῇ τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας, τοῦ μηκέτι δουλεύειν ἡμᾶς τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ; Eph. iv. 22–24, ἀποθέσθαι . . . τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον, τὸν φθειρόμενον κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τῆς ἀπάτης· ἀνανεοῦσθαι δὲ τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ νοὸς ὑμῶν, καὶ ἐνδύσασθαι τὸν καινὸν ἄνθρωπον, τὸν κατὰ θεὸν κτισθέντα ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ κ.τ.λ.; Col. iii. 9, 10, ἀπεκδυσάμενοι τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον σὺν ταῖς πράξεσιν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐνδυσάμενοι τὸν νέον, τὸν ἀνακαινούμενον εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτόν. As generic conceptions, both of them designate a particular mode or manifestation of human nature, and, indeed, ὁ καινὸς ἄνθρωπος, humanity as renewed after the image of God, Eph. iv. 24; Col. iii. 10, ὁ παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος, on the contrary, human nature as it is in contrast with this renewal, as the individual is naturally,—accordingly similar to σάρξ, *vid.* Rom. vi. 6, ἵνα καταργηθῇ τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας, cf. *s.v.* σάρξ; cf. Gal. v. 24, οἱ δὲ τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ τὴν σάρκα ἐσταύρωσαν, with Rom. vi. 6, only with the distinction that whereas σάρξ and πνεῦμα denote vital forces, principles, and define the form in which they appertain to man, ὁ παλαιὸς and ὁ καινὸς ἄνθρωπος express the result and outcome of the principles in question. Cf. Eph. iv. 23 with ver. 24; Col. iii. 9. This suggests also the explanation of Eph. ii. 15, ἵνα τοὺς δύο κτίσῃ ἐν ἑαυτῷ εἰς ἓνα καινὸν ἄνθρωπον. Cf. Chrys. *in loc.*, ὁρᾷς οὐχὶ τὸν Ἕλληνα γεγόμενον Ἰουδαῖον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦτον κἀκεῖνον εἰς ἑτέραν κατάστασιν ἤκοντας. Cf. Gal. iii. 28, πάντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς εἰς ἓστε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. Inasmuch as one and the same species of human nature is communicated in like manner to both, the difference between them ceases; the one as well as the other is a καινὸς ἄνθρωπος.

(IV.) The word ἄνθρωπος is used in classical Greek with the subordinate idea of what is despicable or the object of compassion, both in connection with the names of persons and alone (cf. John xix. 15, Ἴδε ὁ ἄνθρωπος); to this corresponds its use in the N. T., where reference is made to the distinction between man and God, Heb. ii. 6, viii. 2, Rom. ix. 20, ii. 1, cf. Jas. ii. 20; especially in his conduct toward the revelation and messengers of God = the man whose conduct is opposed to God, the man whose way or nature it is to act in opposition to God, e.g. syn. ἁμαρτωλός, Mark ix. 31, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδοται εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπων; Matt. xvii. 22; Luke ix. 44; cf. Mark xiv. 41, εἰς χεῖρας τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν. Matt. xxvi. 45. So in Matt. x. 17, προσέχετε ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων· παραδώσουσι γὰρ κ.τ.λ. Gal. i. 10, 11; Eph. iv. 14; Col. ii. 8, 22, and other places.

Ἀνθρώπινος, *ίνη, ον*, human, like ἀνθρώπειος in the Tragedians, used especially by Xen., Plato (along with the rarer ἀνθρώπειος in the same connections, e.g. φύσις, γένος, πρῶγμα, κ.τ.λ.), also by Herod., Thucyd., Aristotle. Whilst ἀνθρώπειος denotes properly what belongs to man, ἀνθρώπινος seems originally to express a quality or attribute, in or by which what man is, is represented (-ινος being a termination which marks the material); hence, what or how man or human nature is, what is peculiar to it; Plat. *Legg.* iv. 713 C, ὡς ἀνθρωπεία φύσις οὐδεμία ἱκανὴ τὰ ἀνθρώπινα διοικοῦσα αὐτοκράτωρ πάντα μὴ οὐχ ὑβρεῶς τε καὶ ἀδικίας μεστοῦσθαι; *Phaed.* 107 C, ὑπὸ τοῦ μεγέθους, περὶ ὧν οἱ λόγοι εἰσὶ, καὶ τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην ἀσθενείαν ἀτιμάζων ἀναγκάζομαι; Xenoph. and Thucyd., ἀνθρώπινα, ἀνθρωπίνως ἀμαρτεῖν. Ἀνθρώπινος therefore suits such connections as Rom. vi. 19, ἀνθρώπινον λέγω διὰ τὴν ἀσθενείαν τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν; 1 Cor. ii. 13, λαλοῦμεν οὐκ ἐν διδακτοῖς ἀνθρωπίνης σοφίας λόγοις; 1 Cor. iv. 3, ἵνα ἀνακριθῶ ὑπὸ ἀνθρωπίνης ἡμέρας, where the fleshliness characteristic of human nature is referred to; 1 Cor. x. 13, πειρασμὸς ἀνθρώπινος, a temptation answering to the powers, or rather to the weakness, of human nature. Some reference of this kind lies also perhaps in Acts xvii. 25, οὐδὲ ὑπὸ χειρῶν ἀνθρωπίνων θεραπεύεται.—Elsewhere also in Jas. iii. 7, φύσις ἀνθρωπίνη, opp. to φύσις θηρίων; 1 Pet. ii. 13, ὑποτάγητε πάσῃ ἀνθρωπίνῃ κτίσει.

Ἄνω, up, on high, John xi. 41, Heb. xii. 15; above, John ii. 7; Acts ii. 19, ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἄνω . . . ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς κάτω.—Equivalent to ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, heaven viewed in its natural and moral antagonism to, and distance from, earth; so Col. iii. 1, 2, τὰ ἄνω ζητεῖτε, φρονεῖτε; Gal. iv. 26, ἡ ἄνω Ἱερουσαλήμ, opposed to τῇ νῦν Ἱερουσ. in ver. 25; Phil. iii. 14, ἡ ἄνω κλήσις; cf. Heb. iii. 1, κλήσις ἐπουράνιος, *vid. s.v. κλήσις*. On John viii. 23, ἐγὼ ἐκ τῶν ἄνω εἰμί, Stier explains the opposite κάτω of Hades as the place of destruction, appealing to Matt. xi. 23, Eph. iv. 9, and עֲלֵיךָ מִן הַיָּדֵיךָ, Ps. lxiii. 10, Ezek. xxvi. 20, Ps. cxxxix. 15, etc. This contrast, ὑμεῖς ἐκ τῶν κάτω ἐστὲ, ἐγὼ κ.τ.λ., does, indeed, mean more than John iii. 31, ὁ ἄνωθεν ἐρχόμενος . . . ὁ ὢν ἐκ τῆς γῆς, to wit, not as here, primarily a difference of degree or of place (ἐπάνω πάντων ἐστίν), but an ethical antagonism; cf. the succeeding ὑμεῖς ἐκ τούτου τοῦ κόσμου κ.τ.λ. But there is no parallel to warrant our taking Hades as the local source or determining basis of human corruption; it is always represented as its end and goal. Cf. *ἄβυσσος*.

Ἄνωθεν, of place, from above downwards; of time, from of old, long since, from the beginning, ἄνωθεν ἄρχεσθαι, etc. The context must decide in which sense it is used. (1) Of place, Matt. xxv. 51; Mark xv. 38; John xix. 23. Corresponding to ἄνω = ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, namely, with predominant reference to the distance between heaven and earth, cf. Ps. ciii. 11. So in John iii. 31, ὁ ἄνωθεν ἐρχόμενος . . . ὁ ὢν ἐκ τῆς γῆς; John xix. 11; Jas. i. 17, iii. 15, 17, ἡ ἄνωθεν σοφία. (2) Of time, from the commencement, from of old; Acts xxvi. 5, *from the beginning*; Luke i. 3, παρακολουθεῖν ἄνωθεν; Gal. iv. 9, πάλιν ἄνωθεν δουλεύειν. So also John iii. 3, 7, ἄνωθεν γεννηθῆναι; cf. *δεύτερον*,

ver. 4; further, Matt. xviii. 3, ἐὰν μὴ γένησθε ὡς τὰ παιδιά; as also the expressions ἀναγεννᾶν, καινὴ κτίσις, 1 Pet. i. 3, 23; Tit. iii. 5; 2 Cor. v. 17. Justin Mart. *Apol.* i. 61 καὶ γὰρ ὁ Χριστὸς εἶπεν ἂν μὴ ἀναγεννηθῆτε, οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθῃτε εἰς τὴν βασ. So also Syr., Copt., Arab. Cf. especially John iii. 12, where τὰ ἐπουράνια denote something different from ἄνωθεν γεννηθῆναι, vv. 3, 7, which must rather be classed among the ἐπίγεια.

Ἀπλοῦς, ἡ, οὖν, *single*; transferred in classical Greek from the physical sphere to the sphere of morals and religion, *simple, artless, plain*; joined, when used in a moral sense, with ἀληθής, γενναῖος, σαφής = *sincere, faithful, pure, without dissimulation, open*. Xen. *Anab.* ii. 6. 22, συντομωτάτην ὥστε οὐδὲν εἶναι διὰ τοῦ ἐπιτοκεῖν τε καὶ ψεύδεσθαι καὶ ἔξαπατᾶν, τὸ δὲ ἀπλοῦν τε καὶ ἀληθές ἐνόμιζε τὸ αὐτὸ τῷ ἡλιθίῳ εἶναι. So ἀπλότης, Xen. *Hell.* vi. 1. 6 = *sincerity, fidelity*. Plato, *Rep.* ii. 382 E, κομιδὴ ἄρα ὁ θεὸς ἀπλοῦν καὶ ἀληθές ἐν τε ἔργῳ καὶ ἐν λόγῳ. Legg. v. 738 E, ὅπως μήτε αὐτὸς κίβδηλός ποτε φανέται ὁφθαλμοῖς, ἀπλοῦς δὲ καὶ ἀληθής αἰεὶ, μήτε ἄλλος τοιοῦτος ὧν αὐτὸν διαπατήσῃ. *Rep.* ii. 361 B, ἄνδρα ἀπλοῦν καὶ γενναῖον κατ' Αἰσχύλον, οὐ δοκεῖν, ἀλλ' εἶναι ἀγαθὸν ἐθέλοντα. Aristoph. *Plut.* 1158, οὐ γὰρ δόλου νῦν ἔργον, ἀλλ' ἀπλῶν τρόπων. It might be contrasted with the N. T. δίψυχος . . . ὑποκριτής. It occurs also in this sense still in later Greek, as in Diod. v. 21, xiii. 76, ἄκακος καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ἀπλοῦς; yet we find Aristotle and Isocr. already using the word, with some degree of contempt, to denote spiritual, and especially intellectual, narrowness, with which is associated not indeed a lower morality, but some degree, though small, of meanness; as e.g. Plut. *Mor.* 63 B, among πονηροὶ καὶ ἀνελεύθεροὶ καὶ γόητες are specified the ἀπλούστεροὶ and πανουργότεροὶ. Isocr. *ad Nicocol.* 24 A, ἀπλοῦς δὲ ἡγούνται τοὺς νοῦν οὐκ ἔχοντας.

Of this latter usage not the least trace is to be found in the LXX., the Apocr., or the N. T. The LXX., indeed, use the adj. only in that difficult passage, Prov. xi. 25 (with which Schleusner appropriately compares the N. T. ἀπλότης in 2 Cor. viii. 2, etc.). Ἀπλότης, on the contrary, is in a moral sense = 𐤀𐤓𐤕, 1 Chron. xxix. 17, ἐν ἀπλότητι καρδίας προεθυμήθην ταῦτα. = 𐤀𐤓𐤕, 2 Sam. xv. 11, πορευόμενοι ἐν τῇ ἀπλότητι αὐτῶν καὶ οὐκ ἔγνωσαν πᾶν ῥήμα; Prov. xix. 1, πτωχὸς πορευόμενος ἐν ἀπλότητι αὐτοῦ. Wisd. i. 1; 1 Macc. ii. 37, 60. Ἀπλοῦν = 𐤀𐤓𐤕, *Hiphil*, Job xxii. 3, ὅτι ἀπλώσης τὴν ὁδόν σου, parallel with τοῖς ἔργοις ἄμεμπτος εἶναι. The adv. ἀπλῶς, Prov. x. 10, πορεύεσθαι ἀπλῶς = 𐤀𐤓𐤕. Aq., Symm., Theodot. sometimes render 𐤀𐤓𐤕 by ἀπλότης; LXX., besides = ἀλήθεια, ἀκακία, ὁσιότης, καθαρῶς; Aq. = ἀκακία, ἀθωότης; Symm. ἀμωμότης. LXX. 𐤀𐤓𐤕 = ἄμωμος, ἄμεμπτος, ἄκακος, ἄπλαστος; 𐤀𐤓𐤕 = ὅλος, ὁλόκληρος, τέλειος, ἀθῶος, ἄμεμπτος, but not = ἀπλοῦς. 𐤀𐤓𐤕, 𐤀𐤓𐤕 (save once, see above) are not rendered by ἀπλοῦς and its derivatives.

We can hardly therefore call in the analogy of this Hebrew word to establish the fact that ἀπλοῦς in Luke xi. 34, Matt. vi. 22, ἐὰν ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου ἀπλοῦς ᾖ, must mean *sound*, in antithesis with πονηρός. This antithesis itself sanctions this meaning,—a meaning which would not have been strange to a Greek ear; cf. Demosth., ed. Reisk., 325. 17, πάντα ταῦτα

ἰγιῶς καὶ ἀπλῶς καὶ δικαίως πεπολίτευμαι. Perhaps this use of ἀπλοῦς was occasioned partly by the connection of the discourse, in which (ver. 24) all double-mindedness and indecision are condemned, and partly by a reference to the parallelism with τὸ φῶς τὸ ἐν σοι, cf. οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ τῆς καρδίας, Eph. i. 18, Acts xxvi. 28, xxviii. 27, Rom. xi. 8, 10, 1 John ii. 11, Rev. iii. 18, and ἀπλότης τῆς καρδίας, Eph. vi. 5; Col. iii. 22. Certainly ἀπλοῦς and πονηρός in this connection denote not moral behaviour (Meyer), but states or conditions; cf. Mark vii. 22, where ὀφθαλμὸς πον. occurs in quite another sense. Philo, *de cond. mundi*. i. 12, ὅπερ νοῦς ἐν ψυχῇ, τοῦτο ὀφθαλμὸς ἐν σώματι.

The adverb ἀπλῶς only in Jas. i. 5, τοῦ διδόντος θεοῦ πᾶσιν ἀπλῶς καὶ μὴ ὀνειδίζοντος. See ἀπλότης. Cf. Dem. 288. 12, ἀπλῶς ἔδωκα ὑμῖν ἑμαντόν. Reisk., *sine tergiversatione; of a sincere trusty heart*.

Ἀπλότης, ἡ, in the N. T. only in a moral sense, and indeed (1) generally = simplicity, purity, sincerity, faithfulness, *plenitude*; Eph. vi. 5, ὑπακούετε τοῖς κυρίοις . . . ἐν ἀπλότητι τῆς καρδίας ὑμῶν. Col. iii. 22.—2 Cor. xi. 3, μὴ πως ὡς ὁ ὄφεις ἐξηπάτησεν Εὐάν ἐν τῇ πανουργίᾳ αὐτοῦ, οὕτως φθαρῇ τὰ νοήματα ὑμῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀπλότητος τῆς εἰς Χριστόν; cf. Plato, *Legg.* v. 738 E. Plut. *Mor.* 63 B, under ἀπλοῦς.—In 2 Cor. i. 12, instead of ἐν ἀπλότητι καὶ εἰλικρινείᾳ, the truer reading is perhaps ἀγιότητι; (2) specially, sincerity, faithfulness towards others, manifest in helpfulness and giving assistance; cf. ἀπλῶς. Xen. *Mem.* iv. 2. 16, διορισώμεθα πάλιν πρὸς μὲν τοὺς πολεμίους δίκαιον εἶναι τὰ τοιαῦτα ποιεῖν (*sc.* κλέπτειν, ἀρπάζειν), πρὸς δὲ τοὺς φίλους ἄδικον, ἀλλὰ δεῖν πρὸς γε τούτους ὡς ἀπλούστατον εἶναι, where it is evidently equivalent to faithful and benevolent.

This signification completely suits the N. T. passages in question, without substituting the meaning *liberalitas*, and thus it may most simply be taken as akin to the first meaning. Cf. 2 Cor. viii. 2, ἡ πτωχεία αὐτῶν ἐπερίσσευσεν εἰς πλοῦτος τῆς ἀπλότητος αὐτῶν, with ver. 3, ὅτι κατὰ δύναμιν καὶ παρὰ δύναμιν αὐθαίρετοι. Rom. xii. 8; 2 Cor. ix. 11, 13.

Ἀρά, ἡ, originally *vox media*: Prayer, cf. *Il.* xv. 378, etc.; oftener the imprecation of something evil, a curse or imprecation which the Deity is to execute, opp. εὐχή; cf. Plat. *Alc.* ii. 143 B; see κατάρρα. Then the evil imprecated, the mischief itself, the realized curse. *Vid.* Lexica. LXX. = אָרָה, both in the sense *oath*, Gen. xxiv. 41, xxvi. 28, 1 Kings viii. 31; and in that of imprecation, curse, Num. v. 20, ὅρκοι τῆς ἀρᾶς ταύτης; Ps. x. 7. Also = אָרָה, Deut. xxix. 18, etc. In the N. T. Rom. iii. 14, ὧν τὸ στόμα ἀρᾶς καὶ πικρίας γέμει; cf. Ps. x. 7. The compound κατάρρα is more usual.

Ἐπάρατος, as Lachm. and Tisch. read in John vii. 49, instead of ἐπικατάρματος (which see), from ἐπαράομαι, the compound commonly used in classical Greek instead of the ἐπικαταράομαι of biblical Greek.

Κατάρρα, ἡ, imprecation, curse. Polyb. xxiv. 8. 7, κατάρραι γίνονται κατὰ τινος; Plat. *Alc.* ii. 143 B, τοῦτο κατάρρα τινὲ ἀλλ' οὐκ εὐχῇ ὅμοιον ἂν εἴη. Cf. Jas. iii. 10, opp.

to εὐλογία: ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ στόματος ἐξέρχεται εὐλογία καὶ κατάρα. The same antithesis in Heb. vi. 8, Gal. iii. 13, only that in these, as well as in the remaining passages, *the curse proceeding from God, the rejection and surrender to punishment, to the destruction of judgment*, is meant; κρίσις ἀνέλεος, Jas. ii. 12; cf. Deut. xxviii. 15 ff. Heb. vi. 8, γῆ . . . ἀδόκιμος καὶ κατάρας ἐγγὺς, ἥς τὸ τέλος εἰς καὺσιν; 2 Pet. ii. 14, κατάρας τέκνα; cf. 2 Thess. ii. 3, ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας; Wisd. xii. 10, 11, σπέρμα ἦν κατηραμένον ἀπ' ἀρχῆς. Gal. iii. 10, ὑπὸ κατάραν εἶναι, opp. to εὐλογεῖσθαι, ver. 9, answers to the ἐπικατάρατος in ver. 10 (q.v.); ver. 13, ἡ κατάρα τοῦ νόμου, is *the curse pronounced in the law*, cf. Dan. ix. 11, both as *the sentence of the divine judgment and the ruin therein inflicted, the manifested curse*. Here we have the explanation of the expression Χριστὸς γενόμενος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν κατάρα = *the realized sentence of curse* and Christ are not to be separated from each other; cf. 2 Cor. vi. 21, ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν Χριστὸν ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησεν, ἵνα ἡμεῖς γινώμεθα δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ; Isa. xix. 24, 25, יְהִי־כֹכָבִים בְּרֹאשׁ הָאָרֶץ בְּרֹאשׁ הָאָרֶץ בְּרֹאשׁ הָאָרֶץ; Ezek. xxxiv. 26; Zech. viii. 13.—In Isa. xix. 14, the LXX. renders the abstract by the concrete εὐλογημένος (Zech., i.e., ἐν εὐλογίᾳ), as in Deut. xxi. 23 (Gal. iii. 13) they render the abstract הָלָלָה by κεκατηραμένους. Cf. Aesch. Choeph. 1025, μητέρα, θεῶν στύγος. Eurip. Herc. fur. 458 sq., ἔτεκον μὲν ὑμᾶς, πολεμίους ἐθρεψάμην ὕβρισμα κἀπείχαρμα καὶ διαφθοράν.—LXX. = הָלָלָה, הָלָלָה, הָלָלָה.

Καταράομαι, to wish any one evil or ruin, to curse, opp. to εὐλογεῖν. In classical Greek mostly with the dat.; by later writers used occasionally, as always in the LXX. and N. T., with the accusative = *to give one over to ruin*. Matt. v. 44; Luke vi. 28; Rom. xii. 14; Jas. iii. 9; Mark xi. 21.—Matt. xxv. 41, οἱ κατηραμένοι, whose being cursed is a settled fact. Cf. Deut. xxi. 23.—LXX. = הָלָלָה, and other words.

Ἐπικατάρατος, verbal adj., from ἐπικαταράομαι, to lay a curse on, or to connect it with anything, LXX., instead of the word ἐπαράομαι, usual in classical Greek. Num. v. 19, 23, 24; Mal. ii. 7 = אָרַר; Num. xxii. 17, xxiii. 7. Hence ἐπικατάρατος, one on whom the curse rests, or in whom it is realized. In Gal. iii. 10, corresponding with ὑπὸ κατάραν εἶσιν; ver. 13, ἐπικ. πᾶς ὁ κρεμáμενος ἐπὶ ξύλου. LXX. = אָרַר, Gen. iii. 14, 17, iv. 11; cf. Prov. xxiv. 24, parallel with μισηθός. Isa. lxv. 20; Wisd. iii. 12, xiv. 8; Tob. xiii. 12, opp. to εὐλογημένος.—In John vii. 49, Lachm. and Tisch. read ὁ ὄχλος οὗτος ὁ μὴ γινώσκων νόμον ἐπάρατοί εἰσιν—instead of ἐπικατάρατοι—in the same sense.

Ἄρετή, ἡ, “*quaelibet rei praestantia*,” Sturz, *lex. Xen.* According to Curtius, from the root *ap*, which we find in ἀπαρίσκω, to join to, ἄρτιος, fitted to, becoming, of the inseparable particle ἀρι, which in the epic and lyric poets, as a prefix to substantives, strengthens the meaning; whence ἀρείων, ἄριστος, ἀρέσκω, to please; ἀρετή, fitness; ἀρεάω, to be of use, to thrive, in Homer and later writers. Cf. Od. viii. 329, οὐκ ἀρετᾶ κακὰ ἔργα; xix. 114, λαοὶ ἀρετῶσι, “the people prosper, are happy.”—Akin to the Latin *ars*, *artus*, *arma*, the German “arm,” the English *arm*. (1) Generally, without any special moral

import. Cf. Hom. *Il.* xx. 411, ποδῶν ἀρετή; Aristot. *Eth. Nicom.* iv. 7, θηλείων ἀρετῇ σωματὸς μὲν κάλλος καὶ μέγεθος, ψυχῆς δὲ σωφροσύνη. In this general sense = superiority everywhere in Greek. So also the LXX., who speak of God's ἀρετή, syn. δόξα, answering to the Heb. הִנָּח, Isa. xlii. 8, 12; xliii. 21, τὰς ἀρετὰς αὐτοῦ ἀναγγέλλειν, διηγείσθαι, parallel with δόξαν τῷ θεῷ διδόναι; Hab. iii. 3, ἐκάλυψεν οὐρανοὺς ἡ ἀρετὴ αὐτοῦ = הִנָּח, as also Zech. vi. 13, αὐτὸς λήψεται ἀρετήν. In the N. T. 1 Pet. ii. 9, ὅπως τὰς ἀρετὰς ἐξαγγείλητε τοῦ ἐκ σκότους ὑμᾶς καλέσαντος εἰς κ.τ.λ.; 2 Pet. i. 3, τοῦ καλέσαντος ἡμᾶς ἰδίᾳ δόξῃ καὶ ἀρετῇ, it denotes accordingly the superiority of God (*sit venia verbo*!) revealed in the work of salvation, the μεγαλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, Acts ii. 11, that which lies at the foundation of the praise of God. Cf. the combination of ἀρετή and ἔπαινος in Phil. iv. 8.—Ἀρετὴ then (2) denotes in a moral sense what gives man his worth, his efficiency. Plat. *Theaet.* 176 C, ἡ μὲν γὰρ τοῦ δικαιοτάτου γνῶσις σοφία καὶ ἀρετὴ ἀληθινή, ἡ δὲ ἄγνοια ἀμαθία καὶ κακία ἐναργής; *Rep.* vii. 536 A, πρὸς σωφροσύνην . . . καὶ ἀνδρείαν καὶ μεγαλοπρέπειαν καὶ πάντα τῆς ἀρετῆς μέρη. So in Phil. iv. 8, εἴ τις ἀρετὴ καὶ εἴ τις ἔπαινος; 2 Pet. i. 5, ἐπιχορηγήσατε ἐν τῇ πίστει ὑμῶν τὴν ἀρετήν, ἐν δὲ τῇ ἀρετῇ τὴν γνῶσιν, it denotes moral excellence, cf. 1 Pet. ii. 12; Matt. v. 16.

Ἀρνεομαι, ἀρνήσομαι, aor. 1 ἡρνήσάμην, in Homer and later writers for the Attic ἡρνήθην (connected perhaps with ἄρνυμαι, ἀρέσθαι, ἄρασθαι, the aorists usually referred to αἰίρω, αἶρω) = to decline, to refuse, a request or demand; e.g. Herod. iii. 1. 2, οὐκ εἶχε οὔτε δοῦναι, οὔτε ἀρνήσασθαι. Hes. *Op.* 406, μὴ σὺ μὲν αἰτῆς ἄλλον, ὁ δ' ἀρνήται. Later also with reference to a question, assertion, fact = to gainsay, e.g. Xen. *Mem.* iv. 2. 10, ἀλλὰ μὴ ἀστρολόγος βούλει γενέσθαι; ὥς δὲ καὶ τοῦτο ἡρνεῖτο κ.τ.λ. Aesch. *Prom.* 266, ἔκων ἤμαρτον οὐκ ἀρνήσομαι. Soph. *Oed. R.* 571, εἰ γὰρ οἶδά γ', οὐκ ἀρνήσομαι. The idea of mendacious denial is not necessarily implied in the word; only ἀπαρνέσθαι, ἐξαρνέσθαι, καταρνέσθαι, in and for themselves imply a lying denial, manifestly corresponding with the force of the prefixes. Thus Pilon, *Synonymes Grecs*, cites as synonyms of ἀρ. only words which denote refusal or denial, ἀναίνεσθαι, ἀπαγορεύειν, ἀνανεύειν, ἀπονεύειν, ἀποφάναι, ἀπειπεῖν, but not ψεύδειν, ψεύδεσθαι, which are classified as synonyms with ἀπατᾶν, δολεᾶν, δολοῦν, and others. It rests with the connection to show whether or not a lying denial is meant, cf. Eur. *Or.* 1581, ἀρνεῖ κατακτὰς κάφ' ὕβρει λέγεις τάδε; and in this case it is stronger than ψεύδεσθαι, for the idea of refusal or denial prevails, the lie becomes denial, the negation of the truth becomes opposition thereto. *Opposition is the distinguishing feature of the denial expressed by ἀρνέσθαι.* (But not, as E. Haupt on 1 John ii. 22 says, that the denial takes place upon the ground of, and with the underlying better conviction to the contrary; this latter element, which the apostle certainly lays stress upon in the passage cited, lies in the words which precede, τίς ἐστίν ὁ ψεύστης, εἰ μὴ ὁ ἀρνούμενος ὅτι κ.τ.λ., where he first brands the ἀρνέσθαι as a ψεύδεσθαι. Cf. Matt. x. 33, ὅστις δ' ἂν ἀρνήσῃται με ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἀρνήσομαι κατὰ αὐτὸν ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ πατρὸς μου τοῦ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. Cf. vii. 23, καὶ τότε ὁμολογήσω

αὐτοῖς ὅτι οὐδέποτε ἔγνων ὑμᾶς; xxvi. 72, ἡρνήσατο μετὰ ὅρκου ὅτι οὐκ οἶδα τὸν ἄνθρωπον. It is clear from a comparison of these passages that the element of falsehood is to be included only as an inference from the connection.) Ἀρνεῖσθαι occurs (1) as = *to deny, to refuse*, and thus occurs but once in biblical Greek, Heb. xi. 24, ἡρνήσατο λέγεσθαι υἱὸς θυγατρὸς Φαραώ; Wisd. xvii. 9, τὸν μηδαμόθεν φευκτὸν ἀέρα προσιδεῖν ἀρνούμενοι; xvi. 16, ἀρνούμενοι γὰρ σε εἰδέναι ἀσεβεῖς . . . ἐμαστιγώθησαν; xii. 27, ἰδόντες δὲ πάλαι ἡρνοῦντο εἰδέναι θεὸν ἐπέγνωσαν ἀληθῇ κ.τ.λ. Akin to this (2) is the combination peculiar to N. T. Greek, ἀρνεῖσθαί τινα = *to refuse any one, not to know or recognise him, to reject him*, either in the face of former relationship or better knowledge = *to deny*, or without this reference = *to decline, to reject, give up*. Which of these is meant in any case, the connection must decide. In the last-named sense, only in Matt. x. 33, ἀρνήσομαι, καὶ γὰρ αὐτόν; 2 Tim. ii. 12, κακέινος ἀρνήσεται ἡμᾶς; 1 John ii. 23, πᾶς ὁ ἀρνούμενος τὸν υἱόν, cf. with ver. 22; Luke ix. 23, ἀρνησάσθω ἑαυτόν; 2 Tim. ii. 13, ἀρνήσασθαι ἑαυτόν οὐ δύναται.—(See under 3.)—With the idea of falsehood included, of contradiction not only with reference to the object, but on the part of the subject against himself, Acts iii. 13, ὁ θεὸς ἐδόξασεν τὸν παῖδα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν, ὃν ὑμεῖς μὲν παρεδώκατε καὶ ἡρνήσασθε αὐτὸν κατὰ πρόσωπον Πιλάτου. Ver. 14, τὸν ἅγιον καὶ δίκαιον ἡρνήσασθε. Perhaps also Acts vii. 35, τοῦτον τὸν Μωϋσῆν δὲ ἡρνήσαντο εἰπόντες, τίς σε κατέστησεν κ.τ.λ.—Matt. x. 33, ὅστις ἂν ἀρνήσῃταί με; Luke xii. 9, ὁ δὲ ἀρνησάμενός με; xxii. 57, ἡρνήσατο αὐτόν, λέγων· οὐκ οἶδα αὐτόν; John xiii. 38, ἀρνήσῃ με τρίς; 2 Pet. ii. 1, τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς δεσπότην ἀρνούμενοι; Jude 4, τὸν μόνον δεσπότην καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἀρνούμενοι; 1 John ii. 22, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἀντίχριστος, ὁ ἀρνούμενος τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὸν υἱόν; cf. ψεύδης, ψεύστης, vv. 21, 22.—Cf. Rev. iii. 8, οὐκ ἡρνήσω τὸ ὄνομά μου. Grammatically akin to this mode of expression is (3) the combination ἀρν. τί, *to reject anything, to retract, or to renounce, to deny, to disown*, just according to the connection; the former in Tit. ii. 12, ἀρνησάμενοι τὴν ἀσεβειαν; 2 Tim. iii. 5, ἔχοντες μόρφωσιν εὐσεβείας, τὴν δὲ δύναμιν αὐτῆς ἡρνημένοι. Cf. Tit. i. 16. The latter in 1 Tim. v. 8, τὴν πίστιν ἡρνηται; Rev. ii. 13, οὐκ ἡρνήσω τὴν πίστιν μου. Cf. Josephus, c. Ap. i. 22, μὴ ἀρνούμενοι τὰ πατρώα. Absolutely, 2 Tim. ii. 12, εἰ ἀρνούμεθα, overagainst ὑπομένειν, which see. (4) ἀρν. with ὅτι following, 1 John ii. 22, ὁ ἀρνούμενος ὅτι Ἰησοῦς οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ Χριστός. As to the negative in the latter clause or consequent, see Krüger, § lxvii. 11. 3. In classical Greek we often find the inf. with μή, where it occurs with the meaning *to lie*. On the contrary, not with the meaning *to refuse*, see above under 1. (5) *To gainsay*, without further specification of the object, Luke viii. 45; Acts iv. 16. *Falsely to deny, to disown*, Gen. xviii. 15 = שָׁחַב, Matt. xxvi. 70, 72; Mark xiv. 68, 70; John xviii. 25, 27. Opposed to ὁμολογεῖν, John i. 20, ὁμολόγησε καὶ οὐκ ἡρνήσατο. Cf. Matt. x. 33; Tit. i. 16; ὑπομένειν, 2 Tim. ii. 12. Dem. Orest. 871. 15, οὐκ ἡδύναντ' ἀρνηθῆναι διὰ τὴν περιφάνειαν, ἀλλὰ προσωμολόγησεν.

Ἀπαρνέομαι, *to remove from oneself, to refuse, to deny, to disown*. The prep.

indicates a putting away on the part of the speaker, a recoil on his part; cf. Eurip. *El.* 796, ἔτοιμοι κοῦκ ἀπαρνούμεσθ'. Plat. *Rep.* v. 468 C, μηδενὶ ἐξείναι ἀπαρνηθῆναι δ' ἀν βούληται φιλεῖν, *quicunque voluerit osculari.* Dem. 575. 27, οὔτε φύγοιμ' ἂν οὐτ' ἀπαρνούμαι τοῦνομα; cf. Rev. iii. 8, οὐκ ἡρνήσω τὸ ὄνομά μου. But it is not a mere strengthening of ἀρνεῖσθαι, as Suidas explains, ἀρνούμαι καθόλου. ἀπαρνος· ὁ ἀρνούμενος καθ' ὅλου. It must be added that where it signifies a *denial*, it always, in linguistic usage, expresses a false denial, and thus it differs from the simple verb. Plat. *Theaet.* 165 A, φάναι τε καὶ ἀπαρνεῖσθαι. In N. T. usage the back reference to the subject always gives a very strong sense. It occurs here only with a personal object (like ἀρνεῖσθαι, 2); cf. Apollon. *Rh.* i. 867, τὰς Ἑλληνίδας γυναῖκας ἀπαρνησάμενοι; 932, τὴν Ἀφροδίτην ἀπαρνηθῆναι τὸν παῖδα = "to decline or withdraw from fellowship with any one." Still the N. T. mode of expression is akin to the use of the simple verb ἀρν. τί or τινά (see ἀρν., 2 and 3). It occurs, (1) ἀπαρν. Χριστόν, Matt. xxvi. 34, 35, 75; Mark xiv. 30, 31, 72; Luke xxii. 61; John xiii. 38;—Luke xxii. 34, followed by μὴ εἰδέναι με, see ἀρνεῖσθαι; in all these places, of Peter's denial. (2) ἀπαρν. ἐαυτόν, Matt. xvi. 24; Mark viii. 34; Luke ix. 23 = to refuse oneself, to give up oneself; cf. John xii. 25, ὁ μισῶν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ. Gal. v. 24.—Isa. xxxi. 7 = נִכְזַּר. (3) The future ἀπαρνηθήσομαι in a passive sense, used in classical Greek side by side with ἀπαρνήσομαι, occurs once in Luke xii. 9, ὁ δὲ ἀρνησάμενός με . . . ἀπαρνηθήσεται, whereas in Soph. *Phil.* 527, χή ναὺς γὰρ ἄξει κοῦκ ἀπαρνηθήσεται. Isa. xxxi. 7, τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἀπαρνηθήσονται οἱ ἄνθρ. τὰ χειροποίητα αὐτῶν, actively. (Matth. *Gramm.* § 224, also renders the word in Soph. *l.c.* as a passive. In Isa. xxxi. 7, Tisch. reads ἀπαρνήσονται.)

Ἄρνιον, τό, dimin. of ἀρήν, later ἀρνός, Lamb. John xxi. 15. In the Apocalypse it is the designation of Christ, and, indeed, of the exalted Christ; first, in Rev. v. 6, εἶδον . . . ἄρνιον ἐστηκὸς ὡς ἐσφαγμένον, where the term, especially in its dimin. form, appears to have been selected primarily for the sake of the contrast with ver. 5, ἰδοὺ ἐνίκησεν ὁ λέων ὁ ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς Ἰούδα. The reason why the lion, which has overcome, presents Himself as a lamb (cf. Hofmann's *Weissagung und Erfüllung*, ii. 328) is, that He gained His victory in that form; cf. Isa. liii. 7; Acts viii. 32. The words ὡς ἐσφαγμένον point to His death; both in classical Greek and in the LXX. σφάζειν is the usual expression for slaughtering for sacrifice; *vid.* Lexicons and K. F. Hermann's *Lehrbuch der gottesdienstlichen Alterthümer der Griechen*, xxviii. 14, although it is also used in both in the simple sense of to kill. But that it here denotes sacrificial death, is clear from vii. 14, ἔπλυναν τὰς στολὰς αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ αἵματι τοῦ ἁρνίου; xii. 11, xiv. 4; cf. 1 John i. 7, 1 Pet. i. 19, *vid. s.v.* αἷμα, Rev. xiii. 8, τὸ ἐσφαγμένον ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, with Heb. ix. 26, 1 Pet. i. 20, so that accordingly this expression of the Revelation, which here alone, where it occurs for the first time, is used without article, must be taken as = ὁ ἁμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ. It is plainly, indeed, not connected with the paschal lamb, as this latter is, but with Isa. liii. 7 ff.; hence the lack of the article when the term is first introduced, cf. xiii. 11, and the words

ὡς ἐσφαγμένον are not yet to be taken in that special sense; but in the course of the further employment of the word, the two ideas pass over into each other, and the latter becomes allied with the former. Cf. also xix. 7, 9, xxi. 9, with Eph. v. 25–27. Elsewhere, v. 8, 12, 13, vi. 1, 16, vii. 9, 10, 17, xiii. 8, xiv. 1, 4, 10, xv. 3, xvii. 14, xxi. 14, 22, 23, 27, xxii. 1, 3.

Ἀρράβων, ὦνος, ὁ, earnest money, earnest, pledge, a word seemingly transferred by the Greeks, Romans, Egyptians, from the Phoenicians; Hebrew רַבָּעַ, Gen. xxxviii. 17, 20, from רָבַע, to interlace, to exchange, to pledge. Suidas says, ἡ ταῖς ὠναῖς περὶ τῶν ὠνουμένων διδομένη προκαταβολή, ὑπὲρ ἀσφαλείας. Figuratively used in Menand. et Philem. fragm., ed. Cleric., p. 274, ὅταν ἐκ πονηροῦ πράγματος κέρδος λάβῃς, τοῦ δυστυχεῖν νόμιζε σ' ἀρράβων' ἔχειν; Stob. floril. lxi. 2. 6; Aristot. Polit. i. 11. The explanation of Chrysostom, μέρος τοῦ παντός, is better than that of Hesych. ἀρράβων πρόδομα, though the element of time, which ἀρράβων essentially includes, remains unnoted. In the LXX. Gen. xxxviii. 17, 18, 20. In the N. T. 2 Cor. i. 22, ὁ καὶ σφραγισάμενος ἡμᾶς καὶ δοὺς τὸν ἀρράβωνα τοῦ πνεύματος ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν; v. 5, ὁ δοὺς ἡμῖν τὸν ἀρράβωνα τοῦ πνεύματος; Eph. i. 14, ὅς ἐστιν ἀρράβων τῆς κληρονομίας ἡμῶν; likewise of the Holy Spirit, who in the same sense is called ἀπαρχή in Rom. viii. 23; accordingly, Basil. M., τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς αἰωνίου κληρονομίας ἀρράβων καὶ τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν ἀπαρχή. Cf. Suic. Thes., synon. ἐνέχυρον, Prov. xx. 19; Deut. xxiv. 10–12.

Ἀρχω, to be first, to begin, to reign. According to Curtius, coincident with the Sanscrit arhāmi, "to be worth," "to be able," "to have ability;" arhas, "worthy," etc. "The idea forming the common basis of both is worth, perhaps brightness, ἀρχειν λάμπειν" (Hes.). J. Grimm compares the German ragen.

Ἀρχή, ἡ. (I.) Beginning; ἀρχή ὠδίνων, Matt. xxiv. 8; Mark i. 1, ἀ. τοῦ εὐαγγ.; cf. Phil. iv. 15; John ii. 11, ἡ ἀρχὴ τῶν σημείων.—Heb. iii. 14, v. 12, vi. 1, vii. 3.—Matt. xxiv. 21, ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κόσμου ἕως τοῦ νῦν. Mark xiii. 19, ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως; 2 Pet. iii. 4. Ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, ἐξ ἀρχῆς is either relative, referring to the beginning of that which is spoken of, as in Luke i. 2, οἱ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται; John xv. 27, ἀπ' ἀρχῆς μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐστέ; xvi. 4, ταῦτα δὲ ὑμῖν ἐξ ἀρχῆς οὐκ εἶπον; Acts xi. 15, ἐπέπεσεν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐπ' αὐτοὺς, ὥσπερ καὶ ἐφ' ἡμᾶς ἐν ἀρχῇ; xxvi. 4, τὴν μὲν οὖν βίωσιν ἐκ νεότητος τὴν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς γενομένην ἐν τῷ ἔθνει μου; 1 John ii. 7, cf. with ver. 24, iii. 11; 2 John v. 6; 1 John iii. 8, ὁ ποιῶν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἐκ τοῦ διαβόλου ἐστίν, ὅτι ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ὁ διάβολος ἁμαρτάνει (where the position of ἀπ' ἀρχῆς confirms what the connection shows, that the reference is to the relation (in time and as cause) of devilish to human sin); or absolute, denoting the beginning of the world and of its history,—the beginning of creation,—akin to the analogous usage of classical Greek, where ἐξ ἀρχῆς (in Hom., Herod., the Attic writers, as also in the Apocrypha), ἀπ' ἀρχῆς (Herod., Tragg., Plut., LXX., and N. T.) = from of old, at all times, from the beginning, hitherto; except that in bibl. usage the starting-point is fixed as the beginning of creation, the beginning of the world; cf. ἀπ

ἀρχῆς, Matt. xix. 4, 8, with its parallels, Mark x. 6, ἀπὸ δὲ ἀρχῆς κτίσεως; John viii. 44. More rarely (*e.g.* in Plato) κατ' ἀρχάς, as in Heb. i. 10. It has been supposed that in 1 John i. 1, ii. 13, 14, ἀπ' ἀρχῆς must be explained in the sense of πρὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος, to strengthen which it is used in Eccles. xxiv. 9; and ἀρχή has accordingly been designated "a makeshift name for eternity" (E. Haupt on John i. 1), and ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, 2 Thess. ii. 13, as synonymous with πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, Eph. i. 4 (Huther). In this case, the signification of ἀπ' ἀρχῆς in classical Greek (as also in the LXX., *e.g.* Josh. xxiv. 2; Isa. lxiii. 16, 19, ii. 6, xxiii. 7, and often), *from of old*, must have been generalized into the meaning *always, eternally, from eternity*; and this is not in itself inconceivable. Still, apart from the fact that such a use of the word is unknown elsewhere in the N. T., it cannot be proved even in the LXX.; and in explanation of the texts cited, it is enough to refer to Isa. xliii. 13 as a decisive parallel, ἐγὼ κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἔτι ἀπ' ἀρχῆς = עוֹלָם תְּחִלָּה, taken by the LXX. manifestly as = עוֹלָם תְּחִלָּה; and it would betray no little dogmatic microscopicness, not acuteness, to argue from this expression in 1 John i. 1, ii. 13, 14, against, instead of for, the pre-existence of Christ. Side by side with ἐξ ἀρχῆς, ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, κατ' ἀρχάς, which imply a progressive movement from the beginning onwards, the expression ἐν ἀρχῇ, peculiar to biblical Greek, Gen. i. 1, Prov. viii. 23, John i. 1, fixes the beginning-point absolutely, without reference to its relation to the time following. There is difficulty in the much disputed τὴν ἀρχὴν in John viii. 25, ἔλεγον οὖν αὐτῷ, Σὺ τίς εἶ; εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Τὴν ἀρχὴν ὃ τι καὶ λαλῶ ὑμῖν, or Τὴν ἀρχὴν, ὅτι καὶ λαλῶ ὑμῖν. πολλὰ ἔχω περὶ ὑμῶν λαλεῖν κ.τ.λ. Hengstenberg's explanation seems quite inadmissible; he sees in τὴν ἀρχὴν the self-witnessing of Christ to His pre-existence, "originally, the beginning am I;" for this we should rather have expected, according to John's usage, ἡ ἀρχή. For an answer intended to signify this, the expression would be too vague and unintelligible. Certainly ἀρχὴν, τὴν ἀρχὴν, signifies not merely *earlier, before*, in contrast with *now*,—cf. Gen. xliii. 20; Thuc. ii. 74, οὔτε τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀδίκως ἐπὶ γῆν τήνδε ἤλθομεν, οὔτε νῦν ἀδικήσομεν, not merely "in the beginning," "originally," in contrast simply with *after time*; cf. Herod. viii. 142. 1, περὶ τῆς ὑμετέρης ἀρχὴν ὁ ἄγων ἐγένετο; ii. 28. 1, ταῦτα μὲν νῦν ἔστω ὡς ἔστι τε καὶ ὡς ἀρχὴν ἐγένετο,—but also "from the beginning onwards, hitherto," apart from any intended antithesis; cf. Herod. i. 9. 1, ἀρχὴν γὰρ ἐγὼ μηχανήσομαι οὕτω ὥστε μηδὲ μαθεῖν μιν ὀφθεῖσαν ὑπὸ σεῦ; and we must in this case, though it be not wholly without difficulty, transfer the full distinctively biblical conception of ἀρχή into the adverbial expression. But then the relative clause (John viii. 25) would rather run, ὃ τι καὶ λελάληκα ὑμῖν, if indeed λαλεῖν could be used here at all, λαλεῖν, as distinct from λέγειν, giving prominence not to the contents,—the thing said,—but to the act of discoursing; cf. ver. 26, xvii. 13, xii. 48, xvi. 25. Here, at least, no reason could be seen why just λαλεῖν should be employed. Considering that in ver. 26 Christ answers the question concerning Himself by a statement as to His relation to His questioners, weight must be attached to the fact that the περὶ ὑμῶν of ver. 26 should stand over against the σὺ τίς εἶ of ver. 25, and thus τὴν ἀρχὴν should

introduce a putting off of the question. If, now, we join τὴν ἀρχὴν with πολλὰ ἔχω περὶ ὑμῶν κ.τ.λ., and regard ὅτι καὶ λαλῶ ὑμῖν as a parenthesis (so Hofmann), no relation of former time to subsequent or present time will be denoted by τὴν ἀρχὴν, but it is either equivalent to "from the beginning hitherto," "first of all," "before all things," as in Herod. i. 9. 1, or it includes a contrast between the present and the future which finds its close in the τότε of ver. 28 (Hofmann, *Schriftbeweis*, ii. 1. 178). The first rendering cannot, in view of the passage quoted from Herod., be rejected on the ground that ἀρχὴν, τὴν ἀρχὴν, with the signification "generally," occurs only in negative sentences; for this is true only in those cases where the primary idea of *time* in the word quite disappears, and it is equivalent to *generally, entirely*. Of Christ, as used in Rev. iii. 14, ἡ ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως τοῦ θεοῦ, it signifies the causal relation of Christ to the creation of God; cf. ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ τὸ τέλος, xxi. 6, xxii. 13, under ἄλφα, and Düsterdieck on iii. 14. For Col. i. 18, ὅς ἐστιν ἀρχὴ, πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, ἵνα γένηται ἐν πᾶσιν αὐτὸς πρωτεύων, see πρωτότοκος. Cf. Gen. xlix. 3, ἀρχὴ τέκνων μου; Deut. xxi. 17, ὁ πρωτότοκος υἱὸς . . . ἐστὶν ἀρχὴ τέκνων αὐτοῦ.

(II.) **Government**, specially the *highest dignitaries* of the State; e.g. τιμαὶ καὶ ἀρχαί, honours (dignities) and offices; also *the authorities*; *vid.* Lex. So in Luke xii. 11, ὅταν δὲ φέρουσιν ὑμᾶς ἐπὶ τὰς συναγωγὰς, καὶ τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας; Luke xx. 20, ὥστε παραδοῦναι αὐτὸν τῇ ἀρχῇ καὶ τῇ ἐξουσίᾳ τοῦ ἡγεμόνος, where ἀρχὴ relates to his position and authority; ἐξουσία, to the executive power connected therewith; Tit. iii. 1. Herewith is connected the peculiar Pauline usage in Rom., 1 Cor., Eph., Col., where ἀρχαί, conjoined with ἐξουσίαι, δυνάμεις, κυριότητες, θρόνοι, denotes *supramundane powers*—Angels; so in Eph. iii. 10, ἵνα γνωρισθῇ νῦν ταῖς ἀρχαῖς καὶ ταῖς ἐξουσίαις ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις διὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἡ πολυποίκιλος σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ; Col. i. 16. Of *evil* supramundane powers in Eph. vi. 12, οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμῖν ἡ πάλη πρὸς αἷμα καὶ σάρκα, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὰς ἀρχὰς, πρὸς τὰς ἐξουσίας, πρὸς τοὺς κοσμοκράτορας τοῦ σκότους τούτου, πρὸς τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις. In Col. ii. 10 also, ὅς ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλὴ πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας, as in contrast with ver. 18, according to the context it refers to supramundane, and indeed (cf. ver. 15, ἀπεκδυσάμενος τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας ἐδενγμάτισεν κ.τ.λ.) to *evil powers*; so also, probably, in Rom. viii. 38; 1 Cor. xv. 24; and the analogy of other passages warrants the supposition that the apostle generally refers to evil powers (cf. 1 Cor. xv. 26, ἔσχατος ἐχθρὸς, with ver. 24), where the context does not, as in Col. i. 15, Eph. iii. 10, as compared with 1 Pet. i. 12, demand the opposite. The several *synonymous* designations by no means indicate a relationship of the angels one to another, nor a difference of rank, though this may have to be recognised elsewhere (see ἀρχάγγελος, and cf. 2 Pet. ii. 11), for the synonymousness of the designations forbids such a distinguishing. They rather bear upon the relation and conduct of angels toward mankind; cf. Tit. i. 3; see under δύναμις, ἐξουσία, κυριότης. We have here therefore no indication of, or connection whatever with, the Rabbinical or Neo-Platonic angelology, which in itself, upon closer comparison, is found to be altogether inappropriate. See Harless on Eph. i. 21.

Cf. 1 Pet. iii. 22; Jude 6; 2 Pet. ii. 20. "*Cur autem non simpliciter nominavit angelos? Respondeo, amplificandae Christi gloriae causa Paulum exaggerasse hos titulos, acsi diceret: nihil est tam sublime aut excellens, quocunque nomine censeatur, quod non subjectum sit Christi majestate,*" Calvin.

Ἀρχαῖος, α, ον, (1) *what is and endures from the beginning, from of old hitherto.* Old; Xen. *Hell.* v. 2. 23, ἀρχαῖον εἶναι νόμιμον, ἐξεῖναι τὰ τοιαῦτα; *Anab.* vii. 3. 28, ἀρχαῖος νόμος, iii. 1. 4, ξένος; *Ecclus.* ix. 10; 2 Macc. vi. 22, ἀρχαία φιλία. So Rev. xii. 9, xx. 2, ὁ ὄφεις ὁ ἀρχαῖος. In the sense of originality, not with the kindred idea of age, Acts xv. 7, ἀπ' ἡμερῶν ἀρχαίων, *from the first days onward*; xxi. 6, ἀρχαῖος μαθητής, perhaps = *one of the first disciples*, who had been so from the beginning of the gospel proclamation. (2) *What was before of old*; Xen. *Hell.* ii. 4. 30, τοῖς νόμοις τοῖς ἀρχαίοις; "*jam neglectis, abrogatis, antiquitatis,*" Sturz.—Dion. *Halic. Ant. R.* iv. 18, τὰς καλέσεις ἀρχαίων ἐκάλουν κλάσεις; Ps. lxxix. 8, μὴ μνησθῆς ἡμῶν ἀνομιῶν ἀρχαίων; 2 Pet. ii. 5, ἀρχαῖος κόσμος; Acts xv. 21, ἐκ γενεῶν ἀρχαίων. Especially in later Greek, yet already also in the Attic writers, οἱ ἀρχαῖοι signifies predecessors or ancestors, as a certain dignity and authority clothe these for descendants; syn. with οἱ παλαιοί, which, without any side reference, simply denotes those who have lived in earlier times. Dem. *Phal. in Walz, Rhett.* ix. 79. 11, οἷον τὸ ἀρχαῖοι ἀντὶ τοῦ παλαιοὶ ἐντιμότερον οἱ γὰρ ἀρχαῖοι ἄνδρες ἐντιμότεροι.—Aristoph. *Eq.* 507, εἰ μὲν τις ἀνὴρ τῶν ἀρχαίων κωμωιδάσκαλος ἡμᾶς ἠνάγκαζεν. Plato, *Theaet.* 180 C, τό γε δὴ πρόβλημα ἄλλο τι παρειλήφαμεν παρὰ μὲν τῶν ἀρχαίων ἀνέστη. Akin to this, we might take the ἀρχαῖοι named in the Sermon on the Mount, Matt. v. 21 (27, Rec. text), 33, ἐρρέθη τοῖς ἀρχαίοις, to signify the old teachers, explaining the dative in the sense of the ablative; but the connection of the discourse forbids this,—therein Christ aims at something more than setting up His authority in opposition to an earlier authority,—apart from the fact that, with ἐρρέθη, the dative never elsewhere occurs in this sense, and that the old authorities used to be designated by the term πρεσβύτεροι, Matt. xv. 2; Mark vii. 3, 5; Heb. xi. 2. The predecessors who received the law and handed it down to those who came after, possess for this very reason a dignity, cf. οἱ πατέρες, Rom. ix. 5; and by the choice of this expression, what is said to them of old is intended to be both recognised in its significance and estimated in its temporary limitation, Christ intending His words to be regarded not as an abrogation, but a deepening and fulfilling, v. 17 sq. It is true that οἱ ἀρχαῖοι, in classical Greek, is specially used when reference is made to some prominent representatives of antiquity, yet not so as κατ' ἐξ. to denote these, or to warrant the statement that οἱ ἀρχ. signifies the great ones of antiquity, whether writers or teachers. Such a narrowing of the thought expressed by the word cannot be proved. If, moreover, according to the context, single individuals from among the ancients were meant, even this limitation does not lie in the word, but in the context only, which indicates the special circumstances upon which this comprehensive conception rests. Cf. Aristoph. *l.c.*, Thuc. ii. 16 sq. below. Often in Aristotle. (3) ἀρχαῖος signifies

the *original*, *hitherto*, *earlier*, in contrast with the present—the *old* in relation to the *new*, without reference to duration. Cf. Plato, *Symp.* 192 E, ἡ ἀρχαία φύσις ἡμῶν ἦν αὕτη. So 2 Cor. v. 17, εἴ τις ἐν Χριστῷ, καινὴ κτίσις· τὰ ἀρχαῖα παρῆλθεν, ἰδοὺ γέγονεν καινὰ τὰ πάντα. Synon. with παλαιός. Apoll. *Rh.* i. 1, διαφέρει τὸ παλαιὸν τοῦ ἀρχαίου· τὸ μὲν γὰρ παλαιὸν καὶ ἀρχαῖον, τὸ δὲ ἀρχαῖον οὐκέτι παλαιόν· τὸ γὰρ ἀρχαῖον ἀναφέρει εἰς τὸ ἀρχῇ ἐνέχεσθαι. Both words are in by far the most instances used as perfectly synonymous; where they cannot be interchanged, or must be distinguished, it must be remembered that παλαιός demands as its antithesis *the new* or *young*, while ἀρχαῖος involves only an antithesis with *the following*. Cf. Acts xxi. 16; Thuc. ii. 16, οἱ ἀρχαῖοι signifies the original inhabitants, in contrast with οἱ ὕστεροι, the later settlers. Ἀρχαῖος is the *original*, and therefore *hitherto*, *old*, *primeval*, either what has been and still is, or what is now no more; παλαιός is that which already has long been *aged*, *old*, *ancient*, whether it still is or is no more. LXX. ἀρχ. = 𐤀𐤓𐤕𐤁, Ps. lxxix. 8, 48, and often; 𐤀𐤓𐤕𐤁, 1 Sam. xxiv. 14; Isa. xliii. 18; παλαιός, on the other hand, is = 𐤀𐤓𐤕𐤁, 𐤀𐤓𐤕𐤁, and other words.

Ἀρχηγός, adj. *commencing*; substantive, *originator*, *founder*, *leader* — *chief*, *first*, *prince*. In the latter sense = 𐤀𐤓𐤕𐤁, Ex. vi. 14; Num. xiii. 4. 𐤀𐤓𐤕𐤁, Isa. iii. 5, 6, where, in ver. 6, it is also = 𐤀𐤓𐤕𐤁, physician. So in Acts v. 31, τοῦτον ὁ θεὸς ἀρχηγὸν καὶ σωτῆρα ὕψωσεν; cf. Isa. *passim*; Mic. i. 13, ἀρχηγὸς ἀμαρτίας.—Synonymous with αἴτιος, Plat. *Crat.* 401 D: τὸ οὖν αἴτιον καὶ τὸ ἀρχηγὸν αὐτῶν (sc. τῶν ὄντων) εἶναι τὸ ὠθεῖν, from which it differs, as *beginning* differs from *cause*; so that ἀρχηγός denotes the founder as the first participator, possessor, etc. This is always the case when it is connected with the gen. of the thing—not of the person; e.g. Aristot. *Metaphys.* i. 983. 20, Θαλῆς ὁ τῆς τοιαύτης ἀρχηγὸς φιλοσοφίας; Polyb. v. 10, καὶ μὴν ὁ πρῶτος αὐτῶν αὐξήσας τὴν βασιλείαν καὶ γενόμενος ἀρχηγὸς τοῦ προσχήματος τῆς οἰκίας Φιλίππος; so τῆς τέχνης ἀρχηγός, τοῦ πράγματος, τῶν τοιούτων ἔργων; cf. ἀρχηγὸς ἀμαρτίας, Mic. i. 13. In this sense especially, Heb. xii. 2, ἀφορῶντες εἰς τὸν τῆς πίστεως ἀρχηγὸν . . . Ἰησοῦν, who Himself has set us an example in πιστεύειν, and is therefore the ἀρχηγός of the πιστεύοντες. Cf. Luke xxii. 28, where Jesus says to His disciples, ὑμεῖς ἔστε οἱ διαμεμενηκότες ἐν τοῖς πειρασμοῖς μου, in which it was faith that was in question. It must be taken, therefore, in the same sense in Acts iii. 15, τὸν ἀρχηγὸν τῆς ζωῆς ἀπεκτείνετε; cf. 1 Cor. xv. 20, ἀπαρχὴ τῶν κεκοιμημένων; Acts xxvi. 23, εἰ πρῶτος ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν φῶς μέλλει καταγγέλλειν κ.τ.λ., and other places. Heb. ii. 10, τὸν ἀρχηγὸν τῆς σωτηρίας τελειῶσαι; cf. v. 9, τελειωθείς ἐγένετο . . . αἴτιος σωτηρίας. Christ, accordingly, considered in relation to τοῖς ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ, Heb. v. 9, is the ἀρχηγός, the Forerunner (Captain), so far as He, being the first possessor of the ζωή, of σωτηρία, is at the same time its founder. In Luke and Heb. only in the places cited.

Ἀπαρχή, originally the *presentation* of the firstlings, then the *first-fruits*. Hesych. ἀπαρχή, προσφορά, ἀφαίρεμα. Demosth. p. 164. 21, τῶν αἰχμαλώτων Μήδων ἀπαρχὴν ἀνδριάντα χρυσοῦν ἀνέστησεν εἰς Δελφούς. Finally, in general, firstling, in relation to the

whole; thus, however, very rarely in classical Greek, *e.g.* ἀπαρχὴ γένους; Isocr. p. 36 E, ἀπαρχὰς τοῦ σίτου. Used almost exclusively where offerings are meant. LXX. = לֶחֶן, Num. xviii. 12, 29, 30, 32; חֶבֶן, Deut. xviii. 4, xxvi. 2. Mostly *cum gen. part.*, cf. the passages quoted, and Ps. lxxviii. 51, cv. 36; Ex. xxii. 29. If the remark made by Schleusner were correct, "*videntur LXX. cum voce ἀπαρχή conjunxisse notionem universam ejus, quod est Deo sacrum,*" this would correspond to the general usage of classical writers; but *e.g.* in Ps. lxxviii. 51, cv. 36, Num. xviii. 12, comp. ver. 13, τὰ πρωτογενήματα πάντα κ.τ.λ., this seems not to be the case. Rather might one say, as Schol. Eurip. *in Orest.* ver. 96, ἀπαρχὴ ἐλέγετο οὐ μόνον τὸ πρῶτον τῇ τάξει, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ πρῶτον τῇ τιμῇ, ὅθεν καὶ ἀπαρχὰς καρπῶν προσήγον οἱ παλαιοὶ ὠνόμαζον, τὰ κρείττονα ἐκλεγόμενοι. Still even this is not an essential, but merely an accidental, *secondary* reference. This meaning seems to occur in the N. T. conjointly with the other, *Deo sacrum*, in Jas. i. 18, εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἡμᾶς ἀπαρχὴν τινα τῶν αὐτοῦ κτισμάτων; Rev. xiv. 4, ἡγοράσθησαν ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀπαρχὴ τῷ θεῷ καὶ τῷ ἀρνίῳ; cf. Ex. xxv. 2, αἱ ἀπαρχαί μου. But we find the former signification alone, *Deo sacrum*, in Rom. xvi. 5, ἀπαρχὴ τῆς Ἀσίας εἰς Χριστόν, where εἰς occurs, as in Rev. xiv. 4 we have the dative; cf. Xen. *de vect.* iv. 42, τὶ γὰρ δὴ εἰς πόλεμον κτήμα χρησιμώτερον ἀνθρώπων; Phil. ii. 22; 1 Cor. xvi. 15, ἀπαρχὴ τῆς Ἀχαΐας. On the other hand, generally the word means *the firstling* in relation to whole. 1 Cor. xv. 20, ἀπαρχὴ τῶν κεκοιμημένων; ver. 23, ἕκαστος δὲ ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ τάγματι, ἀπαρχὴ Χριστὸς, ἔπειτα οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ. In this way also it is to be explained in Rom. viii. 23, τὴν ἀπαρχὴν τοῦ πνεύματος ἔχοντες, whether τοῦ πν. be the partitive genitive or the genitive of apposition. For the latter view there are no parallels, although it is specially favoured by a comparison of vv. 11, 17; 2 Cor. v. 5, i. 22; Eph. i. 4; Tit. iii. 6. In this case the Spirit is represented as the first-fruits of redemption. Cf., however, for the former view, 1 Cor. xv. 44, σπείρεται σῶμα ψυχικόν, ἐγείρεται σῶμα πνευματικόν, with Rom. viii. 23, τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν.

Αὐγή, brightness, only in later writers = dawn, as in Acts xx. 11; cf. Isa. lix. 9; 2 Macc. xii. 9. Theophan. *Chronogr.* a. 1. Leonis Chazari, ὥρα αὐγῆς ἐξελθὼν ὁ βασιλεύς.

Αὐγάζω, transitive, to illuminate; intrans. to shine, to appear, *e.g.* Orph. *Lith.* 178, ἡελίοιο καταντίον αὐγάζοντος; Theodor. *Stud.* lxi. 16. 1, ἐξ ἡλίου τις αὐγάσας ἀρτὴρ μέγας. So in 2 Cor. iv. 4, εἰς τὸ μὴ αὐγάσαι τὸν φωτισμὸν τοῦ εὐαγγ. τῆς δόξης τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Cf. Lev. xiii. 24, 25, 26, 28, xiv. 56. Only in the poets = to see.

Ἀπαύγασμα, τὸ, from ἀπανγάζω = to radiate, or also to reflect, only in later Greek (and indeed in both senses, cf. Plut. *Mor.* 934 D, χωρὶα διὰ τῆς ἀνακλάσεις ἀποδίδοντα πολλοὺς καὶ διαφόρους ἀπανγασμούς, where ἀνακλάσεις as well as ἀποδιδόναι demand for ἀπανγ. the meaning *reflex*). Heliodor. *Aeth.* iii. 4. 13, πλέον ἀπὸ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν σέλας ἢ τῶν δάδων ἀπηύγασεν; Philostr. *vit. Ap.* iii. 8, λίθους πάντα ἀπανγαζούσας χρώματα. Hence ἀπαύγασμα = *what is radiated*, or = brightness, reflection. Heb. i. 3, ὃς ὦν ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ. Taken by patristic exeg. sis in the

first sense, *e.g.* Theodoret, τὸ ἀπαύγασμα καὶ ἐκ τοῦ πυρός ἐστι καὶ σὺν τῷ πυρί ἐστι, καὶ αἷτιον μὲν ἔχει τὸ πῦρ, ἀχώριστον δὲ ἐστι τοῦ πυρός, ἐξ οὗ γὰρ τὸ πῦρ, ἐξ ἐκείνου καὶ τὸ ἀπαύγασμα; Greg. Nyss. *c. Apollinar.* ii. 47 sq., ὥσπερ συγγενῶς ἔχει πρὸς τὸν ἥλιον ἀκτὶς καὶ πρὸς τὸν λύχνον τὸ ἀπαναζόμενον φῶς . . . οὕτω καὶ τὸ παρὰ τῆς δόξης τοῦ πατρὸς ἀπανασθὲν φῶς. So also Chrysostom = φῶς ἐκ φωτός. This explanation, however, having been developed in the course of the christological controversies, cannot decide; the usage of Philo is the only one that can help us to an understanding of the word, less because of its theological import than because in classical Greek there are no earlier parallels. The meaning *reflex* is recommended by *de plant.* No. 1, 337. 19, τὸ δὲ ἀγίασμα, οἶον ἀγίων ἀπαύγασμα, μίμημα ἀρχετύπων, ἐπεὶ τὰ αἰσθήσει καλὰ καὶ νόησει καλῶν εἰκόνες; cf. 2 Cor. iv. 4, ὅς ἐστιν εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ; Ex. xxxiii. 23, וְרָאָה אֱלֹהִים אֶת־אֶתְנַחְשֵׁתִּי (vid. ἀπανασμός in Plut. *l.c.*), and from the analogy of Scripture, perhaps, no objection can be brought against it. Other passages, however, from Philo oblige us to adopt the meaning *radiation*, — φῶς ἐκ φωτός, according to Chrysostom. So in *de Cherub.* i. 156, ed. M., αὐτὸς (sc. ὁ θεός) δ' ὢν ἀρχέτυπος αὐγῇ, μυρίας ἀκτῖνας ἐκβάλλει, ὧν οὐδεμία ἐστὶν αἰσθητή, νοηταὶ δὲ αἱ ἀπᾶσαι; *De mund. opif.* i. 35, πᾶς ἄνθρωπος κατὰ μὲν τὴν διάνοιαν ὑψεύεται θεῷ λόγῳ, τῆς μακαρίας φύσεως ἐκμαγεῖον ἢ ἀπόσπασμα ἢ ἀπαύγασμα. Cf. *de nom. mut.* i. 579, πηγὴ δὲ τῆς καθαρωτάτης αὐγῆς θεός ἐστιν, ὥσθ' ὅταν ἐπιφαίνηται ψυχῇ, τὰς ἀσκήτους καὶ περιφανεστάτας ἀνίσχει. Hence ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ = *radiation of his glory*; cf. Matt. xxiv. 31; Acts vii. 55; Rom. iii. 23; John i. 14, xvii. 5. — Wisd. vii. 25, 26. — So in the Targum of Jonathan on Isa. vi. 1, וְיִרְאֶה אֱלֹהִים אֶת־אֶתְנַחְשֵׁתִּי; see Schlottman, *Hioh*, p. 129 f.

B

Βαίνω, to step out, to walk, to go; not in the N. T. Hence παραβαίνω, παράβασις, παραβάτης.

Παραβαίνω, aor. 2 παρέβην, to step on one side; trans. to transgress, to violate; in the connections νόμον, δίκην, δίκαια παραβ., oftener in classical Greek. Also absolutely, Hesych. παραβαίνοντας, ἀρνητικούς· ἢ μὴ εὐθέως βαίνοντας, for which Pape *s.v.* cites Aesch. *Ag.* 59, πέμπει παραβάσιν Ἑρινύν. In the N. T. always in a moral sense, Matt. xv. 2, τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων; ver. 3, τὴν ἐντολὴν τοῦ θεοῦ. LXX. = עבר, Num. xiv. 41, xxii. 18, τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦ Κυρίου; Josh. vii. 11, τὴν διαθήκην μου; Isa. xxiv. 5; Esth. iii. 3 = παρακούειν. Also = רד; Ex. xxxii. 8, ἐκ τῆς ὁδοῦ ἧς ἐνέτειλα αὐτοῖς; Deut. ix. 12, 16, xvii. 20, xxviii. 14. It must be taken also in this moral sense in Acts i. 25, ἀφ' ἧς (sc. ἀποστολῆς) παρέβη Ἰούδας πορευθῆναι εἰς τὸν τόπον τὸν ἴδιον. — Absolutely (as in Ecclus. xl. 14) only in 2 John 9, Received text, πᾶς ὁ παραβαίνων καὶ μὴ μένων ἐν τῇ διδαχῇ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, where Lachm. and Tisch. read προάγων, which, according to Düsterdieck, in the present connection denotes “an advance in refinement of doctrine, which is incompatible with remaining in the truth, — that false progress which Paul designates ‘perverse disputings’ and ‘school janglings,’ 1 Tim. i. 4, vi. 5.” Cf. 2 Tim. iii. 14, i.

13, iv. 2 ff.; Tit. i. 9; so that *παραβαίνων* may be regarded as an explanatory reading. — Opposed to *τὸν νόμον τελεῖν*, Rom. ii. 27.

Παράβασις, εως, ἡ, trespass, transgression; in a moral sense — *τῶν νόμων* and the like; also absolutely, but rarely in classical Greek = *παρανομία*. — Wisd. xiv. 31, ἡ τῶν ἁμαρτανόντων δίκη ἐπεξέρχεται ἀεὶ τὴν τῶν ἀδίκων παράβασιν. In this case it designates sin as deviation from the prescription of the law; cf. Rom. iv. 15, οὐ γὰρ οὐκ ἔστι νόμος, οὐδὲ παράβασις, so that it denotes (comp. Rom. v. 13, ἁμαρτία δὲ οὐκ ἔλλογεῖται, μὴ ὄντος νόμου), sin, so far as it is imputed as a violation of the law. Hence v. 14, ἐπὶ τοὺς μὴ ἁμαρτήσαντας ἐπὶ τῷ ὁμοιώματι τῆς παραβάσεως Ἀδάμ. Cf. Gal. iii. 19, ὁ νόμος τῶν παραβάσεων χάριν προσετέθη, with Rom. vii. 13, ἵνα γένηται καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ἁμαρτωλὸς ἡ ἁμαρτία διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς. The *παράβασις* τοῦ νόμου, in contrast with *ὅς ἐν νόμῳ καυχᾶσαι*, Rom. ii. 23, thus acquires special emphasis. 1 Tim. ii. 14; Heb. ii. 2; syn. παρακοή. On Heb. ix. 15, εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν τῶν ἐπὶ τῇ πρώτῃ διαθήκῃ παραβάσεων, cf. Josh. vii. 11; Plat. *Legg.* iv. 714 D, τὰ τεθέντα παραβαίνειν. Aelian, *V. H.* x. 2, παραβῆναι τὰς συνθήκας; Ep. Barnab. c. 12.

Παραβάτης, ου, ὁ, transgressor of the laws; thus only rarely in classical Greek, for which Aesch. *Eum.* 533, τὸν ἀντίτολμον παραβάταν, is adduced, as also the designation of a perjurer as *παραβ. θεῶν*, Polem. in Macrob. *Saturn.* v. 19. (Usually it denotes the combatant who stood in the war-chariot alongside the charioteer.) Symmach. = יִרְבֵּי, Ps. xvii. 5, ἐγὼ ἐφυλαξάμην ὁδοὺς παραβάτου. So also Ezek. xviii. 10; in Ps. cxxxix. 19 γυν. Patriotic writers designate Julian the Apostate (ἀποστάτης) also παραβάτης. Cf. Jas. ii. 11, γέγονας παραβάτης νόμου, where Cod. A has ἀποστάτης. — Like *παράβασις*, *παραβάτης* is used with reference to the imputation of sin, so far as it is transgression of the known law, deviation from recognised truth. See Jas. ii. 9, ἐλεγχόμενοι ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου ὡς παραβάται; Gal. ii. 18, παραβάτην ἐμαυτὸν συνιστάνω, where ver. 17, ἁμαρτωλόι. Cf. Rom. vii. 13, s.v. παράβασις; Rom. ii. 25, 27, κρινεῖ ἡ ἀκροβυστία σε τὸν διὰ γράμματος καὶ περιτομῆς παραβάτην, *vid.* γράμμα.

Βάλλω, to throw, to lay, to set; frequently in the N. T. Hence:

Διαβάλλω, to throw over; fig. = to accuse, to malign; usually explained = *reeve or hatchel with words* (censure). On the contrary, Steph. *thes. s.v.*, "*proprie signific., ut opinor, calumnior trajiciendo culpram in alium.*" It would be perhaps still more correct to derive this sense from the meaning, *to stir up a quarrel* (between friends), *to sow discord*, opposed to *συμβάλλειν*. So Plat. *Conv.* 222 C D, ἐμέ καὶ Ἀγαθῶνα διαβάλλειν; *Rep.* vi. 498 C, etc. In the sense of *to accuse* in Luke xvi. 1, οὗτος διεβλήθη αὐτῷ ὡς διασκορπίζων τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτοῦ. So with the dative, Plat. *rep.* viii. 566 B, and followed by ὡς, the usual construction. Instead of the dative, also *πρὸς τινα*, Herod. v. 96; Plat. *Ep.* xiii. 362 D; Xen. *Anab.* i. 1. 3, εἰς τινα; Plat. *Euthyd.* iii. B; Xen. *Hell.* iii. 5. 2. In LXX. Dan. iii. 8, vi. 24 = נִשְׁבַּח לְכֹחַ, *vid.* Fürst, *hebr. Wörterb. s.v.* נִשְׁבַּח; in Num. xxii. 22 = נִשְׁבַּח; in Ps.

lxxi. 13, רָצוֹן = ἐνδιαβάλλειν, as in Ps. cix. 4, 20, 29, xxxviii. 20. Only in Zech. iii. 1 = ἀντικείμεθα. From which:

Διάβολος, ὁ, ἡ, slanderous, calumnious; also as a substantive, calumniator; not frequent in classical Greek; Polluc. v. 18, τὸ λοιδόρος εὐτελές, καὶ ὁ βλάσφημος καὶ διάβολος. Thus in 1 Tim. iii. 11; 2 Tim. iii. 3; Tit. ii. 3. LXX. = רָצוֹן , Esth. vii. 4, viii. 1. Then = רָצוֹן , which 1 Kings v. 18 ἐπίβουλος, parallel with ἀπάντημα πονηρόν. So also 1 Sam. xxix. 4; 2 Sam. xix. 23. Cf. Xen. Anab. i. 1. 3, Τισσαφέρνης διαβάλλει τὸν Κῦρον πρὸς τὸν ἀδελφόν, ὡς ἐπιβουλεύει αὐτῷ.—1 Kings xi. 14, 23, 25 = Σατάν. Then also 1 Chron. xxi. 1; Job i. 6, 7, 9, 12, ii. 1–6; Zech. iii. 1, 2 = ὁ διάβολος, who appears among the ἀγγέλοις τοῦ θεοῦ before God, opponent of the יְהוָה . It is to be rendered, not calumniator, but antagonist, accuser; cf. Zech. iii. 1, ὁ διάβολος εἰστήκει ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἀντικείμεθα αὐτῷ. See 1 Pet. v. 8, ὁ ἀντίδικος ὑμῶν διάβολος; Rev. xii. 10, ὁ κατήγωρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἡμῶν. The chief of the daemons (who are his angels) is thus designated, Matt. xxv. 41, as it would seem, in view of his relation to men over against God; whilst in his name σατάν, σατανᾶς, he appears merely as the antagonist of men, without respect to the relation which he thus assumes as against God; cf. the passages where רָצוֹן is used of men, 1 Kings v. 18, xi. 14, 23, 25; 1 Sam. xxix. 4; 2 Sam. xix. 23. It looks, however, as though at an early period in the use of this expression, the reference to the relationship of men over against God was withdrawn, for we read in Num. xxii. 32, ἐξῆλθον εἰς διαβολὴν σου, רָצוֹן יְהוָה רָצוֹן ; so that in διάβολος, as in ἐνδιαβάλλειν in other places, the meaning accuser, maligner, has acquired the more general signification of antagonist, enemy ("the evil enemy"). Cf. John vi. 70, ἐξ ὑμῶν εἰς διάβολός ἐστιν; comp. Matt. xvi. 23; Mark viii. 33. (The pass. διαβεβλήσθαι τι, πρὸς τινα, to be indignant at any one, cannot be referred to here because of the derivation from the active.) In no case is there in the expression what is suggested by Chrysost. Hom. lxvii. 6 (in Suic. Thes.), διάβολος ἀπὸ τοῦ διαβάλλειν εἴρηται, διέβαλε γὰρ τὸν ἄνθρωπον πρὸς τὸν θεόν, διέβαλε πάλιν τὸν θεὸν πρὸς ἄνθρωπον. A distinction between διάβολος and σατανᾶς cannot be pointed out in the N. T. Only in Rev. xii. 9 and xx. 2 does διάβ. appear to be used appellatively along with ὁ σατανᾶς = ὁ κατήγωρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν, xii. 10. This much, however, seems to be clear, that διάβολος denotes the enemy of men, because he is the disturber of their union with God. Cf. Suid., διάβολος διὰ τοῦτο ὡς δυνάμενος βάλλειν καὶ ἐχθροὺς ποιεῖν τοὺς φίλους. Hence the contraposition in John viii. 44, ὑμεῖς ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ διαβόλου ἐστέ (cf. Matt. xiii. 38), as compared with ver. 47, ὁ ὢν ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ; 1 John iii. 10, τὰ τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὰ τέκνα τοῦ διαβόλου. Cf. ver. 8, ὁ ποιῶν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, ἐκ τοῦ διαβόλου ἐστίν' ὅτι ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ὁ διάβολος ἁμαρτάνει. εἰς τοῦτο ἐφανερώθη ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα λύσῃ τὰ ἔργα τοῦ διαβόλου. The devil appears here in possession of a power to influence man, and that, too, in opposition to God and His influences; cf. Eph. ii. 3. The result of the devil's activity is sin, which, in its collective manifestations, is described as τὰ ἔργα τοῦ διαβόλου. Cf. Acts xiii. 10,

νιῇ διαβόλου, ἐχθρὲ πάσης δικαιοσύνης. It is this aspect which is made everywhere specially prominent in the N. T.; so Rev. xx. 10, ὁ διαβ. ὁ πλανῶν αὐτούς; xii. 9, ὁ πλανῶν τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην. James, in iv. 7, contrasts the ὑποτάγητε τῷ θεῷ with ἀντίστητε τῷ διαβόλῳ, where there must likewise be a reference to an influence exerted by the devil on human conduct, described in the Revelation as πλανᾶν, its design being to exchange the truth (righteousness) for a lie (sin), 2 Cor. vi. 8; Rom. i. 27; Jas. v. 19; cf. John viii. 44. In the same sense does Eph. vi. 11 speak of the μεθοδεῖαι τοῦ διαβόλου, which must probably be assumed also in reference to iv. 27, μὴ δίδοτε τόπον τῷ διαβόλῳ; cf. 2 Cor. ii. 11. Arts of seduction are meant, as in μὴ πως . . . φθαρῇ τὰ νοήματα ὑμῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀπλότητος εἰς Χριστόν, 2 Cor. xi. 3; cf. 2 Tim. ii. 25, 26, μήποτε δῶ αὐτοῖς ὁ θεὸς μετάνοιαν εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας, καὶ ἀνανήψωσιν ἐκ τῆς τοῦ διαβόλου παγίδος, ἐξωγρημένοι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ ἐκείνου θέλημα, *vid.* Huther *in loc.*, 1 Tim. iii. 7 (in vi. 9, Lachm. and Tisch. omit τοῦ διαβ.).—Accordingly, the devil appears as πειράζων, whose aim is πλανᾶν, Matt. iv. 1–11, Luke iv. 2–13, and John xiii. 2, as the one who suggested to Judas the betrayal of Christ;—an extremely humane view on the part of Scripture (be it observed by the way), according to which this betrayal does not flow forth from the man's own nature.—The devil is the adversary of mankind, inasmuch as he puts himself in the way of God's saving designs regarding them, Luke viii. 12, εἶτα ἔρχεται ὁ διάβολος καὶ αἶρει τὸν λόγον ἀπὸ τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν, ἵνα μὴ πιστεύσαντες σωθῶσιν, cf. 2 Cor. iv. 4; Matt. xiii. 19. Only once, and in relation to the saving purposes of God, is he directly represented as the adversary of God, Matt. xiii. 39.—Cf. ὁ τοῦ κόσμου ἄρχων, John xiv. 30, xii. 31, xvi. 11; ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, 2 Cor. iv. 4.—The devil further works also physical misery, Acts x. 38; Rev. ii. 10; cf. ver. 13. To him is ascribed τὸ κράτος τοῦ θανάτου, Heb. ii. 14, cf. Wisd. ii. 24, and “an authority to award condemnation” (Hahn, *neutest. Theol.* p. 361); 1 Tim. iii. 6, ἵνα μὴ τυφωθεῖς εἰς κρίμα ἐμπέση τοῦ διαβόλου—it would be better perhaps to say, *execute a judgment*, cf. 1 Cor. v. 5; 1 Tim. i. 20.—Other designations are: σατανᾶς, ὁ πονηρός, ὁ ἀντικείμενος, ὁ ὄφεις ὁ ἀρχαῖος, ὁ δράκων ὁ μέγας.

Καταβάλλω, aor. 1 pass. κατεβλήθην, Rev. xii. 10, to throw down, to hurl down, Rev. xii. 10, where Tisch. reads ἐβλήθη; to strike down; cf. Herod. ix. 63, κατέβαλον πολλοὺς τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων. So in 2 Cor. iv. 9, καταβαλλόμενοι ἄλλ' οὐκ ἀπολλύμενοι. Middle, to throw oneself down; middle of interest, to lay down for oneself, e.g. τὰ σπέρματα, θεμέλιον, the latter in Heb. vi. 1; cf. 1 Cor. iii. 10. For the image employed in Heb. vi. 1, cf. Plat. *Legg.* vii. 803 A. Καταβάλλεσθαι is also frequently used by itself as = to make a beginning; Pind. *Nem.* ii. 1, γάμον καταβάλλομ' αἰεῖδεν. Further = to establish, Plut. *Mor.* 329 A, τοῦ τὴν Στωικὴν αἵρεσιν καταβαλομένου Ζήνωνος; Diod. xii. 20, καταβαλόμενος ἐξ ἀρχῆς καινὴν νομοθεσίαν. Hence:

Καταβολή, ἡ, the founding, the establishing, e.g. Polyb. xiii. 6. 2, καταβολὴν ἐποιεῖτο καὶ θεμέλιον ὑπεβάλλετο πολυχρονίου καὶ βαρείας τυραννίδος; 2 Macc. ii. 29.

Ἐκ καταβολῆς, *from the very bottom, e.g. ναυπηγεῖν, κατηγορεῖν*. In this sense it is only used in later Greek. (Otherwise = *attack of fever, deposition of definite sums of money*.) We also find it = *jactus seminis, generation*, cf. Lucian. *Amor.* xix., ἡ φύσις . . . τοῖς ἄρρεσιν ἰδίας καταβολὰς σπερμάτων χαρισαμένη, τὸ θῆλυ δ' ὥσπερ γονῆς τι δοχεῖον ἀποφύνασα; Galen. *de Sem.* i.; *Aphorism.* iv.; Philo, *Opif. Mund.* p. 31; Mang., αἱ καταβολαὶ τῶν σπερμάτων, but only of the male; hence Heb. xi. 11, πίστει . . . Σάρρα δύναμιν εἰς καταβολὴν σπέρματος ἔλαβε, καὶ παρὰ καιρὸν ἡλικίας ἔτεκεν, can scarcely be interpreted in accordance with this meaning, unless, with Baumgarten, we resort to the periphrase εἰς τὸ δέχεσθαι σπέρμα καταβεβλημένον—which is inconsistent both with the active καταβολή and with δύναμις, followed by the final εἰς, cf. Luke v. 17, δύναμις κυρίου ἦν εἰς τὸ ἰᾶσθαι πάντας. We must therefore understand either “establishment of progeny,” σπέρμα, as in xi. 18, ii. 16; Gen. iv. 25, ἐξανέστησε γάρ μοι ὁ θεὸς σπέρμα ἕτερον ἀντὶ Ἀβελ. Against the interpretation that the δύναμις on Sarah's part answers to the καταβολὴ σπέρματος on Abraham's, εἰς being = *with reference to*, it is decisive (apart from the unnecessary, and therefore to be rejected, nakedness of the expression) that the plural only, καταβ. σπερμάτων, occurs with the signification *jactus seminis*. The Greek Fathers, indeed, take it exclusively in the sense just rejected; but evidently feel that the expression is unusual in such a connection, and accordingly try to justify its occurrence; cf. Theophyl. in Bleek's *Commentary on the Hebrews*, in *loc.*; and Chrysost., who, without hesitation, explains it εἰς ὑποδοχὴν.

In the remaining passages, always καταβολὴ κόσμου, and indeed ἀπὸ κ., Matt. xiii. 35 (Tisch. omits κόσμου), xxv. 34; Luke xi. 50; Heb. iv. 3, ix. 26; Rev. xiii. 8, xvii. 8; πρὸ κ., John xvii. 24; Eph. i. 4; 1 Pet. i. 20. Not in the LXX. The expression denotes the *beginning of history* in view of the future and the end. Cf. 1 Pet. i. 20, προεγνωσμένου μὲν πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, φανερωθέντος δὲ ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν χρόνων, for in καταβολή there always lies the relation to an intended continuation. Eph. i. 4, 1 Pet. i. 20, treat of the plan of the salvation formed by God before history commenced; as also Rev. xiii. 8, xvii. 8, whose realization was designed in the καταβ. τοῦ κόσμου, cf. Matt. xxv. 34, κληρονομήσατε τὴν ἡτοιμασμένην ὑμῖν βασιλείαν ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, and Cremer's treatise upon Matt. xxiv. 25, p. 198. The synonym ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κόσμου, Matt. xxiv. 31, is only a simple definition of time, as also ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως, Mark x. 6, xiii. 19, 2 Pet. iii. 4.

Παραβάλλω, to throw beside, to incline; e.g. Prov. v. 1, λόγοις παράβαλλε σὸν οὖς; xxii. 17; Plat. *Rep.* vii. 531 A, παραβάλλοντες τὰ ὄντα; Prov. ii. 2, καρδίαν εἰς σύνεσιν = πω, Hiphil.—Intrans. = to approach, e.g. εἰς τὴν πόλιν, Polyb. xii. 5. 1; εἰς χώραν εὐδαίμονα, xxi. 8. 14. So in Acts xx. 15, παρεβάλομεν εἰς Σάμον.—Metaph. = to place beside one another, i.e. to compare; Herod. iv. 198, τὶς ἢ Λιβύη σπουδαίη ὥστε ἡ Ἀσίῃ ἢ Εὐρώπῃ παραβληθῆναι; Xen. *Mem.* ii. 4. 5, πρὸς ποῖον κτήμα παραβαλλόμενος φίλος ἀγαθὸς οὐκ ἂν πολλῷ κρείττων φανείη; iv. 8. 11, παραβάλλων τὸ ἄλλων ἦθος πρὸς

ταῦτα. So in Mark iv. 30, Received text, ἐν ποίᾳ παραβολῇ παραβάλωμεν αὐτήν; (Lachm. and Tisch. read ἐν τίνι αὐτήν παραβολῇ θῶμεν;). Hence:

Παραβολή, ἡ, placing beside, comparison, *e.g.* Plat. *Phileb.*, ἐν τῇ παραβ. τῶν βίων, in the comparison of different kinds of life and work; Plut. *de Rat. Aud.* 40 E.—Then an utterance which involves a comparison, Matt. xv. 15, in reference to ver. 14, τυφλοὶ εἰσιν ὁδηγοὶ τυφλῶν. Mark iii. 23; Luke v. 36, vi. 39, xiv. 7, cf. ver. 11; a proverb, so far as it is applied to any particular case, or gives opportunity for a comparison, *e.g.* Luke iv. 23, πάντως ἐρεῖτέ μοι τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην Ἰατρὲ, θεράπευσον σεαυτόν; 1 Sam. xxiv. 14, καθὼς λέγεται ἡ παραβολὴ ἡ ἀρχαία ἐξ ἀνόμων ἐξελεύσεται πλημμέλεια; Ezek. xii. 22, 23, xviii. 2, 3. Similar is 1 Chron. vii. 20, δώσω αὐτὸν εἰς παραβολὴν καὶ εἰς διήγημα ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσιν; Deut. xxviii. 37; Ps. xlv. 15, ἔθου ἡμᾶς εἰς παραβολὴν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν; Ps. lxxix. 12, ἐγενόμην αὐτοῖς εἰς παραβολὴν. He at whom men (as we say) point with the finger, becomes a παραβολή, cf. Ps. xlv. 15, κίνησιν κεφαλῆς ἐν τοῖς λαοῖς. The Heb. **הַפְּלֵגָה**, to which παραβολή corresponds in these as in all the other passages, also denotes originally *comparison*,—both a complete parable and “a single figurative saying, a proverb, old German *Beispiel*, example; the last-mentioned word expresses the essence of a proverb, which sets up a single case as the type of an entire genus,” Hupfeld on Ps. xlv. 15. Cf. Fürst, *Concord. s.v.*; Delitzsch, *Zur Geschichte der jüd. Poesie*, p. 196. It then denotes also a song, a poem, in which an example is set up for instruction or mockery, Mic. ii. 4; Hab. ii. 6; Jer. xxiv. 9; Wisd. v. 3, ὃν ἔσχομέν ποτε εἰς γέλωτα καὶ εἰς παραβολὴν ὀνειδισμοῦ; Tobit iii. 4. A word or discourse of deeper meaning, which becomes intelligible through application or comparison, conjoined with αἶνιγμα, πρόβλημα, etc., cf. Ps. xlix. 5. **הַפְּלֵגָה**, Ps. lxxviii. 2; Prov. i. 6, **הַפְּלֵגָה** **הַפְּלֵגָה**, παραβολή καὶ σκοτεινὸς λόγος. So Ezek. xxiv. 3, xvii. 2; cf. Ecclus. iii. 29, καρδία συνετοῦ διανοηθήσεται παραβολὴν, καὶ οὐς ἀκροατοῦ ἐπιθυμία σοφοῦ. Hence also *e.g.* of the sayings of Balaam, Num. xxiii. 7, 18, xxiv. 3, 15. Of ambiguous sayings, Ecclus. xiii. 26, xxxviii. 33. (Elsewhere **הַפְּלֵגָה** is also rendered by παροιμία, θρήνος, προοίμιον, Job xxvii. 1, xxix. 1, xiii. 12, etc.) **Παραβολή** serves, therefore, in the usage of the **LXX.**, to denote either a dictum whose significance arises either from application to or derivation from a concrete case, or one whose proper meaning is not that expressed by the words, but becomes clear only through the intended application. For examples of the latter use, see Matt. xiii. 35, 3, 10, 13, 34, xxii. 1; Mark iv. 2, 11, 33, 34, xii. 1; Luke viii. 4, 10. Christ used this mode of speech as the appropriate form for the **μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν** (Matt. xiii. 11),—a form which conceals from the one class what it reveals to the other, Matt. xiii. 11–17. The **μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρ.** concern the kingdom of God in its relations to man, and *vice versa*; accordingly, relations and incidents of the earthly life are used for the figurative, comparative setting forth of those mysteries. The next lower sphere serves to illustrate the higher. Here lies at once the affinity and the difference between the parables of Christ and the parable as it occurs in the sphere of

classical Greek, where it is akin to the fable and the example. Aristot. *Rhet.* ii. 20, εἰσι δ' αἱ κοιναὶ πίστεις (*means of conviction*) δύο τῷ γένει, παράδειγμα καὶ ἐνθύμημα. ἡ γὰρ γνώμη μέρος ἐνθυμήματός ἐστιν. . . . παραδειγμάτων δ' εἶδη δύο ἐν μὲν γὰρ ἔστι παραδείγματος εἶδος τὸ λέγειν πράγματα προγεγενημένα, ἐν δὲ τὸ αὐτὸν ποιεῖν. τούτου δ' ἐν μὲν παραβολή, ἐν δὲ λόγοι, οἷον οἱ Αἰσώπειοι καὶ Διβυκοί. The *parable* differs from the *fable* and from the *example*, in that it adduces for illustration *what is wont to happen*,—the example, *what has happened*; but the fable transfers the case in point to another and lower sphere; and as it could not happen within that sphere, the design and meaning are more easily discerned. Cf. Aristot. *l.c.*, ῥᾶω μὲν οὖν πορίσασθαι τὰ διὰ τῶν λόγων, χρησιμώτερα δὲ πρὸς τὸ βουλευσασθαι τὰ διὰ τῶν πραγμάτων; Minucian. *de Argum.* 731, διαφέρουσιν αἱ παραβολαὶ τῶν παραδειγμάτων, ὅτι τὰ μὲν παραδείγματα ἐξ ἱστορίας λαμβάνεται, αἱ παραβολαὶ δὲ ἄνευ ἱστορίας καὶ ἀορίστως ἐκ τῶν γιγνομένων.—In point of form the parables of Christ are more like fables than what were termed parables; for in the fable the circumstances of one sphere are transferred to another, whose own circumstances are indeed different; whereas in the parable, some particular set of circumstances or position of things, some possible event, is employed to illustrate what the speaker wishes to explain or communicate. Cf. the example of a parable quoted by Aristotle. To this idea of parable would answer the sayings which involve a comparison adduced above, Matt. xiii. 18, xv. 15, xxiv. 32, etc. The parables of Christ, so styled κατ' ἔξοχ., are only detailed comparisons; cf. Luke xii. 41, xxi. 29; but form as such an independent group. Matt. xiii. 18, 24, 31, 33, 36, 53, xxi. 33, 45; Mark iv. 10, 13, vii. 17, xii. 12; Luke viii. 9, 11, xiii. 6, xv. 3, xviii. 1, 9, xix. 11, xx. 9, 19.

In Heb. ix. 9, ἡ πρώτη σκίνη is termed a παραβολή, because it is referred to not on its own account,—in which case either παράδειγμα or ὑπόδειγμα would have been used,—but for the sake of its significance, seeing it has no independent worth, but only serves (as a σκιά τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν, οὐκ αὐτὴ ἡ εἰκὼν τῶν πραγμάτων) in the way of comparison to illustrate the truth, as indeed its cultus likewise corresponded to this its character (καθ' ἣν . . . προσφέρονται). On the difference between παραβ. and type, *vid. τύπος, ἀλληγορεύω*.

In Heb. xi. 19, ὅθεν αὐτὸν καὶ ἐν παραβολῇ ἐκομίσατο, some explain ἐν παραβολῇ = παραβόλως (as ἐν ἀληθείᾳ = ἀληθῶς, ἐν τάχει = ταχέως), which cannot be shown to denote anything but *bold, venturesome, temerario ausu*; e.g. παραβόλως διδοὺς αὐτὸν εἰς τοὺς κινδύνους, Polyb. iii. 17. 8; παραβόλως διεκόμισαν τοὺς ἄνθρας, i. 20. 14, etc.; *vid. Raphael*; Bleek on Heb. xi. 19. But even if the subst. παραβολή in the passage cited for this—Plut. *Arat.* 22, διὰ πολλῶν ἐλιγμῶν καὶ παραβολῶν περαίνοντος πρὸς τὸ τεῖχος—denotes *bold enterprise* (Pape, *Wörterbuch*; Tholuck), and not synon. ἐλιγμός, *deviations from the straight course*, analogously to the use of the word of the ellipse (Delitzsch), the prominence given to ἐν παραβολῇ as a special feature, by means of καί, would still remain unexplained. On the contrary, this prominence becomes intelligible if we take παραβολή here in the sense of *similitude*, as in ix. 9; for then we are not merely told that Abraham

received Isaac back, but, as a special and chief feature of the reward of faith, that he, ἐν παραβολῇ, received him again. The receiving of Isaac back again is to be regarded as a similitude, and has a special significance, to wit, as expositors maintain, so far as it is a confirmation of the faith of Abraham, ὅτι ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγείρειν δυνατός ὁ θεός; cf. v. 35 with 1 Kings xvii. 23; 2 Kings iv. 36. Still, that this deliverance of Isaac was a *kind of* return from the dead, or as a pledge to Abraham that there will be a resurrection of the dead, would be too feeble a thought side by side with the preceding description of Abraham's faith, cf. Rom. iv. 17; and it is better to explain ἐν παραβολῇ with reference to the expression of Abraham's faith and Messianic hope occasioned by his reception of Isaac back, כִּי־יִהְיֶה, Gen. xxii. 14, and to the renewed confirmation of the Messianic promise that was thereupon received, vv. 16–18. Herein lies the *significance of the event*; and just this, its peculiar significance, is referred to in the words, καὶ ἐν παραβολῇ ἔκομ. (This may perhaps throw light also on John viii. 56.)

Βάπτω, to immerse; John xiii. 26; cf. Ruth ii. 14; Luke xvi. 24, βάπτειν τὸ ἄκρον τοῦ δακτύλου ὕδατος; cf. *Iliad*, v. 6, λελουμένος ὠκεανοῖο; and in *Arat.* 658, 858, 951, βάπτειν ὠκεανοῖο, ποταμοῖο; elsewhere with εἰς. *Vid.* Bernhardt, *Synt.* 168; Winer, xxx. 8. The gen. may be explained from the more complete expression βάπτειν τὸ ἀπὸ τινος, Ex. xii. 22; Lev. xiv. 16; Dan. iv. 30; cf. Josh. iii. 16 = *to make wet by immersion*. LXX. = לבב. — Then = *to dye by dipping*, Rev. xix. 13, ἱμάτιον βεβαμμένον αἵματι; cf. Herod. vii. 67, εἴματα βεβαμμένα; Mosch. i. 29, τὰ γὰρ πυρὶ πάντα βέβαπται; cf. Gen. xxxvii. 31, ἐμόλυναν τὸν χιτῶνα τῷ αἵματι = לבב. — Ἐμβάπτειν, Matt. xxvi. 23; Mark xiv. 20 (John xiii. 26, Lachm.). Hence:

Βαπτίζω, aor. 1 pass. ἐβαπτίσθην, aor. 1 mid. ἐβαπτισάμην, only in Acts xxii. 16, 1 Cor. x. 2; to immerse, to submerge; often in later Greek, Plut. *de Superst.* 166 A, βάπτισον σεαυτὸν εἰς θάλασσαν. LXX. once = לבב, 2 Kings v. 14, ἐβαπτίσατο ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ. Metaphorically, e.g. Plut. *Galb.* 21, ὀφλήμασι βεβαπτισμένος; cf. Isa. xxi. 4, ἡ ἀνομία με βαπτίζει = תשׁב.

The peculiar N. T. and Christian use of the word to denote *immersion, submersion* for a religious purpose = *to baptize*, John i. 25, τί οὖν βαπτίζεις; may be pretty clearly traced back to the Levitical washings, Hebrew רָחַץ, Lev. xiv. 8, 9, xv. 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 16, 18, 21, 22, 27, xvii. 15, xv. 13, xvi. 4, 24, 28, Num. xix. 7, 19, Ex. xix. 10, xxix. 4, xl. 12, for which LXX. = λούεσθαι; cf. Acts xxii. 16, βάπτισαι καὶ ἀπόλυσαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας σου. For, according to Mark vii. 4, Luke xi. 38, Heb. ix. 10, Ecclus. xxxiv. 10, βαπτιζόμενος ἀπὸ νεκροῦ, βαπτίζειν, appears to have been at that time the technical term for these washings; cf. Matt. xv. 2, νίπτεσθαι, for which Mark vii. 4 has βαπτίζεσθαι. (Out of these washings certainly arose also the baptism of proselytes, which, according to the testimonies as to its age, cannot have suggested the New Testament βαπτίζειν. *Vid.* Schneckenburger, *Ueber das Alter der jüdischen Proselytentaufe*, 1828; Winer, *Realwört. s.v.* Proselyten: "Josephus, Philo, and the older Targumists

never allude to the baptism of proselytes, properly so termed,—a baptism which was deemed as essential as circumcision,—although they had frequent opportunities of doing so.”—Leyrer in Herzog’s *Real-Encyclopaedie*, xii. 242 ff.) As the terms כְּבִילָה, כְּבִילָה, were used in post-biblical Hebrew, rather than the biblical word קָטַר, to denote these washings, and the former had already been rendered βάπτειν by the LXX. (*vid. supra*), it is intelligible enough how this use arose. Cf. 2 Kings v. 10, where ver. 14 βαπτίζειν. Expressions like Isa. i. 16, and prophecies like Ezek. xxxvi. 25, xxxvii. 23 ff., Zech. xiii. 1, are connected with the Levitical washings. These washings again, and the prophecies in question, are connected with the purification which followed on and completed the act of expiation or cleansing from sin; cf. *s.v.* καθαρίζω, καθαρισμός; cf. Num. viii. 5–22; Lev. xiii. 14; Ex. xix. 14; also 1 John v. 6, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἐλθὼν δι’ ὕδατος καὶ αἵματος κ.τ.λ. Heb. x. 22, 23, ῥεραντισμένοι τὰς καρδίας ἀπὸ συνειδήσεως πονηρᾶς καὶ λελουμένοι τὸ σῶμα ὕδατι καθαρῷ. This is the reason also why βαπτίζειν in itself was not a thing unknown to the Jews, and why they did not consider it right for every one to come forward as John the Baptist did, John i. 25. For what was unusual in John was, that he performed the βαπτίζειν on others, hence his title ὁ βαπτιστής, whereas the law required such lustrations to be accomplished by every one for himself. His was an act which only had a parallel in Lev. viii. 6, and could not but call to mind the prophecies in question; and indeed the Rabbis testify (*vid.* Lightfoot, *Horae Hebr.* on John i. 25) that corresponding expectations were entertained, *e.g.*, concerning the advent of Elias. Kimchi on Zech. ix. 6 says, “*tradunt Rabbini: Elias purificabit nothos eosque restituet congregationi.*”

By βαπτίζειν, therefore, we must understand a washing whose design, like that of the theocratic washings and purifications, was to purge away sin from him on whom it was performed. For this, cf. John iii. 25 ff., where both the baptism of Jesus and that of John are included under the idea of καθαρισμός. Hence Matt. iii. 6, ἐβαπτίζοντο . . . ἐξομολογούμενοι τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν; Mark i. 4, ἐγένετο Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτίζων ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ κηρύσσων βάπτισμα μετανόας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν. Cf. Luke iii. 3; Acts ii. 38, βαπτισθῆτω ἕκαστος ὑμῶν . . . εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν; Acts xxii. 16, βαπτίσαι καὶ ἀπόλυσαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας σου; 1 Pet. iii. 21, *vid. s.v.* βάπτισμα. So far, therefore, there is no difference between the baptism of John and Christian baptism, as both aim at the ἄφεσις ἁμ. The expression, βαπτίζω ὑμᾶς ἐν ὕδατι εἰς μετάνοιαν, Matt. iii. 11, means nothing more than Mark i. 4, βάπτισμα μετανόας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, and Acts ii. 38, Μετανοήσατε καὶ βαπτισθῆτω κ.τ.λ., *vid. supr.* Not as though μετάνοια were to be worked by this baptism in the place of ἄφεσις, but ἄφεσις cannot be without μετάνοια, without which also no one can enter the kingdom of heaven; and as μετάνοια is required too of all who come to baptism, Matt. iii. 2, 8, Acts ii. 38, it remains accordingly the distinctive characteristic of those who are baptized for the remission of sins. To bring about such μετάνοια John appeared βαπτίζων ἐν ὕδατι; and the expression in Matt. iii. 11 is selected instead of εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμ. in view, vv. 7, 8. The expression implies, notwithstanding, that there is a distinction between the baptism of John and that of the Messianic church, in which

μετάνοια is appropriated by πίστις. The baptism of John is styled, κατ' ἐξ, the βάπτισμα μετανοίας in Mark i. 4; Luke iii. 3; Acts xiii. 24, xix. 4, — we might accordingly designate Christian baptism βάπτισμα πίστεως; comp. Acts xix. 4, 5, Ἰωάννης μὲν ἐβάπτισε βάπτισμα μετανοίας, τῷ λαῷ λέγων, εἰς τὸν ἐρχόμενον μετ' αὐτὸν ἵνα πιστεύσωσι, τοῦτ' ἐστὶν εἰς τὸν Ἰησοῦν. ἀκούσαντες δὲ ἐβαπτίσθησαν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ; Acts viii. 12, 13. The difference lies, however, not in the βαπτίζειν, which was in all cases a washing unto purification from sin, but in the temporal relation thereof to Jesus Christ. For all depends on what is had in view at the immersion or washing, Acts xix. 3, εἰς τί οὖν ἐβαπτίσθητε; οἱ δὲ εἶπαν· εἰς τὸ Ἰωάννον βάπτισμα; ver. 5, ἐβαπτίσθησαν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ; 1 Cor. i. 13, ἡ εἰς τὸ ὄνομα Παύλου ἐβαπτίσθητε; ver. 15, ἵνα μή τις εἴπῃ ὅτι εἰς τὸ ἐμὸν ὄνομα ἐβαπτίσθητε; x. 2, πάντες εἰς τὸν Μωϋσῆν ἐβαπτίσαντο, on which cf. Ex. xiv. 31, וַיִּבְרָךְ יְהוָה אֶת-יִשְׂרָאֵל בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא. What is in question is a relation into which the candidates for baptism are to be brought; as also in the case of εἰς μετάνοιαν, εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, εἰς ἐν σῶμα ἐβαπτίσθημεν, 1 Cor. xii. 13,—expressions which differ from those previously mentioned only as the relation to a person differs from that to a thing. Εἰς is invariably used in an ideal sense. That the local force of the preposition must not be pressed, as though it were to be explained in analogy with Mark i. 9, ἐβαπτίσθη ὑπὸ Ἰωάννου εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην, is plain from the expressions last adduced, especially from 1 Cor. x. 2, πάντες εἰς τὸν Μωϋσῆν ἐβαπτίσαντο ἐν τῇ νεφέλῃ καὶ ἐν τῇ θαλάσῃ; Matt. iii. 11, ἐν ὕδατι εἰς μετάνοιαν. A complete explanation is thus furnished of Rom. vi. 3, 4, ὅσοι ἐβαπτίσθημεν εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, εἰς τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ ἐβαπτίσθημεν συνετάφημεν οὖν αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος εἰς τὸν θάνατον. Further conjoined with εἰς in Matt. xxviii. 19, εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος; Gal. iii. 27, ὅσοι εἰς Χριστὸν ἐβαπτίσθητε, Χριστὸν ἐνεδύσασθε; Acts viii. 16, εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ. The other connections also, ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ, Acts ii. 38, ἐν τῷ ὄν. τοῦ κυρίου, Acts x. 48, in which the word occurs, are favourable to this explanation, so far as they show that what the word was designed to indicate was, so far as εἰς was used, the relation into which the baptized were placed; so far as ἐπὶ and ἐν were used, the basis or ground on which baptism was administered. The βαπτίζεσθαι ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν in 1 Cor. xv. 29 is an allowing oneself to be baptized on account of the dead; ὑπὲρ assigns the motive, as often in classical and N. T. Greek, cf. Rom. xv. 8. Plat. *Conviv.* 208 D, ὑπὲρ ἀρετῆς ἀθανάτου καὶ τοιαύτης δόξης εὐκλεοῦς πάντες πάντα ποιοῦσιν. It is not said that the baptism was for the advantage of the dead, but that the dead, inasmuch, namely, as they will rise again (for only in this sense can mention be made of them), give the living occasion to be baptized; cf. Acts xvii. 32, that those who have undergone baptism for such a reason have no hope (τί ποιήσουσιν), and have therefore been baptized in vain (τί καὶ βαπτίζονται) if the dead do not rise at all. Βαπτίζεσθαι ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν is parallel therefore with τί καὶ ἡμεῖς κινδυνεύομεν (ver. 30); εἰ νεκροὶ οὐκ ἐγείρονται, vv. 29, 32.

Metaphorically used, βαπτίζειν occurs in Matt. iii. 11, βαπτ. ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ

πυρί, opposed to ἐν ὕδατι εἰς μετάνοιαν; cf. Luke iii. 16; John i. 33. That the meaning "to wash in order to purification from sin," is metaphorical, and not that of "immerse," is clear from the contraposition of ἐν ὕδ. and ἐν πν., by which the two baptisms are distinguished from each other. Both in the case of John and of the Messiah the question was one of washing for purification from sin, which the former effected by means of water, the latter by means of the Holy Spirit and fire; cf. Ezek. xxxvi. 25–27; Mal. iii. 2, 3; Isa. vi. 6, 7. (It makes no material difference whether ἐν be taken *locally* or *instrumentally*; it is the *former*, if in βαπτίζω, with the meaning *to dip*, we maintain the idea of *immersion*; it is the *latter*, if we maintain the idea of a *washing* or *pouring over*.) No distinction is drawn between the baptism which Christ adopted from John and transmitted to His disciples, and John's own baptism; it is only said what Messiah's work is in relation to John's; cf. Acts i. 5. It follows, however (comp. Acts ii. 38), that the baptism enjoined by Christ, not pointing to something future, but to something present (Acts xix. 4, 5), must have conjoined with the use of water the factor of which John had opened up the prospect; in other words, that it was a baptism ἐν ὕδατι καὶ πνεύματι, or πυρί, cf. John iii. 5.

The use of the word in Luke xii. 50, βάπτισμα δὲ ἔχω βαπτισθῆναι; Mark x. 38, 39, τὸ βάπτισμα δ' ἐγὼ βαπτίζομαι βαπτισθήσεσθε, was probably suggested by O. T. expressions like Ps. lxi. 2, 3, 15, 16, xlii. 7, cxiv. 4, 5, cxliv. 7, Isa. xliii. 2, cf. Rev. xii. 15, not by its employment in the sense "to baptize for purification from sin," in opposition to Mark x. 39, as Theophyl. on Matt. xx. 22, βάπτισμα ὀνομάζει τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ, ὡς καθαρτικὸν ὄντα πάντων ἡμῶν, assumes. — The active and passive occur in Matt. iii. 11, 13, 14, 16, xxviii. 19; Mark i. 4, 8, vi. 14, x. 38, 39, xvi. 16; Luke iii. 16; John i. 25, 26, 28, 31, 33, iii. 22, 23, 26, iv. 1, 2, x. 40; Acts i. 5, viii. 16, 36, 38, x. 47, 48, xi. 16, xix. 3, 4; Rom. vi. 3; 1 Cor. i. 13–17, xii. 13; Gal. iii. 27. The middle = to let oneself be baptized, with the aor. 1 both pass. and middle (cf. Krüger, § 52, 6. 1, 4, cf. Matt. iii. 13, 14; Mark x. 38, 39, xvi. 16; Luke xi. 38, for the notion that in this case the middle is properly a medial passive, and that the verbs in question, owing to the affinity between this meaning and that of the pass., hover between the passive and middle aorist, Acts xxii. 16; 1 Cor. x. 2); Matt. iii. 6; Mark i. 5, 9; Luke iii. 7, 12, 21, vii. 29, 30, xii. 50; John iii. 23; Acts ii. 38, 41, viii. 12, 13, xvi. 15, 33, xviii. 8, xxii. 16; 1 Cor. x. 2 (where Lachm. reads ἐβαπτίσθησαν instead of ἐβαπτίσαντο, — the middle to be explained with a regard to Ex. xiv. 31); 1 Cor. xv. 29.

Βαπτισμός, ὁ, the washing, Mark vii. 4, 8, ποτηρίων κ.τ.λ. (ver. 8 omitted by Tisch. and the cod. Sin.), vide supra, βαπτίζω. Heb. ix. 10, διάφοροι βαπτισμοί, as constituents of the δικαιώματα of the O. T. law; Heb. vi. 2, βαπτισμῶν διδαχή, as a constituent of the ὁ τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγος. Accordingly it is less probable that the writer referred to Christian baptism in distinction from O. T. lustrations, than to the difference and relation between Christian baptism and that of John, — a difference which

would often need to be discussed. *Vid.* John iii. 25 ff.; Acts xviii. 25, xix. 3–5. *Βαπτισμός* denotes the act as a fact, *βάπτισμα* the result of the act, and hence the former word is suitable as a designation of the institution. *Jos. Antt.* xviii. 52 uses *βαπτισμός* of the baptism of John. Otherwise, like *βάπτισμα*, *βαπτιστής*, *βαπτιστήριον*, it is used exclusively by biblical and ecclesiastical writers.

Βάπτισμα, τό, baptism (as accomplished), *i.e.* washing unto purification from sin. Of the baptism of John, *τὸ β. Ἰωάννου*, Matt. iii. 7; Mark xi. 30; Luke vii. 29, xx. 4; Acts i. 22, xviii. 25, xix. 3 = *βάπτισμα δ' ἐκήρυξεν Ἰωάννης*, Acts x. 37; cf. xiii. 24. Designated *β. μετανόας*, Mark i. 4; Acts xiii. 24, xix. 4; more completely, *β. μεταν. εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν*, Luke iii. 3, so far as *μετάνοια*, being both condition and result, conferred on it its peculiar character; *vid.* *βαπτίζειν*. *Baptism unto Christ*, see Rom. vi. 4, *β. εἰς τὸν θάνατον Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ*, as cleansing from sin follows by virtue of the death of Christ, cf. 1 John i. 7, *τὸ αἷμα Ἰησοῦ καθαρίζει ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης ἁμαρτίας*; 1 Pet. i. 2, *ῥαντισμὸς αἵματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, cf. Rom. vi. 5, 6, and accordingly baptism, as a washing unto purification from sin, stands connected with the death of Christ. Col. ii. 12, *συνταφέντες τῷ Χριστῷ ἐν τῷ βαπτίσματι*, as in Rom. vi. 4, *συνετάφημεν αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ β.*; Eph. iv. 5, *ἐν βάπτισμα*, counted among the *momenta* (elements) constituting Christian fellowship. 1 Pet. iii. 12, *δ (sc. ὑδὼρ) καὶ ὑμᾶς ἀντίτυπον νῦν σώζει βάπτισμα, οὐ σαρκὸς ἀπόθεσις ῥύπον, ἀλλὰ συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς ἐπερώτημα εἰς θεόν*. As the passage treats of the effect of water in baptism (*σώζει*), and as *βάπτισμα* is generally something done *to*, not *by* the subject, *ἐπερώτημα* and *ἀπόθεσις* cannot denote an act of the subject, and it will not do to explain the words, *συνειδ. ἀγ. ἐπερώτημα εἰς θεόν*, either (with Hofmann and Schott) as “the request or petition for a good conscience directed to God,” or as “vow of a good conscience” (*gen. subj.* or *obj.*), which is based on the transference of a Latin idiom by the Roman jurists (*ἐπερώτημα* = *stipulatio*). *Ἐπερώτημα*, in Herod. vi. 67, Thuc. iii. 53, 68 = *question*, may also denote the thing asked or prayed for (Matt. xvi. 1), as *αἶτημα* denotes both the petition and the *res petita*, Luke xxiii. 24, 1 John v. 14, *καύχημα*, the boast and the object thereof, 2 Cor. i. 14, Phil. ii. 14, *δώρημα*, and other words. *Συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς ἐπερώτημα εἰς θεόν* is that pertaining to a good conscience which has been asked and obtained from God (not as Hofmann, *Weissagung und Erfüllung*, ii. 234, the requested happiness of a good conscience), that constituting a good conscience which has been obtained by prayer. That *ἐπερώτημα* may be used in this sense, is evident both from Dan. iv. 14, where *נְדָבָה* = *ἐπερώτημα*, *what is demanded* (*i.e.* *something determined, decree?*), and from the legal use which was suggested by the meaning “something asked” (*vid.* Brückner in de Wette *in loc.*). The use of *ἀπόθεσις* does not require us to suppose that baptism is conceived as the act of the person baptized, but only as an act which has been, or is being, performed on him.

Βαπτιστής, ὁ, the Baptist = *ὁ βαπτίζων*, as Tisch. and cod. Sin. Mark vi. 24 (cf. ver. 14). Name given to John, suggested by the function committed to and exer-

cised by him, Matt. xxi. 25; Mark xi. 30; Luke xx. 4; John i. 33, ὁ πέμψας με βαπτίζειν ἐν ὕδατι; cf. ver. 25, τί οὖν βαπτίζεις, εἰ σὺ οὐκ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς οὐδὲ Ἕλλας οὐδὲ ὁ προφήτης; Matt. iii. 1, xi. 11, 12, xiv. 2, 8, xvi. 14, xvii. 13; Mark vi. 24, 25, viii. 28; Luke vii. 20, 28 (Tisch. omits), 33, ix. 19. See βαπτίζω.

Βασιλεύς, ἑως, ὁ, king, he who has rule over the people, from βαίνω and λαός = the German *Herzog*. The idea connected with the word is that of ruler, governor; whilst τύραννος marks him as one invested with power. Plat. defin. 415 B, βασιλεὺς ἄρχων κατὰ νόμους ἀνυπεύθυνος; Xen. Mem. iii. 9, 10, βασιλεῖς δὲ καὶ ἄρχοντας οὐ τοὺς τὰ σκήπτρα ἔχοντας ἔφη εἶναι, οὐδὲ τοὺς ὑπὸ τῶν τυχόντων αἵρεθέντας, οὐδὲ τοὺς κλήρω λάχοντας, οὐδὲ τοὺς βιασαμένους, οὐδὲ τοὺς ἐξαπατήσαντας, ἀλλὰ τοὺς ἐπισταμένους ἄρχειν. Cf. iv. 6, 12, under βασιλεία.—1 Pet. ii. 13, ὑποτάγητε βασιλεῖ ὡς ὑπερέχοντι; cf. 1 Tim. ii. 2; John xix. 15, οὐκ ἔχομεν βασιλεία εἰ μὴ Καίσαρα, cf. Acts xvii. 7. Hence it is a designation of every one in possession of a dominion, both of the Roman emperor, 1 Pet. ii. 13, 1 Tim. ii. 2, and e.g. of the tetrarchs (Luke iii. 1), Matt. ii. 1, Acts xxv. 13; of Aretas of Arabia, 2 Cor. xi. 32.—Cf. Heb. vii. 1, xi. 23, 27; Rev. i. 5, ix. 11. God is designated μέγας βασιλεύς, Matt. v. 35, cf. Ps. xlviii. 3, as the sphere of His rule includes all, world and time, Ps. ciii. 19; Wisd. vi. 5; cf. 1 Tim. i. 17, ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν αἰώνων; Tob. xiii. 6, εὐλογήσατε τὸν κύριον τῆς δικαιοσύνης καὶ ὑψώσατε τὸν βασιλέα τῶν αἰώνων, ver. 10; cf. Heb. i. 2, xi. 3, see αἰών; 1 Tim. vi. 15, ὁ μόνος δυνάστης, ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν βασιλευόντων καὶ κύριος τῶν κυριευόντων; Rev. xv. 3, β. τῶν ἐθνῶν, cf. Ps. xlvii. 9. In this sense God is repeatedly designated King in the O. T., Ex. xv. 18; 2 Kings xix. 15; Jer. x. 7, 10, and frequently in the Psalms, especially Ps. xciii.—xcix., where, however, it must not be forgotten that both the revelation and the recognition of this His universal rule are reserved for the future, Zech. xiv. 9, 16, Isa. ii.; at present it manifests itself only in isolated cases; as, for example, in judgments on those who resist His plan of salvation; cf. Rev. x. 17, εἴληφας τὴν δύναμίν σου τὴν μεγάλην καὶ ἐβασίλευσας κ.τ.λ. But especially is God a King in His relation to Israel, Deut. xxxiii. 5, ה'יְהוָה מֶלֶךְ יִשְׂרָאֵל, and that, too, not merely as the one who rules Israel, 1 Sam. viii. 7, xii. 12, Judg. viii. 23, but so far as His relation to Israel is a manifestation of what He is and designs to be to the whole world, Isa. xxiv. 21–23, ii.—that is, so far as He procures help and redemption, Isa. xxxiii. 22; Ps. lxxiv. 12; cf. Dan. vi. 26, 27. He is King, in a special sense, within the economy of redemption, Isa. xliii. 15; Lev. xxv. 23, xxvi. 11, 12; Deut. vii. 6, xiv. 2, as He who carries out His saving purpose (Ex. xv. 18, and particularly Isa. lii. 7), and thus binds the people to Himself, makes them dependent on and subject to Him,—nay more, thus will bring about a totally different state of the world from that hitherto, Isa. ii.; Mic. iv. Cf. 1 Cor. xv. 24–28; Dan. ii. 35, 45.

As the Messiah, Jesus is designated βασιλεύς, and, indeed, in the first instance, β. τῶν Ἰουδαίων, Matt. ii. 2; Mark xv. 2, 9, 12, 18, 26; Luke xxiii. 3, 37, 38; John xviii. 39, xix. 3, 14, 15, 19, 21; ὁ β. τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, Mark xv. 32; John i. 50, xii. 13; cf. Luke

i. 32, 33; δώσει αὐτῷ κύριος ὁ θεὸς τὸν θρόνον Δαυὶδ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ βασιλεύσει ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰακώβ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, καὶ τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔσται τέλος. This in connection with prophecies such as Isa. ix. 6, 7; Dan. vii. 14; Ezek. xxxiv. 23, xxxvii. 24; Jer. xxxiii. 15; Zech. ix. 9; cf. Matt. xxi. 5; John xii. 15. Hence Χριστὸς βασιλεὺς, Luke xxiii. 2; ὁ ἐρχόμενος βασιλεὺς, Luke xix. 38; cf. John xviii. 37, βασιλεὺς εἰμὶ ἐγώ; ver. 36, ἡ βασιλεία ἡ ἐμὴ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου. The Messiah is King, as He is called and sent to carry out the redeeming purposes of God concerning His people, and finally concerning the world; as the representative therefore of God, in which capacity He will restore the normal relation between God and His people, or the world, Jer. xxxiii. 15, 16; Ezek. xxxiv. 23; cf. 1 Cor. xv. 24, εἴτα τὸ τέλος ὅταν παραδιδῶ τὴν βασιλείαν τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ, ὅταν καταργήσῃ πᾶσαν ἀρχὴν κ.τ.λ. Hence His βασιλεία is not one which belongs to, or manifests itself in accordance with, the present organism of the world; and so far as it reaches into the present (Luke xvii. 21, xi. 30), it bears the same relation to its form in the future as the Son of man on earth bears to the same Son καθημένῳ ἐπὶ θρόνου δόξης αὐτοῦ, who, as a matter of course, wears the title ὁ βασιλεὺς, Matt. xxv. 34, 40.—In Rev. xvii. 14, xix. 16, He is termed βασιλεὺς βασιλέων, κύριος κυρίων, not merely to describe His power (i. 5, ὁ ἀρχὼν τῶν βασιλέων τῆς γῆς), but as He who is victorious over all opposing powers; cf. Rev. xi. 17, εἴληφας τὴν δυνάμιν σου τὴν μεγάλην καὶ ἐβασίλευσας; xvii. 12; Dan. vii. 14, ii. 35, 45; 1 Cor. xv. 25, δεῖ γὰρ αὐτὸν βασιλεύειν ἄχρις οὗ θῇ πάντας τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ.

In Rev. i. 6, according to the majority of testimonies, we must read ἐποίησεν ἡμᾶς βασιλείαν, ἱερεῖς τῷ θεῷ instead of βασιλεῖς κ.τ.λ.; on the contrary, v. 10, ἐποίησας αὐτοὺς βασιλεῖς καὶ ἱερεῖς, according to most authorities, where Lachm., Tisch., following cod. A, also again read βασιλείαν. Cf. Rev. xx. 4, 6, xxii. 5; Dan. vii. 27; Gen. xii. 3, xviii. 18; Jas. i. 18.

Βασίλειος, ον, royal, belonging to, appointed, or suitable for the king, e.g. θρόνος, πορφύρα. The neuter in the sing. (Xen.) and the plural (Luke vii. 25) = royal palace.—In 1 Pet. ii. 9, βασιλεῖον ἱεράτευμα, corresponding to the Hebrew כֹהֲנִים מְלָכִים, Ex. xix. 6. Here the explanation (comp. Rev. v. 10, xx. 4, 6) suggests itself readily,—“a priesthood called to royal dominion, or clothed with royal dignity.” Nor is the meaning of the adj. βασιλειος opposed thereto; cf. e.g. Herod. i. 35, ἀνὴρ γένεος τοῦ βασιληίου. On the other hand, however, this explanation does not correspond to the Hebrew text, which describes Israel as the people whose King is God (compare βασιλεὺς, מֶלֶךְ in this sense in 1 Kings xviii. 10), and who are more precisely defined as a nation of priests, cf. Rev. i. 6.

Βασιλεία, ἡ, royal dominion; a designation both of the power (Ezra iv. 5) and the form of government, and, especially in later writers, of the territory and the rule, the kingdom and the kingdom. Suidas, τὸ ἀξίωμα καὶ τὸ ἔθνος βασιλευμένον; Xen. Mem. iv. 6. 12, βασιλείαν δὲ καὶ τυραννίδα ἀρχὰς μὲν ἀμφοτέρας ἡγεῖτο εἶναι, διαφέρειν δὲ ἀλλήλων ἐνόμιζε.

τὴν μὲν γὰρ ἐκόντων τε τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ κατὰ νόμους τῶν πόλεων ἀρχὴν βασιλείαν ἡγεῖτο, τὴν δὲ ἀκόντων τε καὶ μὴ κατὰ νόμους, ἀλλ' ὅπως ὁ ἀρχὼν βούλοιτο, τυραννίδα.

(I.) It is in the New Testament a designation of *power*, Rev. xii. 10, xvii. 18, ἡ ἔχουσα βασιλείαν ἐπὶ τῶν βασιλείων τῆς γῆς. Also, probably, in xvii. 12, οἵτινες βασιλείον οὐπω ἔλαβον, ἀλλ' ἐξουσίαν ὡς βασιλεῖς μίαν ὥραν λαμβάνουσιν; cf. ver. 17, δοῦναι τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτῶν τῷ θηρίῳ. Further, Rev. i. 9, συγκοινωνὸς ἐν τῇ θλίψει καὶ βασιλείᾳ καὶ ὑπομονῇ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ; ver. 6, ἐποίησεν ἡμᾶς βασιλείαν κ.τ.λ.; cf. v. 10, xx. 4, 6, xxii. 5; Dan. vii. 27. As ἐγένετο ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ κόσμου τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν in xi. 15 must, it would seem, be explained as = "dominion over the world," one will be disposed to take it in the same sense in the only other passage, Rev. xvi. 10, ἐγένετο ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ ἐσκοτισμένη, so that, in the Revelation, βασιλεία would always denote *royal power*, or *glory*. It occurs, besides, in this sense in 1 Cor. xv. 24, ὅταν παραδιδοῖ τὴν βασιλείαν τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ; Luke i. 33, βασιλείας αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔσται τέλος.

(II.) In the remaining passages βασιλεία denotes the *sphere of rule*, realm, or kingdom; Matt. iv. 8; Luke iv. 5, ἔδειξεν αὐτῷ πάσας τὰς βασιλείας τῆς οἰκουμένης, τοῦ κόσμου; Matt. xii. 25 sq., πᾶσα βασιλεία μερισθεῖσα . . . πᾶσα πόλις κ.τ.λ.; cf. Mark iii. 24; Luke xi. 17, 18.—Matt. xxiv. 7, ἐγερθήσεται βασιλεία ἐπὶ βασιλείαν; Mark vi. 23, xiii. 8; Luke xix. 12, 15, xxi. 10; Acts i. 6; Mark xi. 10. In the N. T. it occurs principally in the expression, ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, for which Matthew has, except in vi. 10, 33, xii. 28, xxi. 31, 43, always ἡ βασ. τῶν οὐρανῶν. The same also absolutely, ἡ βασιλεία, Matt. viii. 12, xiii. 38, xxiv. 14; Luke xii. 32. It thus denotes the *sphere of God's rule*, or that *order of things* (cf. John xviii. 36, in contrast with κόσμος) in which the prevalence of His will, *i.e.* according to what was remarked under βασιλεύς, specially the realization of His saving purpose (the fulfilment of His promises, Jas. ii. 5), becomes manifest. Cf. Luke xvi. 16, ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται μέχρι Ἰωάννου ἀπὸ τότε ἡ βασ. τ. θεοῦ εὐαγγελίζεται (*vid.* εὐαγγέλιον); Mark xv. 43, προσδεχόμενος τὴν βασ. τ. θ.; Luke xxiii. 51, προσεδέχετο τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ; Luke xvii. 20, πότε ἔρχεται ἡ βασιλεία τ. θεοῦ; Matt. xxv. 34, κληρονομήσατε τὴν ἡτοιμασμένην ὑμῖν βασιλείαν, κ.τ.λ. As the matter in hand is the realization of the saving purposes of God as proclaimed by the prophets, we at once understand why the preaching of the Gospel commenced with the announcement, ἡγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν, Mark i. 15; Luke x. 9, 11; cf. Matt. iii. 2, iv. 17, x. 7, to which the petition corresponds, ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου, Matt. vi. 10; Luke xi. 2; so also the proof adduced in Matt. xii. 28, εἰ δὲ ἐν πνεύματι θεοῦ ἐγὼ ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια, ἄρα ἔφθασεν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἡ β. τ. θ.; cf. Luke xi. 20, xxi. 31, as compared with ver. 28, where βασ. τ. θ. and ἀπολύτρωσις correspond. This explains also the emphasis laid on the distinction between the redemptive economy of the Old and New Testaments, Matt. xi. 11; Luke vii. 28. Hence *the kingdom of God* formed the contents and subject of evangelical preaching and instruction, Acts xix. 8, explained from its connection with the entire course of the history of redemption or revelation, Acts xxviii. 23, οἷς ἐξετίθετο διαμαρτυρούμενος τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ, πείθων τε αὐτοὺς περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ

ἀπό τε τοῦ νόμου Μωσέως καὶ τῶν προφητῶν. Cf. Luke iv. 43, ὅτι καὶ ταῖς ἐτέραις πόλεσιν εὐαγγελίσασθαι με δεῖ τὴν βασ. τ. θ., ὅτι ἐπὶ τοῦτο ἀπεστάλην. The combinations εὐαγγελίσασθαι τὴν β. τ. θ., further, in Luke viii. 1, xvi. 16; Acts viii. 12; cf. τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς β. τ. θ., Mark i. 14; Matt. iv. 23, ix. 35, xxiv. 13 (εὐαγγ., the good tidings of the fulfilled promise of salvation, correlate to ἐπαγγελία, the promise of salvation itself); κηρύσσειν τὴν β. τ. θ., Luke ix. 2; Acts xx. 25, xxviii. 31; λαλεῖν περὶ τῆς β. τ. θ., Luke ix. 11; διαγγέλλειν τὴν β. τ. θ., Luke ix. 60; λέγειν τὰ περὶ τῆς β. τ. θ., Acts i. 3, xix. 8; τὰ μυστήρια τῆς β. τ. θ., Luke viii. 10; Mark iv. 11; Matt. xiii. 11; ver. 19, ὁ λόγος τῆς β. With the fact that the kingdom of God offers the realization of the divine purpose of salvation, it is in keeping that the working of miracles by Christ and His disciples goes hand in hand with the preaching of the kingdom, Matt. xii. 28; Luke x. 9; Matt. ix. 35; Luke ix. 2, etc.; because the connection between these miracles and salvation in the kingdom of God corresponds to the connection, everywhere expressed or presupposed, between sin and death in the world (cf. Cremer's *Ueber die Wunder im Zusammenhange der göttlichen Offenbarung*, Barmen 1865). Hence the expectation of great blessedness in the kingdom of God, Luke xiv. 15, μακάριος ὃς φάγεται ἄρτον ἐν τῇ β. τ. θ.; cf. xiii. 29, ἀνακληθήσονται ἐν τῇ β. τ. θ.; Matt. viii. 11; cf. Matt. xvi. 19, δώσω σοι τὰς κλεῖδας τῆς β. τῶν οὐρ.; xxiii. 14, κλείετε τὴν βασ. τῶν οὐρ.; xxi. 43, ἀρθήσεται ἀφ' ὑμῶν ἡ β. τ. θ.

Now, inasmuch as the saving designs of God already found their realization with and in Christ, it is said, ἡ β. τ. θ. ἐντὸς ὑμῶν ἐστίν, Luke xvii. 21; cf. John i. 26, μέσος ὑμῶν στήκει, ὃν ὑμεῖς οὐκ οἴδατε; Luke xi. 20; Matt. xi. 12, xii. 28. But inasmuch as this realization first becomes manifest when Christ's work is completed, the kingdom of God is spoken of as yet to be revealed, with the tacit assumption that this can only be accomplished after the appearance of Christ. Cf. Luke xix. 11, διὰ τὸ ἐγγὺς εἶναι Ἱερουσαλὴμ αὐτὸν καὶ δοκεῖν αὐτοὺς ὅτι παραχρῆμα μέλλει ἡ β. τ. θ. ἀναφαίνεσθαι (cf. ver. 38). So Mark ix. 1, ἕως ἃν ἴδωσιν τὴν β. τ. θ. ἐληλυθυῖαν ἐν δυνάμει; Luke ix. 27; Matt. xvi. 28. In this sense it is future for Christ also, Luke xxii. 16, 18, 30; Matt. xxvi. 29; Mark xiv. 25; Luke xxiii. 42. It is designated *the kingdom of Christ* in Matt. xvi. 28; comp. Mark ix. 1; Luke ix. 27; Matt. xx. 21; Luke xxii. 29, 30; comp. xvi. 18, xxiii. 42; cf. Eph. v. 5, ἡ βασ. τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ; 2 Tim. iv. 1, 18; Heb. i. 8,—because it is the Messiah who executes the redeeming will of God, and with whom, accordingly, the new order of things is necessarily connected; *vid.* under βασιλεύς.

When, therefore, Christ says, ἡ βασ. ἡ ἐμὴ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, John xviii. 36, His meaning is that the present order of things (κόσμος) does not set forth the glory (*vid.* δόξα) and saving purpose of God; for which reason the kingdom of God is styled in Matthew, ἡ βασ. τῶν οὐρανῶν; cf. 2 Tim. iv. 18, ῥύσεται με ὁ κύριος ἀπὸ παντὸς ἔργου πονηροῦ καὶ σώσει εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐπουράνιον, whereby both the natural and moral antagonism between it and this world is expressed and emphasized (*vid.* οὐρανός); cf. 1 Cor. xv. 50, σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα βασιλείαν τ. θ. κληρονομήσαι οὐ δύνανται; Luke xvii. 20,

οὐκ ἔρχεται ἡ β. τ. θ. μετὰ παρατηρήσεως, most strongly emphasised in John iii. 3, ἐὰν μὴ τις γεννηθῇ ἄνωθεν, οὐ δύναται ἰδεῖν τὴν β. τ. θ. (see under the words, ἄνωθεν, ὕδωρ, πνεῦμα); Matt. xviii. 3, 4, xix. 12, 14, 23, 24; Mark x. 14, 15, 23–25; Luke xviii. 16, 17, 24, 25, 29; 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10; Gal. v. 21; Eph. v. 5; comp. Bengel on Matt. iv. 17, “*Regni coelorum appellatione, libris N. T. fere propria, praecidebatur spes regni terreni, et invitabantur omnes ad coelestia.*” This antithesis is particularly prominent in the Revelation, which specially deals with the subject. Comp. the ἐβασίλευσας, xi. 17. On the ground of this relation to the present state of the world, allusion is made to τὰ μυστήρια τῆς βασ. τῶν οὐρ., Matt. xiii. 11, Luke viii. 10, or to the μυστήριον τῆς β. τ. θ., Mark iv. 11, concerning which it is said, ἐκείνοις τοῖς ἔξω ἐν παραβολαῖς (which see) τὰ πάντα γίνεται.—Matt. xiii. 24, 31, 33, 44, 45, 47, xviii. 23, xx. 1, xxii. 2, xxv. 1; Mark iv. 26, 30; Luke xiii. 18, 20. As the ultimate goal of the divine plan of redemption, the β. τ. θ. is also the goal of human life and effort, so far as they submit to be determined by the truth and revelation of God; hence Matt. vi. 33, ζητεῖτε δὲ πρῶτον τὴν β. τ. θ.; Luke xii. 31; cf. ver. 32, εὐδόκησεν ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν δοῦναι ὑμῖν τὴν βασιλείαν; cf. 1 Thess. ii. 12, τοῦ καλοῦντος ἡμᾶς εἰς τὴν ἐαυτοῦ βασιλείαν καὶ δόξαν. Hence εἰσερχεσθαι εἰς τὴν β. τ. θ. (Matt. v. 20, vii. 21, xviii. 3, xix. 23, 24; Mark ix. 47, x. 15, 23, 24, 25; Luke xviii. 24; John iii. 5; Acts xiv. 22), which corresponds to σωθῆναι in Mark x. 26, cf. 2 Tim. iv. 18, and to ζῶν αἰώνιον κληρονομεῖν in Mark x. 17 (so that there is a close connection between the σωτηρία, or the ζωὴ αἰώνιος, and the βασ. τ. θ.). Κληρονομεῖν τὴν β. τ. θ., 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10, xv. 50; Gal. v. 21; Eph. v. 5; Jas. ii. 5; in the Gospels only in Matt. xxv. 34; but comp. αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ἡ β. τ. οὐρ., Matt. v. 3, 10, xix. 14; Mark x. 14; Luke vi. 20; as also Matt. xxi. 31, οἱ τελῶναι . . . προάγουσιν ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν β. τ. θ.; Mark xii. 34, οὐ μακρὰν εἰ ἀπὸ τῆς β. τ. θ.; Luke ix. 62, εὐθετος τῇ β. τ. θ. On the expression νίολ τῆς β., Matt. viii. 12, xiii. 38, see under νίος. The reason why the β. τ. θ. is represented both as *present*—*e.g.* in Matt. xi. 12, xii. 28, xxi. 43; Luke xvi. 16, 17, xvii. 20, 21; Rom. xiv. 17; Col. i. 13, iv. 11; Heb. xii. 28—and *future*—*e.g.* in Matt. xxv. 34; Luke xxi. 31; 1 Cor. xv. 50; 2 Thess. i. 5; 2 Tim. iv. 1—is, that the N. T. writers everywhere view the blessings of salvation as, although attainable now or in this world, still appertaining to another order of things, accordingly to the future, so far as there is an antagonism between those blessings and the κόσμος οὗτος (John xviii. 36; cf. 2 Pet. iii. 13; Heb. vi. 5), which prevents their full development; thus, for example, John speaks of ζωὴ, ζωὴ αἰώνιος, as a thing not solely of the future, but possessed now beforehand. But this is not compatible with the idea that in the N. T. a distinction is made between a *kingdom of God* in a spiritually moral sense and in a historically teleological sense, the one belonging to the present, the other to the future. It must be granted, even by the espousers of this view, that such a distinction is by no means everywhere apparent (see *e.g.* Kamphausen, *Gebet des Herrn*, p. 59). The error of this view arises not simply from a false adjustment of the relation of the N. T. present salvation to the O. T. future salvation, or of the N. T. salvation in the present to the N. T. future

salvation, but mainly from the fact that the kingdom of God is not regarded primarily as salvation,—its fellowship is not primarily regarded as a fellowship of the saved, forming the nucleus or foundation of a new spiritual and moral fellowship. What is called the kingdom of God in a spiritually moral sense is, in the N. T., the beginning of the kingdom of God in its teleological sense, in the sphere of the inner life. The future belongs to the β. τ. θ. as βασ. τῶν οὐρ. ("sic appellatur cum prospectu ad consummationem," Bengel), but this future is as yet made a matter of conflict by the present. The β. τῶν οὐρ. was here, ere it drew nigh, Matt. xxv. 34, κληρονομήσατε τὴν ἡτοιμασμένην ὑμῖν βασ. ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου; for the world was created with a view to this order of things. It exists and is operative (1 Cor. iv. 20; Mark ix. 1), as a possession and a power, ere the present order of things has given way to it.

As to the O. T. basis of this idea, βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, being a new order of things, owing its character to the realization or revelation of the dominion of God, is a *comprehensive N. T. expression for the object promised and expected in the plan of salvation* (cf. Acts iii. 21), suggested, perhaps, primarily by Dan. ii. 44, but first used as *term. techn.* in Wisd. x. 10; comp. Gen. xxviii. 12; Song of the three Children, 32. What the expression presupposes may be easily learnt from prophecies like Isa. ii. xi, lii. 7; Mic. iv.; Jer. xxiii. 5 sqq., xxxiii. 14 sqq.; Ezek. xxxiv. 23 sqq., 37; Dan. ii. 44, vii. 14, as well as from passages like Ps. xciii.—xcix. These prophecies, again, are rooted (comp. Ps. xciii.—xcix.) in the relation of God to Israel, as distinguished from other nations,—a relation according to which God displays His royal authority in Israel by *saving and redeeming*; amongst the Gentiles, as the foes of Israel, by *judgments*; cf. Deut. vii. 6–8, xiv. 2; Ex. xv. 18. There Israel is His kingdom (Ex. xix. 6; Deut. xxxiii. 5; Isa. xxxiii. 22), inasmuch as His will, in the form of *law* and promise, determines the life of the nation. The N. T. expression, like αἰὼν οὗτος, μέλλον, seems to have been adopted from the language of the schools and of the religious life of the community; for the formula מלכות משיח is frequently applied to the kingdom of Messiah, which is also sometimes called kingdom of God. Cf. Tholuck on Matt. v. 3; Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr.*; and Wetstein on Matt. iii. 2. Schoettgen, *Dissertatio de regno coel.*—From all this it would appear that the *kingdom of God* is primarily *salvation*, and as such is both the possession and the hope of the ἐκκλησία; cf. Luke xii. 32 (ποιμνιον, corresponding to ἐκκλησία, cf. 1 Pet. v. 2; Acts xx. 28), as also Heb. xii. 28, βασιλείαν ἀσάλευτον παραλαμβάνοντες, with τὰ μέλλοντα ἀγαθά, Heb. ix. 11; Rom. xiv. 17; 1 Cor. iv. 20. It is related, therefore, to ἐκκλησία as redemption is related to the church of the redeemed, and in such a manner that, being encompassed and embraced by the organism of the kingdom of God, the latter has in the former its weal and its law. At the same time, however, the church is the sphere of the demonstration and manifestation of the corresponding order of things—to wit, of the kingdom of heaven, and that in accordance with the development of the ages; *vid. αἰών*. In no case is the church to be regarded as "the form of manifestation" or embodiment of the kingdom of God in any such sense.

Βασιλεύω, to be king, to rule; Matt. ii. 22; Luke i. 33; 1 Tim. vi. 15. Of God, Rev. xi. 15, 17, xix. 6; of Christ, 1 Cor. xv. 25, *vid.* under βασιλεύς; of those who belong to Christ, Rev. v. 10, xx. 4, 6, xxii. 5; cf. Dan. vii. 27; Gen. xii. 3; Jas. i. 18, to denote their participation in the royal glory of Christ, at whose feet all opposing powers must lie, 1 Cor. xv. 25; Rev. xvii. 4, xix. 16; cf. 1 Cor. vi. 2; 2 Tim. ii. 12, εἰ ὑπομένομεν, καὶ συμβασιλεύσομεν. This theocratic meaning will also have to be adopted in 1 Cor. iv. 8, χωρὶς ἡμῶν ἐβασιλεύσατε, especially in view of the words that follow, καὶ ὀφελὸν γε ἐβασιλεύσατε, ἵνα καὶ ἡμεῖς σὺν ὑμῖν συμβασιλεύσωμεν; according to which the apostle has in his eye the goal of Christian hope (Rom. viii. 17, 2 Tim. ii. 12), which the Corinthians in carnal pride were laying claim to beforehand. In antithesis to this is ver. 9, ὁ θεὸς ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀποστόλους ἐσχάτους ἀπέδειξεν, cf. Jas. i. 18; cf. Osiander, Meyer, Burger *in loc.* — In Rom. v. 17, οἱ τὴν περισσεῖαν τῆς χάριτος λαμβάνοντες ἐν ζωῇ βασιλεύουσιν διὰ Χριστοῦ, the expression must be taken primarily in opposition to the foregoing εἰ γὰρ ὁ θάνατος ἐβασίλευσεν; in contrast with the previous subjection to the dominion of death, there now comes in the completest contrary; cf. 1 Cor. iii. 22, εἴτε ζωὴ εἴτε θάνατος πάντα ὑμῶν. Death is subject to them, and life serves for the demonstration of that which they are. They are in the same manner in possession of life, as death was previously in possession of them. — Akin in classical Greek is the use of βασιλεύειν = to live as a king, in Plutarch. — Lastly, Paul uses the word in the following connections, ὁ θάνατος ἐβασίλευσεν, Rom. v. 14, 17; ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐβ., Rom. v. 21, vi. 12; ἡ χάρις βασι., Rom. v. 21 (as in Plato, *Rep.* x. 607 A, ἡδονὴ καὶ λύπη ἐν τῇ πόλει βασιλεύσεται ἀντὶ νόμου; Xen. *Mem.* iv. 3. 14, ἡ ψυχὴ βασιλεύει ἐν ἡμῖν), to mark them as supreme determining powers.

Βδελύσσω. In classical Greek only the middle βδελύσσομαι, to be disgusted, to detest, to abominate; with the acc., Rom. ii. 22, ὁ βδελυσσόμενος τὰ εἰδωλα. LXX. = רָצַץ, Lev. xi. 11, 13; רָצַץ, Deut. vii. 26, xxiii. 8; Job ix. 31. It denotes a very high degree of repugnance. Cf. Aristoph. *Nub.* 1132, ἦν ἐγὼ μάλιστα πασῶν ἡμερῶν δέδοικα καὶ πέφρικα καὶ βδελύττομαι. In biblical Greek used of religious and moral repugnance, see under βδέλυγμα. The act. βδελύσσω only in Lev. xi. 43, xx. 25, 1 Macc. i. 48, in the combination βδελύσσειν τὰς ψυχὰς ἐν τινὶ = to make abominable, detestable, to constitute an object of religious abomination, to defile, Heb. = רָצַץ. Hence the perf. par. pass., Rev. xxi. 8, δειλοὶ καὶ ἄπιστοι καὶ ἐβδελυγμένοι, those who are stained with abominations (heathenish), cf. xvii. 4, 5, xxi. 27; 3 Macc. vi. 9, ἐπιφάνηθι τοῖς ἀπὸ Ἰσραὴλ γένους, ὑπὸ δὲ ἐβδελυγμένων ἀνόμων ἐθνῶν ὑβρίζομένοις. On the contrary, the same form in Job xv. 16, ἐβδελυγμένος καὶ ἀκάθαρτος ἀνὴρ, as also in Isa. xiv. 19, νεκρὸς ἐβδελυγμένος, is the passive of βδελύσσομαι = abominated, an abomination; cf. ἰάθην, ἰάμαι, from ἰάομαι, Matt. viii. 8; Mark v. 29; Isa. liii. 5.

Βδελυκτός, abominable, or abominated; Tit. i. 16, βδελυκτοὶ ὄντες καὶ ἀπειθεῖς; Luther, "who are an abomination to God." Cf. Prov. xvii. 15, ὃς δίκαιον κρίνει τὸν

ἄδικον, ἄδικον δὲ τὸν δίκαιον, ἀκάθαρτος καὶ βδελυκτὸς παρὰ θεῶν = 𐤁𐤇𐤓𐤏𐤋. Ecclus. xli. 5, τέκνα βδελυκτὰ γίνεται τέκνα ἁμαρτωλῶν; 2 Macc. i. 27. The word does not occur in classical Greek; βδελυρός has another sense, and signifies *shameless, disgusting*; in this sense βδελυκτὸς is used in Philo, ii. 261. 4, γυναικῶν θιάσους βδελυκτῶν καὶ ἀκολαστῶν, whereas it is used in patristic Greek in a religious sense, with the passive signification above given; e.g. Chrysostom, καὶ παρὰ ἀνθρώποις μισητοὺς καὶ παρὰ θεῶν βδελυκτούς.

Βδέλυγμα, τό, what is detested, abomination, only in biblical and patristic Greek, to mark an object of the highest moral and religious repugnance. LXX. = 𐤁𐤇𐤓𐤏𐤋, Deut. xxix. 17; 2 Chron. xv. 8, ἐξέβαλε τὰ βδελύγματα ἀπὸ πάσης τῆς γῆς Ἰούδα, over against ἐνεκαίνισε τὸ θυσιαστήριον κυρίου; Jer. xiii. 27; Ezek. xi. 21; Dan. ix. 27, xi. 31, xii. 11 (𐤁𐤇𐤓𐤏𐤋 elsewhere also = εἶδωλον, 1 Kings xi. 7; προσόχθισμα, Deut. vii. 26; 2 Kings xxiii. 13). = 𐤁𐤇𐤓𐤏𐤋, Lev. vii. 21, xi. 10-xiii. 20, etc. = 𐤁𐤇𐤓𐤏𐤋, Ex. viii. 26; Gen. xliii. 21, xlv. 43, βδέλυγμα γάρ ἐστιν Αἰγυπτίους πᾶς ποιμὴν προβάτων; Prov. xi. 1, 20, xvi. 11; 2 Chron. xxxvi. 14; Lev. xviii. 26, 27. (Also = ἀκάθαρτον, ἀκαθαρσία, Prov. iii. 32, xxiv. 9.) Ecclus. xiii. 20, xxvii. 30, xlix. 2, Wisd. xii. 23, xiv. 11, it is said, concerning the idols, ἐν κτίσματι θεοῦ εἰς βδέλυγμα ἐγενήθησαν. Everything that loosens the connection of man with God is an object of the highest religious detestation, βδέλυγμα; hence also, in general, sinful actions and sinful men, so that the frequent connection or interchange of βδ. with ἀκαθαρσία, ἀκάθαρτος (*q.v.*), is well accounted for; cf. Prov. iii. 32, vi. 16, xxiv. 9; Jer. xiii. 27. Especially, however, is it used as *term. techn.* for everything in which—answering to the highest religious detestation—the greatest estrangement from God manifests itself. Hence unclean beasts and the eating thereof is designated βδέλυγμα, cf. Lev. xi., Deut. xiv. 3, for therein was manifested the difference between the Gentiles and Israel as united with God. Then it denotes *idols*; in general κατ' ἐξ., all forms of heathenism. Cf. Deut. xxix. 17; 2 Chron. xv. 8; Isa. ii. 8, 20; Lev. xxviii. 27, etc., as also the combinations of ἀκαθαρσία, πορνεία, and βδελ., Rev. xvii. 4, 5.—This must be kept in mind in all the N. T. passages. It denotes the greatest repugnance on the part of God in Luke xvi. 15, τὸ ἐν ἀνθρώποις ὑψηλὸν βδέλυγμα ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ; heathenish character in Rev. xvii. 4, 5, xxi. 27, πᾶν κοινὸν καὶ ὁ ποιῶν βδέλυγμα καὶ ψεῦδος, with reference to the semblance of Christianity (worldliness). Only in this moral religious sense, therefore, and not in that of physical disgust, can βδέλυγμα ἐρημώσεως, Matt. xxiv. 15, Mark xiii. 14 (comp. Dan. ix. 27, xi. 31, xii. 11; 1 Macc. i. 54 ff.; Matt. xxiii. 38), be understood as designative of a manifestation of the highest opposition to God (Antichrist), cf. Cremer on Matt. xxiv. 25, p. 59 ff.

Βέβαιος, α, ον, in Attic Greek usually ὁ, ἡ (from βάλω) = firm, e.g. of firm land, *terra firma*. Figuratively, synonymous with ἀληθής, ἀσφαλής, πιστός, fixed, sure, certain. Βέβαιος denotes what we can move or act upon; στερεός,—from στα, ἵστημι,—what is or stands fast, firm, hard; thus στερεαὶ πύλαι = fast or fixed gates; βέβαιοι πύλαι (Thucyd. iv. 67) = sure gates, gates guaranteeing safety. Thucyd. iii. 23, κρύσταλλός τε γὰρ ἔπε-

πήγει οὐ βέβαιος ἐν αὐτῇ (sc. τῇ τάφρῳ) ὥστ' ἐπελθεῖν. Hence figuratively = *upon which one may build and rely or trust*. Plato, *Legg.* ii. 653 A, ἀληθεῖς δόξας βεβαίους, where βέβαιος denotes the worth of the ἀληθ.; *Tim.* 49 B, πιστῶ καὶ βεβαίῳ χρήσασθαι λόγῳ; 37 B, δόξαι καὶ πίστει γίνονται βέβαιοι καὶ ἀληθεῖς. With εἰρήνῃ (Xenophon, Isocrates), φιλία (Xen. Plato), and other words. Not unfrequently of persons likewise = *reliable, trusty, constant*, e.g. φίλος. Thucyd. v. 43, οὐ βεβαίους φάσκων εἶναι Λακεδαιμονίους, *untrustworthy, inconstant*. Comp. Wisd. vii. 23, [ἔστι ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ] πνεῦμα . . . φιλόανθρωπον, βέβαιοι, ἀσφαλές; 3 Macc. vii. 7, τὴν τε τοῦ φίλου ἣν ἔχουσι πρὸς ἡμᾶς βεβαίαν . . . εὐνοίαν; v. 31, βεβαίαν πίστιν. Not in the LXX. In the N. T. not of persons, but in other ways as in classical Greek, and indeed (1) objectively, Heb. vi. 19, ἣν (sc. ἐλπίδα) ὡς ἄγκυραν ἔχομεν τῆς ψυχῆς ἀσφαλῇ τε καὶ βεβαίαν, where ἀσφαλῆς and βέβαιος are negative and positive expressions of the same thing, of that which does not fail nor waver, that which is immovable, and upon which one may rely. Heb. ii. 2, λόγος, as in 2 Pet. i. 19; cf. Plato, *Phaed.* 90 C, λόγος βέβαιος καὶ ἀληθής. Rom. iv. 16, ἐπαγγελία. Heb. ix. 17, διαθήκη ἐπὶ νεκροῖς βεβαία; cf. Gal. iii. 15, κεκυρωμένη διαθ. 2 Pet. i. 10, βεβαίαν ὑμῶν τὴν κλήσιν καὶ ἐκλογὴν ποιέεισθαι. (2) Subjectively, 2 Cor. i. 7, ἐλπίς; Heb. iii. 6, παρρησία; iii. 14, ἐάνπερ τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς ὑποστάσεως μέχρι τέλους βεβαίαν κατὰ σχῶμεν.

Βεβαιόω, to make firm or reliable, so as to warrant security and inspire confidence, to strengthen, e.g. τὴν ἀρχὴν, βασιλείαν, to make true, to fulfil; e.g. Xen. *Cyrop.* viii. 8. 2, εἴτε ὅρκους ὁμόσαιεν, ἡμπέδουν, εἴτε δεξιὰς δοῖεν, ἐβεβαίουν. Polyb. iii. 3, βεβαιώσεν ἡμῖν πέπεισμαι τὰς ἐπαγγελίας. So Rom. xv. 8, εἰς τὸ βεβαιῶσαι τὰς ἐπαγγελίας τῶν πατέρων. Comp. Xen. *Anab.* vii. 6. 17, ἀπαιτήσῃ με δικαίως, ἐὰν μὴ βεβαιῶ τὴν πράξιν αὐτῷ ἐφ' ἣ ἐδωροδοκῶν. In this connection it signifies to fulfil, in others again to confirm, to make a thing firm so that it holds, e.g. τοὺς νόμους, *leges sancire*. Plato, *Crit.* 53 B, βεβαιώσεις τοῖς δικάσταις τὴν δόξαν. *Phileb.* 14 C, τοῦτον τοίνυν τὸν λόγον ἔτι μᾶλλον δι' ὁμολογίας βεβαιωθεσώμα. So Mark xvi. 20, τὸν λόγον βεβαιούντος διὰ τῶν ἐπακολουθούντων σημείων; Heb. ii. 3, ὑπὸ τῶν ἀκουσάντων εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐβεβαίωθη; 1 Cor. i. 6, τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐβεβαίωθη ἐν ἡμῖν. While the combination of βέβαιος with a personal subject, so usual in classical Greek, does not occur in the N. T., the union of βεβαιῶν with a personal object, hardly known in classical Greek,—certainly not at all in the manner of the N. T.,—is distinctive of the N. T. When it is said in Thucyd. vi. 34, ἐς τοὺς Σικέλους πέμποντες τοὺς μὲν μᾶλλον βεβαιωσώμεθα, this corresponds simply with the import of the adjective with personal subject, Schol. βεβαίους φίλους ποιήσωμεν. The N. T. βεβαιῶν with personal object does not refer to the character or bearing of the object; it signifies a confirming of the person's state of salvation, preservation in a state of grace, synonymous with στηρίζειν, 1 Thess. iii. 13; 1 Pet. v. 10. It does not modify the meaning of the verb, but it uses it of persons in the same manner as it is said, βεβαιῶν τὴν ἀρχὴν, βασιλείαν. 1 Cor. i. 8, ὃς καὶ βεβαιώσαι ὑμᾶς ἕως τέλους ἀνεγκλήτους ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ κ.τ.λ., comp. Col.

i. 8; Rom. viii. 33. — 2 Cor. i. 21, ὁ δὲ βεβαιῶν ἡμᾶς σὺν ὑμῖν εἰς Χριστὸν καὶ χρίσας ἡμᾶς ὁ θεός, comp. ver. 20, where the objective fulfilment and confirmation of the promises in Christ is spoken of, so that βεβ. ἡμᾶς εἰς Χριστὸν denotes the corresponding work of God upon the subject; He confirms us in Christ, so that we become ever more assured and certain of Him; see also ver. 22. Eph. iv. 14, 15; 2 Thess. ii. 2; therefore = *to confirm in believing possession of salvation*, i.e. *in the faith*, see Col. ii. 7, βεβαιούμενοι ἐν τῇ πίστει, if we do not read, with Lachm. Tisch., τῇ πίστει = διὰ τῆς πίστεως. (Theophylact), so that βεβαιοῦσθαι would be an independent expression; comp. Heb. xiii. 9, καλὸν γὰρ χάριτι βεβαιοῦσθαι τὴν καρδίαν = *to become fixed, assured*, i.e. of one's cause or matter, to become certain of Christ (in faith), cf. Eph. iv. 14, κλυδωνιζόμενοι καὶ περιφερόμενοι παντὶ ἀνέμῳ τῆς διδασκαλίας. This combination of βεβαιοῦν with a personal object was anticipated by the LXX. Ps. xli. 13, ἐβεβαίωσάς με ἐνώπιόν σου εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα = 𐤁𐤏 in the Hiphil. See Ps. cxix. 28, ἐνύσταξεν (𐤏𐤃𐤕) ἡ ψυχὴ μου ἀπὸ ἀκηδίας, βεβαίωσόν με ἐν τοῖς λόγοις σου. The middle, which is usual in classical Greek, does not occur in biblical Greek.

Βεβαίωσις, εως, ἡ, establishing, confirmation, corroboration, δόξης (Plato), γνώμης (Thucyd.). Thucyd. iv. 87, οὐκ ἂν μείζω πρὸς τοῖς ὅρκοις βεβαίωσιν λάβοιτε. Wisd. vi. 20, προσοχὴ δὲ νόμων βεβαίωσις ἀφθαρσίας. In the N. T. Heb. vi. 16, πάσης αὐτοῖς ἀντιλογίας πέρας εἰς βεβαίωσιν ὁ ὅρκος. Phil. i. 7, ἐν τῇ ἀπολογίᾳ καὶ βεβαιώσει τοῦ εὐαγγ. Frequently in Philo, see Delitzsch on Heb. vi. 16.

Διαβεβαίωμα, deponent, firmly to assure (Plut. Polyb. Diod. Dion. Hal., once also in Demosth.). 1 Tim. i. 7, μὴ νοοῦντες . . . περὶ τίνων διαβεβαιοῦνται. Tit. iii. 8, περὶ τούτων βούλομαι σε διαβεβαιοῦσθαι. Plut. *Fab.* 14, διαβεβαιούμενος περὶ τῶν πραγμάτων.

Βέβηλος, ον (equiv. to βατός), related to βηλός, *threshold*, literally, *trodden* = *accessible*; and indeed mostly, in a religious sense, of things that have not been withdrawn by consecration from general use; that are *open to all indiscriminately*, χωρίον βέβηλον, opposed to ἱερόν, ὅσιον; Thuc. iv. 97, ὅσα ἀνθρωποὶ ἐν βεβήλῳ δρῶσιν, opposed to ἱερά; Eurip. *Heraclid.* 404, βέβηλα λόγια, the opposite of κεκρυμμένα; Plut. *Brut.* 20, τὸν νεκρὸν ἐπιθέντες ἐν μέσῳ πολλῶν μὲν ἱερῶν πολλῶν δ' ἀσύλων καὶ ἀβεβήλων τόκων καθηγίζον. Of men = *uninitiated*, ἀμήντος; Hesych. βέβηλον· τὸ μὴ ἱερόν καὶ ἄθεον. βέβηλος· ἀνίερος, ἀμήντος. Later also = *unholy, impure* (cf. the German *gemein* in its ethical sense), syn. κοινός, Theodoret on Isa. lxvi., βέβηλόν ἐστι τὸ μὴ ἅγιον, τουτέστι τὸ κοινόν. So especially in Philo, e.g. ἐπιθυμία βέβηλος καὶ ἀκάθαρτος καὶ ἀνίερος οὕσα, in connection with the usage of the LXX., who employ βέβ. to translate 𐤁𐤕, Lev. x. 10, the opposite of ἅγιος, syn. ἀκάθαρτος; 1 Sam. xxi. 4, ἄρτοι βέβηλοι, for general use, not ἅγιοι; Ezek. xxii. 26, xlii. 23. βέβηλος had not originally a moral meaning, but the natural antagonism between the profane and the holy or divine grew into a moral antagonism, see under ἅγιος; cf. Ezek. xxii. 26, οἱ ἱερεῖς αὐτῆς ἡθέτησαν νόμον μου καὶ

ἐβεβήλουν τὰ ἁγία μου ἀνὰ μέσον ἁγίου καὶ βεβήλου οὐ διέστελλον . . . καὶ ἐβεβηλούμην ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν. Hence βεβηλόω, to profane, desecrate, violate, Lev. xxii. 15, xix. 29; βεβηλωμένος, violated; of a woman, in Lev. xxi. 7, 14 = בְּהֵן, which in Ezek. xxi. 25 = βέβηλος, one who has forfeited his divine, sacred character (connected with ἄνομος). Accordingly βέβηλον is that which lacks all relationship or affinity to God. In the LXX. it is the only word for בְּהֵן, whereas in the N. T. בְּהֵן has two equivalents, βέβηλος and κοινός; indeed, we find κοινός used where ritual or theocratic uncleanness is meant, and where classical usage would lead us to expect βέβηλος; cf. Mark vii. 2, κοιναῖς χερσίν, with 2 Macc. v. 16, βεβήλοις χερσίν; cf. βεβηλόω, Acts xxiv. 6, with xxi. 28. On the other hand, βέβηλος is used where reference is made to the general moral-religious character, the moral-religious worth. So βέβηλοι κενοφώναι, empty babblings, such as lack all affinity to God, all sanction, 1 Tim. vi. 20; 2 Tim. ii. 16 (Luther, unspiritual—*ungeistlich*); 1 Tim. iv. 7, βέβηλοι καὶ γραῶδεις μύθοι. Of persons, 1 Tim. i. 9, ἀνόσιοι καὶ βέβηλοι, both designations of the same character, that is, of the *lack of piety* (*vid. ὅσιος*); cf. the other adjectives used in pairs for the purpose of strengthening in each case the same idea. In this sense it is a specially select designation of Esau, Heb. xii. 16, μή τις πόρνος ἢ βέβηλος ὡς Ἡσαῦ, ὃς ἀντὶ βρώσεως μιᾶς ἀπέδετο τὰ πρωτοτόκια ἑαυτοῦ.

Βεβηλόω, to desecrate; Matt. xii. 5, τὸ σάββατον β.; Acts xxiv. 6, τὸ ἱερὸν ἐπέειρασε βεβηλῶσαι, denoting the same act as xxi. 28, κεκοίνωκεν τὸ ἅγιον τόπον τοῦτον, the latter addressed to Israelites, the former to Felix. See above, under βέβηλος.

Βιάζω, to overpower, to compel; in the N. T. only in Matt. xi. 12; Luke xvi. 16. Only in Homer and in very late Greek does the active occur; usually the word is used as the middle deponent, βιάζομαι. Yet it also is found not very unfrequently as passive in Thucydides, Demosthenes, Philo, so that it would not be strange if the word were taken as a passive in Matt. xi. 12, ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν βιάζεται; Thuc. i. 77, ἀδικούμενοι δὲ οἱ ἄνθρωποι μᾶλλον ὀργίζονται ἢ βιάζόμενοι; Dem. p. 508, ὅπως μὴ βιασθῆτε ἁμαρτάνειν. In favour of the passive rendering in Matt. xi. 12, is the following context there, καὶ βιασταὶ ἀρπάζουσιν αὐτήν, for βιάζειν or βιάζεσθαι and ἀρπάζειν are synonyms. Cf. Plut. *Erotic.* 755 D, οἷε γὰρ ἀρπαγὴν γεγονέναι καὶ βιασμόν, οὐκ ἀπολόγημα καὶ στρατήγημα τοῦ νεανίσκου νοῦν ἔχοντος, ὅτι τὰς τῶν ἐραστῶν ἀγκάλας διαφυγῶν ἐξηυτομόληκεν εἰς χεῖρας καλῆς καὶ πλουσίας γυναικός. Against this it is not decisive that the word in the parallel passage, Luke xvi. 16, πᾶς εἰς αὐτήν βιάζεται, is used as a deponent middle, seeing that one and the same writer, Thucydides, uses it promiscuously as deponent and as passive. It can be shown, moreover, that the word must in Matthew be taken as passive. Taken as deponent, it would be utterly without sense, because βιάζεσθαι without an object or something equivalent thereto, such as πρόσω, εἶσω, neither is nor can be used; it is not an independent, self-contained conception such as = to exercise force, forcibly to step forward. At least our passage would be the only authority for such a rendering. Consequently the rendering, "advances with

power, with violence, presses forcibly on" (comp. John xviii. 36!—the idea of violence cannot be separated from *βιάζεσθαι*), is as impossible as the other, which takes *βιάζεσθαι* as a strengthened synonym for the expression peculiar to Luke, *ἀπὸ τότε ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ εὐαγγελίζεται*, analogous to the use of *βιάζεσθαι*, as = *to persuade, to constrain to, to oblige*, Gen. xxxiii. 12, *καὶ ἐβιάσατο αὐτόν*, Judg. xix. 7, *ἐβιάσατο αὐτὸν ὁ γαμβρὸς αὐτοῦ*, as it likewise occurs in the classics, Eurip. *Alc.* 1116, *ἄναξ, βιάζει μ' οὐ θέλοντα ὄρῶν τάδε*, where it must not be forgotten that *βιάζεσθαι*, even in these connections, is somewhat different from a merely strengthened *πείθειν*, indeed the reverse, strictly speaking, of *πείθειν*, Plut. *Erotic.* 773 D, *ἐπεὶ δὴ πείθειν ἀδύνατος ἦν, ἐπεχείρει βιάσασθαι κ.τ.λ.*, so that it implies at least an *οὐ θέλειν*, a resisting, apart from the fact that even in this connection it cannot be without an object or some equivalent clause. And if the attempt be made to paraphrase the object by the analogy of Luke xvi. 16, *ἡ βασ. τ. οὐρ. βιάζεται πάντας*, and then compare therewith the course of the gospel history, and specially the profoundly mournful *καὶ οὐκ ἠθελήσατε* of Matt. xxiii. 37, one is impressed with the conviction that no unhappier explanation of this much disputed passage could be suggested.

If it be established that *βιάζεσθαι* in Matt. xi. 12 is to be taken as passive, and in Luke xvi. 16 as deponent middle, the question further arises, whether it is to be taken in a good or in a bad sense. Against the former the *ἀρπάζειν* in Matthew does not of itself militate, because this word may, as often in Xen. and Plutarch, denote generally an act of rashly seizing, e.g. *τὰ ὄπλα ἀρπάζειν, quickly to seize weapons*; *τὸ ὄρος, quickly to occupy the mountain*, *τὸν καιρὸν, to seize the opportunity*. In this case the *πᾶς εἰς αὐτὴν βιάζ.* in Luke would correspond with the *βιασταὶ ἀρπάζουσιν αὐτήν* in Matthew, and we might compare Thuc. vii. 69, *εὐθὺς ἔπλεον πρὸς τὸ ζεῦγμα (closing) τοῦ λιμένος καὶ τὸν παραλειφθέντα διεκπλοῦν βουλόμενοι βιάσασθαι ἐς τὸ ἔξω*. It would still be questionable, however, if the force was not directed against the kingdom of heaven itself, where the barrier was which made the entrance difficult. Meanwhile even this explanation proves untenable if we have once for all established it as a settled point that *βιάζεσθαι* in Matthew is to be taken as passive. For the passive *βιάζεσθαι* occurs only in the bad sense of a hostile overpowering subjugation or violence. So Thuc. i. 2. 1, iv. 10. 3, *ἦν καὶ ὑφ' ἡμῶν βιάζεται, he should be thrown by us* (Krüger); vii. 84. 1, viii. 27. 3; so even i. 77. 3, where in contrast with *ἀδικεῖσθαι* we read, *ἀδικούμενοί τε, ὡς ἔοικεν, οἱ ἄνθρωποι μᾶλλον ὀργίζονται ἢ βιαζόμενοι* τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἴσου δοκεῖ πλεονεκτεῖσθαι, τὸ δ' ἀπὸ τοῦ κρείσσονος καταναγκάζεσθαι, ὑπὸ γοῦν τοῦ Μήδου δεινότερα τούτων πάσχοντες ἠνέχοντο ἢ δὲ ἡμετέρα ἀρχὴ χαλεπὴ δοκεῖ εἶναι. Hence it can denote here only a repelling (or some other forcible treatment of the kingdom of God in its representatives, Luke xvii. 21?), and the two propositions in Matthew answer completely to the statement in Matt. xxiii. 13; the kingdom of God is repelled, and its enemies spoil it, i.e. those to whom it belongs, for whom it exists. To this interpretation of *βιάζεται* in Matthew *βιασταὶ* also urges us,—a word unknown in classical Greek, but which, after the analogy

of βιασμός, βιαστός, and in its connection with ἀρπάζειν (cf. Plut. *l.c.*), is most naturally to be taken in a bad sense. Thus Luke's expression, πᾶς εἰς αὐτὴν βιάζεται, is to be compared with Josephus, *Antt.* iv. 6. 5, ὥστε μὴ ταῦθ' ἄπερ ὑπαγορεύει τὸ θεῖον λέγειν, βιάζεσθαι δὲ τὴν ἐκείνου βούλησιν, *to struggle against God's will*. The preceding sentence in Luke, ἀπὸ τότε ἡ βασ. τ. θ. εὐαγγελίζεται, corresponds then to Matt. xi. 11. Thus, linguistically, that explanation alone can be justified which by the espousers of other interpretations is pronounced (not perhaps in good earnest) practically inappropriate to a connection wherein Christ, with forcible and at last even decisive earnestness, denounces the bearing of Israel in its totality—the few exceptions of the disciples not being taken into account—towards John and towards Himself; independently of the fact that the other explanation, which takes βιάζ. in a good sense, affords a meaning which does not harmonize with the tenor of the gospel history and doctrine; cf. Luke xviii. 26, 27. It is interesting to observe that those Greek fathers who take βιάζεσθαι in this good sense, and whose linguistic authority one would avail oneself of, refer to the ascetic practices of watching, fasting, etc., whereby the kingdom of heaven is to be won!

Βούλομαι, ἐβουλόμην, ἐβουλήθην, as Iachm. and Tisch. read everywhere in the N. T., instead of the Attic augmentation ἡβουλόμην, ἡβουλήθην (Received text, 2 John 12). The Attic form of the second perfect, βούλει, instead of βοίλη, has kept its place in Luke xxii. 42; cf. Buttmann, 103, iii. 3, *neutestam. Gr.* p. 37 = *to will, wollen*, with which it is etymologically connected, as also with the German *wählen*. A synonym with θέλειν, from which it is not so to be distinguished that βούλομαι denotes the unconscious, θέλειν the conscious willing, or as impulse is from purpose (Buttmann, Döderlein). On the contrary, compare Plato, *Gorg.* 509 E, μηδένα βουλόμενον ἀδικεῖν, ἀλλ' ἄκοντας . . . ἀδικεῖν. *Legg.* ix. 862 A, μὴ βουλόμενος, ἀλλ' ἄκων, and the meaning of βουλή. The converse also is not true (Ammon.), comp. Dem. *Phil.* i. 9, προσήκει προθύμως ἐθέλειν ἀκούειν τῶν βουλομένων συμβουλεύειν. Plato, *Polit.* 299 E, ὃ γ' ἐθέλων καὶ ἐκὼν ἐν τοιούτοις ἄρχειν. Both words are, upon the whole, used synonymously; both denote a conscious willing, as is clear from the examples above given. Cf. also Plut. *de transg. an.* 13, τί οὖν θαυμαστόν εἰ πλείονες εἰσὶν οἱ λούεσθαι θέλοντες τῶν ἀλειφεσθαι βουλομένων, where form and euphony occasion the change of word. Plato, *Gorg.* 461 A, τὸν ῥητορικὸν ἀδύνατον εἶναι ἐθέλειν ἀδικεῖν. Acts xvii. 20, βουλόμεθα οὖν γινῶναι τί ἂν θέλοι ταῦτα εἶναι. The observation, however, is correct (Schenkl), that βούλομαι denotes a conception of wider range than ἐθέλω, which specially denotes the active resolution, *the will urging on to action*; βούλεσθαι, perhaps = *to have in thought, to intend*; θέλειν, to be determined, akin to the Sanscrit *dhar*, *sustinere* (Curtius, 655). Cf. *Il.* xxi. 177, τρὶς δὲ μεθήκε βίης· τὸ δὲ τέτρατον ἤθελε θυμῷ ἄξει ἐπιγνάμψας δόρυ κ.τ.λ. Thus in Rom. vii. 15, βούλεσθαι would be quite inappropriate; compare there the contrast between θέλειν and μισεῖν, οὐγὰρ ὁ θέλω πράσσω, ἀλλ' ὁ μισῶ τοῦτο ποιῶ. Ver. 16, ὃ οὐ θέλω τοῦτο ποιῶ. On the other hand, ὃ βούλομαι would denote an object of whim or inclination rather than of will. Cf. Acts xviii. 15,

κριτῆς ἐγὼ τούτων οὐ βούλομαι εἶναι. Plato, *Conv.* 199 E, ἵνα μᾶλλον καταμίθῃς δὲ βούλομαι, *what I think*. Though it is often possible to interchange the words, this is always inadmissible where the greater force of the expression requires θέλειν; comp. e.g. Matt. ii. 18, οὐκ ἤθελε παρακληθῆναι. Compare also the careful choice of the words in Matt. i. 19, μὴ θέλων αὐτὴν δειγματίσαι, ἐβουλήθη λάθρα ἀπολύσαι αὐτήν; cf. ver. 20, ταῦτα δὲ ἐνθυμηθέντος, whereas with ἐθέλειν, προθυμείσθαι would rather be joined; cf. Dem. *l.c.* Thus for the Hebrew יִצְחָק we find the expression, peculiar to biblical Greek, θέλειν ἐν τινὶ and βούλεσθαι ἐν τινὶ, the latter, however, by far the rarer. This distinction in the force of the two words appears most strikingly in some peculiarities of classical Greek. Θέλειν occurs with the signification *to will, to dare*; βούλομαι, not. Xen. *Cyrop.* iii. 1. 23, παιόμενοι ὁμῶς ἐθέλουσιν καὶ πάλιν μάχεσθαι τοῖς αὐτοῖς. Jerome i. 14, οὐδεὶς ἐθέλει τυράννου κατ' ὀφθαλμοὺς κατηγορεῖν. While βούλεσθαι is weaker than αἰρεῖν, perhaps = *cupere*, θέλειν stands much nearer to αἰρεῖν, and signifies a being firmly resolved. Cf. Plato, *Legg.* 733 A, ἡδονὴν βουλόμεθα ἡμῖν εἶναι, λύπην δὲ οὐθ' αἰρούμεθα οὔτε βουλόμεθα. *Legg.* i. 630 B, διαβάντες δ' εὖ καὶ μαχόμενοι ἐθέλοντες ἀποθνήσκειν ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ. *Conv.* 179 B, καὶ μὴν ὑπεραποθνήσκειν γε μόνοι ἐθέλουσιν οἱ ἐράωντες. Θέλειν occurs with the signification *to direct*; βούλεσθαι, not; e.g. Thuc. ii. 89. 8, ἡσσωμένων ἀνδρῶν οὐκ ἐθέλουσιν οἱ γινώμειν πρὸς τοὺς αὐτοὺς κινδύνους 'μοῖαι εἶναι; Herod. i. 74. 3, ἄνευ γὰρ ἀναγκαίης ἰσχυρῆς συμβάσεως ἰσχυραὶ οὐκ ἐθέλουσι συμμένειν; vii. 50. 2, τοῖσι τοίνυν βουλομένοισι ποιεῖν ὡς τὸ ἐπὶ πάντων φιλέει γίγνεσθαι τὰ κερδέα, τοῖσι δὲ ἐπιλεγόμενοισί τε πάντα ὀκνεῦσι οὐ μάλα ἐθέλει. Βούλεσθαι, on the other hand, occurs with the signification *to wish rather*, with and without μᾶλλον in Homer and the Attic writers; θέλειν, not. From all this it is evident that βούλεσθαι denotes quite generally *the tendency of the will*, ἐθέλειν the *impulse of the will*, so that βούλεσθαι differs from θέλειν as passive affection from active impulse; βούλομαι can always be rendered by θέλειν, but θέλειν cannot always be expressed by βούλεσθαι.

In N. T. Greek βούλεσθαι occurs far more rarely than θέλειν, and the usage here presents no special exceptions. It signifies (1) in general, *to will, to be inclined to*, to have the intention, comp. 2 Cor. i. 15, ἐβουλόμην πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐλθεῖν, with ver. 17, τοῦτο οὖν βουλευόμενος; 2 John 10, τοὺς βουλομένους κωλύει, cf. 2 Macc. i. 3, and is joined with the aorist infinitive, Matt. i. 19, xi. 27; Mark xv. 15; Luke x. 22; Acts v. 28, xii. 4, xvii. 20, xviii. 27, xix. 30, xxii. 30, xxiii. 28, xxv. 22, xxvii. 43, xxviii. 18; 2 Cor. i. 15; Jude 5; with the present infinitive, 1 Tim. vi. 9; Tit. iii. 8; Philem. 13; Jas. iv. 4; Acts xxv. 20; followed by the accusative with the infinitive, 2 Pet. iii. 9; 1 Tim. v. 14, ii. 8; Phil. i. 12; with conjunctive following, John xviii. 39, βούλεσθε οὖν ὑμῖν ἀπολύσω τὸν βασιλέα κ.τ.λ., as also in classical Greek, only that there βούλει occurs oftener than βούλεσθε in challenging questions. With εἰ βούλει, Luke xxii. 42, comp. Xen. *Anab.* iii. 4. 41, εἰ βούλει μένει ἐπὶ τῷ στρατεύματι, ἐγὼ δ' ἐθέλω πορεύεσθαι εἰ δὲ χρήζεις, πορεύου ἐπὶ κ.τ.λ. Thus it often is used to soften the imperative. (2) More intensively, *to will, to have in purpose, to determine*, giving prominence to the free self-

determining of the subject, to the freedom of his choice; thus Jas. i. 18, βουληθεὶς ἀπεκύησεν ἡμᾶς; iii. 4, ὅπου ἂν ἡ ὁρμή τοῦ εὐθύνοντος βούληται; 1 Cor. xii. 11, καθὼς βούλεται; Heb. vi. 17. Comp. Wisd. xii. 6; Judith viii. 15.

In the LXX. there occur some peculiarities in the use of the word not to be found in the classics, for there βούλεσθαι is joined not only, as in classical Greek, with the accusative of the object,—Ps. lxx. 3, οἱ βουλόμενοί μοι κατὰ (ῥᾷ); Prov. xii. 20, οἱ βουλόμενοι εἰρήνην (= ῥῥ),—but also with ἐν, 1 Sam. xviii. 25, οὐ βούλεται ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐν δόματι (= ῥᾷ); 2 Sam. xxiv. 3, ἵνα τί βούλεται ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ; (ῥᾷ). This construction, however, occurs far oftener with θέλειν, which, moreover, is found with the accusative of a personal object,—a circumstance not unimportant in deciding the difference between the two synonyms.

Βοῦλῆ, ἡ, will, project, intention, as the result of reflection; counsel, decree, aim, or estimation, as it denotes likewise deliberation and reflection, also the assembly of the council, whereby it is distinguished from θέλημα, which belongs to biblical and patristic Greek, but not to the classics. While θέλημα stands also for the commanding and executing will of God, ἡ βουλὴ τ. θ. refers only to God's own act, His saving purpose. Even in the LXX. and Apocrypha, βουλὴ is not used of the executing will of God (not even in Ecclus. xxiv. 30). The distinction between the two words comes out specially to view in ἀνὴρ βουλῆς, Ecclus. xxxii. 19, *a man of reflection*, as compared with viii. 15, μετὰ τολμηροῦ μὴ πορεύου ἐν ὁδῷ, αὐτὸς γὰρ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ ποιήσει καὶ τῇ ἀφροσύνῃ αὐτοῦ συναπολῇ. Where, therefore, as in Eph. i. 11, κατὰ πρόθεσιν τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐνεργούντος κατὰ τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ, we have to distinguish between the two, θέλημα signifies the will urging on to action, and βουλὴ the counsel preceding the resolve, the *decision*, and we shall most appropriately translate, *according to the decision or plan of His will*. The apostle would not only give prominence to the absolute freedom of the decision of the divine will, but he would call attention to the *saving plan* lying at the basis of the *saving will*, as it manifests itself. For the rest, however, βουλὴ and θέλημα are often perfectly synonymous; cf. 1 Cor. iv. 5, φανερώσει τὰς βουλὰς τῶν καρδιῶν; Jer. xxiii. 26, ἐν τῷ προφητεύειν αὐτοὺς τὰ θελήματα τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν.

Βουλὴ is used to denote the divine decree lying at the basis of the history of redemption, Luke vii. 20; Acts ii. 23, iv. 28, xiii. 36, xx. 27; Heb. vi. 17. It occurs also in Luke xxiii. 51, οὐκ ἦν συγκατατεθειμένος τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῇ πράξει αὐτῶν; Acts v. 38, ἡ βουλὴ αὕτη ἣ τὸ ἔργον τοῦτο; Acts xxvii. 12, ἔθεντο βουλὴν ἀναχθῆναι; xxvii. 42, στρατιωτῶν βουλὴ ἐγένετο ἵνα; 1 Cor. iv. 5.

Βοῦλῆμα, τό, the thing willed, the intention. Aristotle, *Ethic. Nicom.* ii. 1, τὸ μὲν βούλημα παντὸς νομοθέτου τοῦτ' ἐστίν (not of the contents of the law,—the N. T. θέλημα,—but of the purpose lying at the basis of the legislation), τοὺς πολίτας ἐθίζοντες ποιῶσιν ἀγαθοὺς; 2 Macc. xv. 5, ὅμως οὐ κατέσχευ ἐπιτελέσαι τὸ σχέτλιον αὐτοῦ βοῦλῆμα. Not in the LXX. In the N. T. Acts xxvii. 43, ἐκώλυσε αὐτοὺς τοῦ βουλήματος; Rom.

ix. 19, τῷ γὰρ βουλήματι αὐτοῦ τίς ἀνθέστηκεν. Lachm. and Tisch. read the word also in 1 Pet. iv. 3, τὸ βούλημα τῶν ἔθνων κατειργάσθαι; Griesbach, θέλημα. Βούλημα "gives prominence rather to the element of wish or inclination" (Schott).

Γ

Γέέννα, ἡ, probably more correct than γέεννα, as it is derived from the Chald. ܓܝܢܐ; with the Rabbis, the place of the damned, *vid.* Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr.* on Matt. v. 22, derived from ܓܝܢܐ, Josh. xv. 8, *valley of Hinnom*, more completely ܓܝܢܐ ܕܝܗܝܡ, Josh. xviii. 16; 2 Chron. xxxiii. 6; also ܓܝܢܐ ܕܝܗܝܡ, 2 Kings xxiii. 10, Kethib, where was the scene of the Moloch-worship, ܡܠܚܝܬ, 2 Chron. xxxiii. 6; Jer. ii. 23, vii. 31 ff., xix. 6, xxxii. 35; hence desecrated by Josiah, 2 Kings xxiii. 10. According to Kimchi's statement on Ps. xxvii.: *Gehinnam fuit locus spretus, in quem abjecerunt sordes et cadavera, et fuit ibi perpetuo ignis ad comburendum sordes illos et ossa; propterea parabolice vocatur judicium impiorum Gehinnam*, the name was not derived directly from the worship of Moloch (cf. 2 Kings xxiii. 10; Isa. xxx. 33), but from the later use of the valley for the burning of carrion by means of a fire always kept burning. Cf. Jer. xxxi. 40; Isa. lxvi. 24. Certain it is, however, that at the time of Christ the place of the damned was designated by this name; and it was probably used as a symbol (cf. Isa. xxx. 33, lxvi. 24; Matt. xviii. 8, 9) for the notion of a devouring judgment fire, which was current prior to the possible employment of Gehenna in this sense (Lev. x. 2; Num. xvi. 35; 2 Kings i., etc.). Hence ἡ γέεννα τοῦ πυρός, Matt. v. 22, xviii. 9, inasmuch as fire was characteristic of the place. The expression βάλλειν εἰς γ., Matt. v. 29, 30, Mark ix. 45, 47, as also ἐκβάλλειν εἰς τὴν γ., Luke xii. 5, appears to confirm the supposition that this application of the word was suggested rather by the later use of the valley (questioned by Beza) than by the worship of Moloch; ἀπέρχεσθαι εἰς γ., Matt. v. 30; Mark ix. 43; ἀπολλύναι τινὰ ἐν γ., Matt. x. 28; ἡ κρίσις τῆς γ., Matt. xxiii. 33; υἱὸς τῆς γ., xxiii. 15; cf. υἱὸς τῆς βασιλείας, etc., under υἱός; Jas. iii. 6, ἡ γλῶσσα φλογιζομένη ὑπὸ τῆς γ., where the tongue as a fire (καὶ ἡ γλῶσσα πῦρ) does the work of hell,—its fire is drawn from hell; "*idoneam esse linguam recipiendo, fovendo et augendo gehennae igni materiam*," Calvin.—Parallel to this expression, which occurs only in the passages quoted from the Synoptics and James, is that other, τὸ πῦρ τὸ αἰώνιον, ἄσβεστον, but especially ἡ λίμνη τοῦ πυρός, Rev. xix. 20, xx. 10, 14, 15, xxi. 8.

Γεννάω, ἡσώ, to beget; in later writers, also, of the mother—to bear, as in Luke i. 13, 57, xxiii. 29; cf. Matt. xix. 12; to bring forth, 2 Tim. ii. 23, γεννώσιν μάχας. Peculiar is the use made by Paul in some passages of the word to denote an influence exerted on some one, moulding his life, as in Gal. iv. 24, διαθήκη εἰς δουλείαν γεννώσα; 1 Cor. iv. 15, ἐν γὰρ Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἐγὼ ὑμᾶς ἐγέννησα; Philem. 10, ὃν ἐγέννησα ἐν τοῖς δεσμοῖς; cf. 1 Cor. iv. 17, inasmuch, namely, as this influence constitutes the beginning

of a new life, and calls into existence a filial relation. In like manner, the words *σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε*, Acts xiii. 33, Heb. i. 5, v. 5, from Ps. ii. 7, *יְהוָה יֵבְרֵךְ אֶת הַיּוֹם*, may denote an act performed by God on the person addressed, so far as by constituting him king He had moulded his life afresh and set it in a special relation to Himself; in other words, so far as He gave Christ a new beginning of life by raising Him up from the dead, Acts xiii. 32, 33; cf. Rom. i. 4; Col. i. 18; Phil. ii. 9; for reference is made to Christ as He appeared in our likeness, not to what He was before His incarnation. Care must be taken not to confound John's expression, *ἐκ θεοῦ γεννηθῆναι*, John i. 13, 1 John ii. 29, iii. 9, iv. 7, v. 1, 4, 18, which is opposed to the *ἐξ αἱμάτων, ἐκ θελήματος σαρκός, ἀνδρός*, i. 13, *ἐκ τῆς σαρκός*, iii. 6, and is therefore an *ἄνωθεν γεννηθῆναι*, iii. 3 (see *ἄνωθεν*), following *ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος* (*vid. πνεῦμα*), cf. ver. 8. The expression denotes a new commencement of the personal life, traceable back to a (creative) operation of God. In Paul's writings, comp. 2 Cor. v. 17, *εἴ τις ἐν Χριστῷ καινὴ κτίσις*; Eph. ii. 5, *ὄντας ἡμᾶς νεκροὺς τοῖς παραπτώμασιν συνεζωοποίησεν τῷ Χριστῷ καὶ συνήγειρεν κ.τ.λ.*, cf. ver. 10; iv. 24, *καινὸς ἄνθρωπος*; Col. iii. 1, *εἰ οὖν συνηγέρθητε τῷ Χριστῷ*; Tit. iii. 5, *ἔσωσεν ἡμᾶς διὰ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας καὶ ἀνακαινώσεως πνεύματος ἁγίου*; Rom. viii. 15, *ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα υἰοθεσίας κ.τ.λ.*; 2 Pet. i. 4, *ἵνα γέννησθε θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως*. Luther, "*nasci ex Deo est naturam Dei acquirere*." This new beginning of personal life answers to the beginning of the natural life, so far as a new principle of life, *πνεῦμα, σπέρμα θεοῦ*, 1 John iii. 19, is ingrafted in the man (*vid. πνεῦμα*, cf. John i. 12, *ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν τέκνα θεοῦ γενέσθαι*), and he is transferred to a new sphere of life, the *βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ*, being taken away from that which the conditions of human nature at the commencement of the natural life brings, 1 John iii. 14, *μεταβέβηκεν ἐκ τοῦ θανάτου εἰς τὴν ζωὴν*, cf. Col. i. 13; and according to the hints given by John in chap. iii. 3, 5, *ἰδεῖν τὴν, εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασ. τ. θεοῦ*, and the declarations of Paul in Rom. viii. 11, 23, 1 Cor. xv., this new life-commencement is connected with an eventual renewal of the natural life of man, so that a new commencement thereof will be a consequence of the *ἐκ θεοῦ γεννηθῆναι, ἀναγεννηθῆναι*.

Γεννητοὶ γυναικῶν, Matt. xi. 11; Luke vii. 28 (cf. *נָשִׁים*, Job xiv. 1, xv. 14, xxv. 4; Ecclus. x. 18, *γεννήματα γυναικῶν*; Gal. iv. 4, *γενόμενος ἐκ γυναικός*),—men are said to be *born of women*, so far as their origin characterizes them as at the same time *κοινωνοὶ αἵματος καὶ σαρκός*, Heb. ii. 14; cf. Job as above; hence, opposite to *ὁ μικρότερος ἐν τῇ βασ. τ. θ.* (*vid. supr.* John iii. 3, 5); cf. 1 Cor. xv. 50, *σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα βασ. θεοῦ κληρονομήσαι οὐ δύναται*.

Ἀναγεννάω, to beget again, to bear again, only in 1 Pet. i. 3, 23, and in patristic Greek. It denotes the redeeming act of God, described already under *γεννάω*, whose result is the *ἄνωθεν, ἐκ θεοῦ γεννηθῆναι*, and this both in relation to the new sphere of life thus opened up to man, i. 3, *ἀναγέννησας ἡμᾶς εἰς ἐλπίδα ζῶσαν δι' ἀναστάσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκ νεκρῶν* (cf. Col. iii. 1), as also to moral renewal, i. 23, *ἀναγεγεννημένοι οὐκ ἐκ σπορᾶς φθαρτῆς ἀλλὰ ἀφθάρτου*, comp. ver. 22. Cf. Jas. i. 18.

Γεύω, to give a taste of; usually *middle*, to taste, to try or perceive the taste of; originally with the gen., afterwards with the acc., Matt. xxvii. 34; Luke xiv. 24; John ii. 9; Acts xxiii. 14; Col. ii. 21. In later writers = to get or take food, Acts x. 10, xx. 11. Metaphorically = to have or receive a sensation or impression of anything, *practically and in fact to experience anything*, e.g. πόνων, κακῶν, ἀρχῆς, etc. LXX. = עָנַם, Ps. xxxiv. 9, γεύσασθε καὶ ἴδετε, ὅτι χρηστὸς ὁ κύριος. Cf. 1 Pet. ii. 3; Prov. xxxi. 18, ἐγεύσατο ὅτι καλὸν ἐστὶ τὸ ἐργάζεσθαι. In the N. T. Heb. vi. 4, τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς ἐπουρανίου; ver. 5, καλὸν θεοῦ ῥῆμα, δυνάμεις τε μέλλοντος αἰῶνος. The combination γεύεσθαι θανάτου, Matt. xvi. 28, Mark ix. 1, Luke ix. 27, Heb. ii. 9, John viii. 52, answering to the rabbinical עָנַם מָוֶת, is a periphrasis to denote the feeling connected with dying, cf. 1 Sam. xv. 32.—In John viii. 52 it answers to θάνατον θεωρεῖν, ver. 51, cf. xi. 25, 26, and the union of γεύεσθαι with ἰδεῖν in Ps. xxxiv. 9. The design was to give prominence to what is really involved in dying.

Γίγνομαι, later (since Aristotle) γίνομαι, to be born, to become, to arise, to happen. Connected with the Latin *gigno*, the German “keimen,” Low German “kiënen,” hence “Kind.”

Γενεά, ἡ, according to Curtius, p. 537, a collective noun, whose original meaning is *generation*, i.e. a multitude of contemporaries. Still it is a matter of question whether the fundamental meaning of the word is to be determined by the time of birth or the descent. In Homer it occurs both with the meaning *race*, *primitive kinship*, *stock*, or *lineage*, e.g. Αἰτωλὸς γενεήν, *Il.* xxiii. 471, xx. 241, ταύτης τοι γενεῆς τε καὶ αἵματος εὐχομαι εἶναι, akin to which is the meaning *race* = *descendants*, *Il.* xxi. 191, xx. 303; and with the meaning *generation*, i.e. affinity of race resting upon time (not in the more abstract sense wherein it signifies, in post-Homeric Greek, a space of time regulated by the duration of a race), e.g. *Od.* xiv. 325, ἐς δεκάτην γενεήν; *Il.* i. 250, δύο μὲν γενεαὶ μερόπων ἀνθρώπων. Both meanings lie inseparably near each other. The first widens itself in the poets of post-Homeric Greek to denote a nation, e.g. Aeschylus, *Pers.* 912, Περσῶν γενεᾷ, while in prose the narrower meaning, *relations*, *family*, *stock*, is to be retained (Xen., Plato, Polyb.); the latter meaning is akin to the still more abstract *age*, *generation*, and this both with the limitation of time = *generation*, e.g. Herod. ii. 142, τρεῖς γενεαὶ ἀνδρῶν ἑκατὸν ἔτη εἰσίν; Dion. Hal. iii. 15, ἐπὶ τῆς ἡμετέρας γενεᾶς, and in the wider sense = *age*, e.g. Herod. iii. 122. 1, ἡ ἀνθρωπινή λεγομένη γενεή, “*humana quae vocatur aetas*, i.e. *tempus historicum a quo distinguitur Mythica vel Heroica aetas*” (Schweighaeuser, *lex. Hrdt.*).

In biblical Greek γενεά answers to the Hebrew גֵּוֹר, which literally means space of time, circle of time, and which only in a derived sense signifies the men of a time, a race; then generally race in the sense of affinity of communion based upon sameness of stock. See Hupfeld on Ps. xii. 8. The rendering of other designations, such as עַם, הָעָם, by γενεά, claims no special place, and adds no new elements to the usage. Γενεά occurs—

I. (a) As = *race*, *stock*, LXX. = עַם. Lev. xiii. 18, ἐξολοθρεύσονται ἀμφότεροι ἐκ τῆς

γενεᾶς αὐτῶν. In particular, used figuratively to denote fellowship-relations of a spiritual kind = γῆ, Ps. xxiv. 6, αὕτη ἡ γενεὰ ζητούντων αὐτόν; lxxiii. 15, τῇ γενεᾷ τῶν υἱῶν σου ἡσυντέθηκα; xviii. 8, ὁ θεὸς ἐν γενεᾷ δικαία; xii. 8, διατηρήσεις ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης, sc. τῶν ἀσεβῶν, ver. 9. So in the N. T. Acts ii. 40, σῶθητε ἀπὸ τῆς γενεᾶς τῆς σκολιᾶς ταύτης; Phil. ii. 15, τέκνα θεοῦ ἀμώμητα μέσον γενεᾶς σκολιᾶς καὶ διεστραμμένης; Mark viii. 12, 38, ix. 19; Luke ix. 41; Matt. xvi. 4, γενεὰ πονηρὰ καὶ μοιχαλὶς; xvii. 17, γενεὰ ἄπιστος καὶ διεστραμμένη; cf. Deut. xxxii. 5, 20; Luke xvi. 8, οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου φρονιμώτεροι ὑπὲρ τοὺς υἱοὺς τοῦ φωτὸς εἰς τὴν γενεὰν τὴν ἑαυτῶν εἰσίν. (b) *Race, posterity*, Ps. cxii. 2, γενεὰ εὐθέων εὐλογηθήσεται, synon. σπέρμα; Eccclus. xlv. 16, Ἐνὼχ . . . ὑπόδειγμα μετανοίας ταῖς γενεαῖς; iv. 16; Lev. xxiii. 43; Acts viii. 33, τὴν δὲ γενεὰν αὐτοῦ τίς διηγῆσεται.—II. *Race, generation*, Gen. xv. 16, τετάρτη γενεᾷ; Deut. xxiii. 3, ἕως δεκάτης γενεᾶς; Matt. i. 17, γενεαὶ δεκατέσσαρες. In this sense the word occurs (a) with special reference to the physical or moral circumstances, just as we speak of the age or of a time, thinking of and intending the spiritual impress of the society of that time. Jer. vii. 29, ἀπεδοκίμασε κύριος καὶ ἀπόσατο τὴν γενεὰν τὴν ποιοῦσαν αὐτά; Judg. ii. 10, καὶ πᾶσα ἡ γενεὰ ἐκείνη προσετέθησαν πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας αὐτῶν, καὶ ἀέστη γενεὰ ἐτέρα μετ' αὐτοὺς οἳ οὐκ ἔγνωσαν τὸν κύριον. So Heb. iii. 10 (quoted from Ps. cxvii. 10), προσώχθισα τῇ γενεᾷ ἐκείνῃ; Acts xiii. 36; Luke vii. 31, οἱ ἄνθρωποι τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης; Luke xi. 31, βασιλίσσα νότου ἐγερθήσεται ἐν τῇ κρίσει μετὰ τῶν ἀνδρῶν τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης. In the same manner, also, Matt. xi. 16, xii. 39, 41, 42, 45, xvii. 17, xxiii. 36; Luke xi. 29, 30, 32, 50, 51, xvii. 25. The connection alone must decide whether the sense is limited thus to the state of society at a certain time, or whether the word stands simply in the sense named in I. (a). As to Matt. xxiv. 34 and parallels (οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη ἕως ἂν πάντα ταῦτα γένηται), this one thing is decisive for the meaning *generation, race*, that some determinate time is treated of, and *παρέρχεσθαι* has reference to the lapse of time and of things which pass away, and not to the destruction of a race or people. For the rest, as to which generation is meant, whether the contemporaries of Jesus, as in Matt. xxiii. 36, or the generation which lives to see the antichristian abomination of desolation and the judgment which comes upon it (Matt. xxiv. 15 sqq.), see my treatise on Matt. xxiv. 25, p. 125 sqq.—(b) *Generation* in a formal sense with reference to time, Acts xv. 21, ἐκ γενεῶν ἀρχαίων; xiv. 16, παρωχημένοι γενεαί; Eph. iii. 5, ἐτέραις γενεαῖς οὐκ ἐγνωρίσθη; Luke i. 48, ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν μακαριοῦσίν με πᾶσαι αἱ γενεαί; ver. 50, εἰς γενεὰς γενεῶν; Eph. iii. 21; Col. i. 26; Ps. xlix. 12; Isa. li. 8, and often.

Ἀπογίνομαι, to be afar off, separated, to take no part in, e.g. τῶν ἀμαρτημάτων ἀπογενόμενοι, Thuc. i. 39. 3. Then = to cease to be, to die, e.g. Herod. v. 4, κατὰ τὸν γινόμενόν σφι καὶ ἀπογινόμενον ποιεῦσι τοιάδε; Thuc. ii. 34, τὰ ὅστ' αὐτῶν ἀπογενομένων. So often, but rarely in the Attic. In this sense it occurs in 1 Pet. ii. 24, ἵνα ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις ἀπογενόμενοι, τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ ζήσωμεν, corresponding with Rom. vi. 11, νεκροὺς μὲν τῇ ἀμαρτίᾳ, ζῶντας δὲ τῷ θεῷ. It denotes, not a legal, but a moral relation to sin, which is

here represented according to its individual manifestations (plural), cf. Rom. vi. 2, vii. 6, Col. ii. 20, and indeed a relation of such a kind that the moulding of the character of the person by sin ceases any longer to be.

Ἀλλογενής, ὁ, ἡ, of another race, foreign, belonging only to biblical and patristic Greek, synonymous with ἀλλόφυλος, which is used in the classics and LXX., but more general and less strong than this. It answers in the LXX. to the Hebrew נִזְר, Ex. xxix. 33, Num. xvi. 40, Lev. xxii. 10, where it stands for those who are not of the family of the high priest. Against this in Joel iii. 17, Jer. li. 51, Obad. 11, Zech. ix. 6, of other peoples in contrast with the people of Israel. Comp. Job xix. 15. = נִזְר, Ex. xii. 43; Lev. xxii. 25; Isa. lvi. 3, 6; cf. Gen. xvii. 17. The latter, on the other hand, is = ἀλλόφυλος in Isa. lxi. 5, which also is = נִזְר in ii. 6. Also מִתְּחִלָּה is = ἀλλόφυλος, 1 Sam. xiii. 3; Ps. cvii. 10; cf. 1 Macc. iv. 22; Joseph. *Antt.* ix. 5. 3. No weight can be attached (as Stier on John iv. thinks) to the otherwise very fine distinction in Luke xvii. 18, where Christ calls the Samaritans ἀλλογενής, not ἀλλόφυλος, Acts x. 28, whereas Josephus calls them ἀλλοθενεῖς (*Antt.* ix. 14, xi. 8).

Μονογενής, ὁ, ἡ, only-begotten, e.g. μονογενὲς τέκνον πατρί, Aesch. *Ag.* 872. A special preciousness and closeness of attachment arises from the fact of its being an only-begotten child, cf. Luke vii. 12, viii. 42, ix. 38; Heb. xi. 17, τὸν μονογενῆ προσέφερεν ὁ τὰς ἐπαγγελίας ἀναδεξάμενος. LXX. = יְחִיד, in Judg. xi. 34, and where idea of oneness is coincident with that of isolation and seclusion, Ps. xxii. 21, xxv. 16, xxxv. 17, whereas elsewhere they render it by ἀγαπητός, see Gen. xxii. 2, 12, 16; Jer. vi. 26; Amos viii. 10; Zech. xii. 10. (Fürst, for Ps. xxii. 21, xxxv. 19, compares the use of יְחִיד as a designation of the soul.) In John it is used to denote the relation of Christ to the Father, John i. 14, 18, iii. 16, 18, 1 John iv. 9, to which the ἀγαπητός of the Synoptists does not quite correspond, but rather the Pauline ἴδιος υἱός, Rom. viii. 32; cf. John v. 18, πατέρα ἴδιον ἔλεγε τὸν θεόν; cf. Mark xii. 6, ἔτι ἓνα εἶχεν υἱὸν ἀγαπητόν. The oneness of the relationship appears specially in the coming and work of Christ, John i. 14, 18, gives to the revelation of God in Him its special worth, iii. 16, 1 John iv. 9, and must determine our conduct towards Him. As to the bearing of this term upon Christ's relation to the Father before the incarnation, see υἱός. Cf. John iii. 16, 1 John iv. 9, Rom. viii. 3, with e.g. Mark xii. 6.

Παλιγγενεσία, ἡ, regeneration, restoration. In the former sense, in Tit. iii. 5, ἔσωμεν ἡμᾶς διὰ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας καὶ ἀνακαινώσεως πν. ἁγ., see γεννάω. In the latter, Matt. xix. 28, ἐν τῇ παλιγγενεσίᾳ ὅταν καθίσῃ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπὶ θρόνου δόξης αὐτοῦ, for which Mark x. 30, Luke xviii. 30, have ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τῷ ἐρχομένῳ; Acts iii. 19, καιροὶ ἀναψύξεως; ver. 21, χρόνοι ἀποκαταστάσεως πάντων ὧν ἐλάλησεν ὁ θεὸς κ.τ.λ. (cf. Matt. xvii. 11). This παλιγγενεσία is contemporary with the resurrection of the dead, cf. Matt. xxii. 30, ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει; Job xiv. 14, ὑπομενῶ ἕως πάλιν γένωμαι = תְּהִי־לִי כִּי־יִבָּרַךְ, "till my change come," cf. 14a, תְּהִי־לִי כִּי־יִבָּרַךְ מִיָּדֶיךָ. Hence Theophylact, παλιγ-

γενεσίαν τὴν ἀνάστασιν νόει; Euthymius, *παλιγγενεσίαν λέγει τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν ὡς παλινζῶσαν*. Cf. also Col. iii. 1 with Rom. vi. 3, Tit. iii. 5. The word may also be taken in a still deeper, more comprehensive sense, as denoting the restoration of all things to their former state, and therefore as = ἀποκατάστασις, cf. Acts i. 6; Rom. viii. 19 sqq. Cf. *παλιγγενεσία τῆς πατρίδος*, Joseph. *Antt.* xi. 3. 9, where § 8 ἀποκατάστασις. Rev. xxi. 5, *ἰδοὺ καινὰ ποιῶ τὰ πάντα*. So also Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.*, under *דְּהַיָּה עֲתִידָהּ*; Bertholdt, *Christolog. Jud.* § 45, who quotes R. Bechai in *Schilchan orba*, fol. 9, c. 4, "*Tempore illo mutabitur totum opus creationis in melius et redibit in statum suum perfectum ac purum, qualis erat tempore primi hominis, antequam peccasset.*"

Γενεαλογία, ἡ, genealogy. The expression in 1 Tim. i. 4, *μηδὲ προσέχειν μύθοις καὶ γενεαλογίαις* (cf. Tit. iii. 9), denotes a busying oneself about traditions of the past, based upon the slightest historical hints, which diverted the heart from God's truth, and which, as appears from Tit. i. 10, was the practice specially of Jewish false teachers, though this is not implied in the expression itself. *Μῦθοι καὶ γενεαλογίαι* is an Hellenistic phrase in the sense above given, cf. Polyb. ix. 2 (see Otto, *die geschichtl. Verhältnisse der Pastoralbriefe*, p. 160), and afterwards as denoting the historical drapery of would-be ancient philosophemes. "The Jewish Gnostics, as we have shown, treated the Mosaic records with the same literalness as the Greeks did the Homeric, the Hesiodic, or the Orphic poems; and they endeavoured to deduce therefrom the old, and, as they would have it, the only true philosophy; nay, while turning the entire historical substance into mere myth, they had the hardihood to assert that they possessed the key to the divine order of the world based on faith (objectively, revelation). The apostle, therefore, in writing to Timothy (who himself was of Greek extraction, and was not unacquainted with the Hellenistic tongue), could not have chosen a more appropriate expression to put the perverseness of Jewish manipulations of Scripture in its true light, saying in a word that they who thus pretended to teach the νόμος taught nothing better than μύθους καὶ γενεαλογίας. The νόμος in their hands ceased to be any longer νόμος; its records had been made like the μύθοις καὶ γενεαλογίαις of the heathen" (Otto as above).—Others explain *γενεαλογίαι* as referring to the Gnostic series of emanations, especially on account of the qualifying ἀπέραντοι; but ἀπέραντος means not only "endless," but "objectless" or "useless," see Thuc. iv. 36. Even the rendering "endless" does not necessarily point to the emanation series, but may express the impression which the ever-repeated myths and genealogies of the false teachers produced upon the bystanders. (Ἀπέραντος applies to μυθ. κ. γενεαλ. as together expressing one idea.) In any case, the object clearly seems to be to characterize the false doctrine taught.

Γενεαλογέω, to make a genealogical register or pedigree; τινά, to draw out in a document the pedigree of any one. Often in Herod., e.g. iii. 75. 1, *ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ Αἰχάιμενέος ἐγενεηλόγησε τὴν πατρίην τοῦ Κύρου*; ii. 91. 3, *ἀπὸ δὲ τούτου γενεηλογέοντες κατέβαινον ἐς τὸν Περσέα*; vi. 53, it stands as = *καταλέγειν τοὺς ἄνω αἰεὶ πατέρας*. Oftener

γενεαλογεῖν ἑαυτόν, *to trace out his descent*. The passive in Herod. vi. 53, ταῦτα μὲν νῦν γεγενεηλόγηται. Heb. vii. 6, ὁ δὲ μὴ γενεαλογούμενος ἐκ τῶν υἱῶν Λευί, "whose pedigree cannot be traced back to the family of the sons of Levi." 1 Chron. v. 1, οὐκ ἐγενεαλογήθη εἰς πρωτοτόκια.—Figuratively, Ael. V. H. iv. 17, τὸν σεισμὸν ἐγενεαλόγει οὐδὲν ἄλλο εἶναι ἢ σύνοδον τῶν τεθνεώτων.

Ἀγενεαλόγητος, *without records as to his pedigree*, Heb. vii. 3, which might prove the right of Melchizedek to the priesthood; cf. Neh. vii. 64.

Γῆ, ἡ, The earth, (I.) as part of the creation; in the expression ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ, which denotes the whole domain of creation and of the history transacted between God and man, Matt. vi. 10, xi. 25, xxiv. 35, xxviii. 18; Mark xiii. 31; Luke xxi. 33; Acts iv. 24, xiv. 15, xvii. 24; 1 Cor. viii. 5; Eph. i. 10, iii. 15; Col. i. 16, 20; Heb. xii. 26; 2 Pet. iii. 13; Rev. xx. 11, xxi. 1; cf. Deut. xxx. 19, xxxii. 1, etc. The earth which is given up to man stands in a relation of dependence to heaven which is the dwelling-place of God, Matt. v. 34; Ps. ii. 4; for which reason the question always is, How will that which occurs on earth be estimated in heaven? Hence Matt. xvi. 19, ὁ ἂν δήσῃς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἔσται δεδεμένον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς κ.τ.λ.; xviii. 18, 19; in this sense, too, Matt. ix. 6, ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας, Mark ii. 10, Luke v. 24, are to be understood; Matt. xxiii. 9. Accordingly, an antithetic relationship readily suggests itself between earth and heaven, not only in a natural, but also in a moral respect, seeing that heaven is not only more exalted than the earth (Ps. ciii. 11; cf. John xii. 32; Acts vii. 49), but also answers to its purpose, as the fit dwelling-place of God. Thus with earth is associated, according to the connection, the idea of emptiness, of weakness, of what does not correspond with the wisdom and power of God, of what is sinful. Cf. Mark ix. 3, οἱ αὐτοὶ γεγραμμένοι ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς οὐ δύναται οὕτως λευκᾶναι; 1 Cor. xv. 47, ὁ πρῶτος ἀνθρώπος ἐκ γῆς χοϊκός, ὁ δεύτερος ἀνθρ. ἐξ οὐρανοῦ; John iii. 31, 32; Rev. xvii. 5, xiv. 3; Matt. vi. 10, γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς. The earth is the sphere of the κόσμος, αἰὼν οὗτος, and representations answering thereto are associated with it. Thus cf. Matt. vi. 19, μὴ θησαυρίζετε ὑμῖν θησαυροὺς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, with 1 Tim. vi. 17, τοῖς πλουσίοις ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰῶνι παράγγελε κ.τ.λ.; ver. 19, ἀποθησαυρίζονται ἑαυτοῖς θεμέλιον καλὸν εἰς τὸ μέλλον, ἵνα ἐπιλάβωνται τῆς ὄντως ζωῆς; Heb. xi. 13. This contrast comes most prominently into view when heaven alone is spoken of. In Rev. v. 3, 13, ἐν τῷ οὐρ. καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ ὑποκάτω τῆς γῆς, cf. Phil. ii. 10 (see under ἐπουράνιος), ὑποκάτω τῆς γ. denotes a contrast to earth analogous to ἐν τῷ οὐρ., but in the opposite direction. — Τὰ κατώτερα τῆς γῆς, Eph. iv. 9, seem to denote the same thing, namely Hades (cf. Geb. Manass., ver. 14), cf. Acts ii. 25 sqq.; 1 Pet. iii. 19; Acts xiii. 36 sqq.; Heb. ii. 9; others, however, explain τῆς γῆς as the *gen. epxeeg.*, and τὰ κατ. τῆς γ. as a designation of earth in its contrast with heaven, comp. Acts ii. 19, John viii. 23, iii. 13, vi. 33, 38, etc.—an explanation grammatically allowable, and quite in harmony with the sense and connection of the passage (see Harless *in loc.*;

Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* ii. 1. 486), which, however, has against it the fact that the corresponding שְׁעוֹלָהּ stands for *Sheol*, cf. Ps. lxiii. 10; see Hoelemann, *Bibelstudien*, ii. 123.

II. Earth, land, in contrast with water, the sea (Luke v. 3, 11; John xxi. 8, etc.), used figuratively in Rev. x. 5, 8, xii. 12, xiii. 11, the contrast between earth and sea being that of the firm and stable land, with the tempestuous and roaring flood (Hofmann, *Weiss. und Erf.* ii. 354). Cf. also Auberlen, *Daniel und Apok.* p. 279: "The sea denotes the restless and mighty heavings of peoples (peoples and multitudes of nations and tongues, Rev. xvii. 15; cf. Ps. lxxv. 8, lxxxix. 10, 11; Isa. viii. 7-9); the earth denotes the established and well-ordered world of peoples, with its culture and wisdom."

Ἐπίγειος, *ον*, to be found upon the earth, belonging to the earth, opposed to ἑγγεῖος, ἐπουράνιος, and other terms, according to the connection. In the N. T. always opposed to ἐπουράνιος, 1 Cor. xv. 40, καὶ σώματα ἐπουράνια καὶ σώματα ἐπίγεια· ἀλλὰ ἑτέρα μὲν ἡ τῶν ἐπουρανίων δόξα, ἑτέρα δὲ ἡ τῶν ἐπιγείων; 2 Cor. v. 1, ἡ ἐπίγειος ἡμῶν οἰκία τοῦ σκήνους, in contrast with οἰκία ἀχειροποίητος αἰώνιος ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς; Phil. ii. 10, πᾶν γόνυ ἐπουρανίων κ. ἐπιγ. κ. καταχθονίων, see γῆ. — In John iii. 12, εἰ τὰ ἐπίγεια εἶπον ὑμῖν, τὰ ἐπίγ. (as the context shows) refers to what Christ had said concerning regeneration as the condition of seeing the kingdom of God (ἐπουρ.), and τὰ ἐπουρ. will then denote what the Synoptists call τὰ μυστήρια τῆς βασ., Matt. xiii. 13-15. The word occurs with a moral import, answering to the moral contrast between earth and heaven, in Phil. iii. 19, οἱ τὰ ἐπίγεια φρονούντες, cf. ver. 14; Col. iii. 2, τὰ ἄνω φρονεῖν; Jas. iii. 15, οὐκ ἔστιν αὕτη ἡ σοφία ἄνωθεν κατερχομένη, ἀλλ' ἐπίγειος, ψυχικός κ.τ.λ.; cf. vv. 14, 16, 17.

Γινώσκω, older and later form of the Attic γιγνώσκω, from the root preserved in νοῦς, νοεῖν, Lat. *nosco*; future γνώσομαι, aor. ἔγνω, 3 sing. conj. γνοῖ for γνῶ, Mark v. 43, ix. 30, Luke xix. 15, as δοῖ for δῶ, aor. 2 of δίδωμι, formed according to the analogy of verbs in -όω: μισθόω . . . μισθοῖ, cf. Mark iv. 29, xiv. 10, 11, etc. Cf. Buttmann, *neutest. Gram.* § 107 = to perceive, to observe, to obtain a knowledge of, or insight into. Plat. *Theaet.* 209 E, τὸ γὰρ γινῶναι ἐπιστήμην ποῦ λαβεῖν ἐστίν; Mark v. 29, ἔγνω τῷ σώματι ὅτι ἵαται κ.τ.λ.; Luke viii. 46, ἔγνω δύναμιν ἐξεληλυθῆσαν ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, and elsewhere; to learn, Mark xv. 45; to recognise, Matt. xii. 33, xxi. 45, xxiv. 32, 33; John v. 42, vii. 26; 2 Cor. ii. 4, 9; to understand, Luke xviii. 34; John viii. 28. To have an insight into or understanding of anything, to know, to be acquainted with, Matt. xvi. 3, τὸ πρόσωπον τοῦ οὐρανοῦ γινώσκετε διακρίνειν; xii. 7, xiii. 11; Luke xii. 47, xvi. 15. Without object, as Plat. *Rep.* i. 347 D, πᾶς ὁ γινώσκων, "every discerning or shrewd person" = to have discernment, to be intelligent, to obtain an insight into. Thus we find it in Matt. xxiv. 39, οὐκ ἔγνωσαν ἕως κ.τ.λ.; Rom. x. 19, μὴ Ἰσραὴλ οὐκ ἔγνω; Eph. v. 5, τοῦτο γὰρ ἵστε γινώσκοντες. But in 1 Cor. xiii. 9, 12, ἐκ μέρους γινώσκειν, the term is most probably used in a formal sense = to apprehend, as often, e.g. Plat. *Rep.* vi. 508 E. The object must be determined according to the connection; see γινῶσις. For various constructions, see Lexicons.

In N. T. Greek, *γινώσκω* frequently denotes a personal relation between the person knowing and the object known, equivalent to, to be influenced by our knowledge of an object, to suffer oneself to be determined thereby; for anything is known only so far as it is of importance to the person knowing, and has an influence on him, and thus a personal relationship is established between the knowing subject and the object known. Thus John ii. 24, 25, v. 42; 1 Cor. ii. 8, *εἰ γὰρ ἔγνωσαν, sc. τὴν σοφίαν τοῦ θεοῦ, οὐκ ἂν τὸν κύριον τῆς δόξης ἐσταύρωσαν*; i. 21, ii. 11, 12, viii. 2, *εἴ τις δοκεῖ ἐγνωκέναι τι, οὐδέπω οὐδὲν ἔγνωκεν καθὼς δεῖ γινῶναι· εἰ δέ τις ἀγαπᾷ τὸν θεόν, οὗτος ἔγνωσται ὑπ' αὐτοῦ*. Christian knowledge calls into existence of itself a relation answering to the significance of its object; hence in the second clause we have *εἰ δέ τις ἀγαπᾷ*. Cf. Gal. iv. 9. As to *οὗτος ἔγνω*, see below. Hence the significance attaching to the knowledge of salvation, 2 Cor. v. 16, viii. 9, xiii. 6; Eph. iii. 19; John vi. 69, vii. 17, 49, viii. 32, *γνώσεσθε τὴν ἀληθείαν, καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια ἐλευθερώσει ὑμᾶς*; 2 John 1; John xiv. 20, 31. Compare the parallelism between the knowledge and the fear of God, Ps. xc. 11. I know anything when I know what it imports, what it is to me. 1 John iv. 8, *οὐκ ἔγνω τὸν θεόν, ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ἀγάπη ἐστίν*. John xiv. 7, 9, 17. Thus we occasionally, though rarely, meet with it in classical writers; see Plat. *Theæt.* 176 C, *ἡ τοῦ δικαιοτάτου γνώσις σοφία καὶ ἀρετὴ ἀληθινή*. But usually the bare formal meaning, to have understanding of, prevails. Most akin is the use of *γιν.* without an object. *Γινώσκω*, in the sense of to discern or judge, is more remote; still here also the idea is implied, to allow oneself to be determined by one's knowledge. Cf. Xen. *Anab.* v. 5. 19, *ἡ στρατία οὕτω γιγνώσκει*, "this is the opinion, the resolve, of the army."

A further particularizing of that use of the word occurs in the writings of St. John. Not only is a rightly adjusted relation (not merely conduct) towards God and His revelation there brought into connection with the knowledge thereof, as in John vi. 69, *ἡμᾶς πεπιστεύκαμεν καὶ ἐγνώκαμεν ὅτι κ.τ.λ.*; 1 John iv. 16, *ἡμεῖς ἐγνώκαμεν καὶ πεπιστεύκαμεν τὴν ἀγ. κ.τ.λ.* (where the point under consideration is simply the giving of an emphatic and complete description of the relation to Christ to which reference is made, so that no question need be raised as to the priority of the one conception or the other, whether of trust or knowledge), but that relation itself is expressed by the word *γινώσκω*, upon the supposition that this involves the subject's entering into a true relation to the object. See John i. 10, *ὁ κόσμος αὐτὸν οὐκ ἔγνω*. — Ver. 11, *οἱ ἴδιοι αὐτὸν οὐ παρέλαβον*. In order to understand the several expressions, two things must be kept in view, viz. that *γινώσκω* has to do both with the significance of the object known for the subject knowing, and, at the same time, with the influence exerted by the object on the subject. Thus we must understand the expression in John xvii. 3, *αὕτη δέ ἐστιν ἡ αἰώνιος ζωὴ, ἵνα γινώσκουσίν σε τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν θεὸν καὶ ὃν ἀπέστειλας Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν*; ver. 25, *ὁ κόσμος σε οὐκ ἔγνω, ἐγὼ δέ σε ἔγνω, καὶ οὗτοι ἔγνωσαν ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας*; i. 10, viii. 55. This is specially clear in 1 John v. 20, *δédωκεν ἡμῖν διάνοιαν, ἵνα γινώσκωμεν τὸν ἀλήθινον καὶ ἐσμεν ἐν τῷ ἀληθινῷ*; 1 John iv. 6, *ὁ γινώσκων τὸν θεόν*, in antithesis with *ὃς οὐκ*

ἔστιν ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ; 1 John ii. 3, comp. vv. 4, 5. There we read (ver. 4) in close connection with ver. 3, ὁ λέγων, ἔγνωκα αὐτόν, καὶ τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ μὴ τηρῶν, ψεύστης ἐστίν, καὶ ἐν τούτῳ ἡ ἀλήθεια οὐκ ἔστιν; ver. 5, ὃς δ' ἂν τηρῇ αὐτοῦ τὸν λόγον—not now, οὗτος ἔγνωκεν αὐτόν, but ἀληθῶς ἐν τούτῳ ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ τετελείωται, cf. iv. 8. Accordingly, in ii. 13, 14, in confirmation of the assurance of salvation (cf. ver. 12), it is said, ἐγνώκατε τὸν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς . . . τὸν πατέρα; iii. 1, διὰ τοῦτο ὁ κόσμος οὐ γινώσκει ἡμᾶς, ὅτι οὐκ ἔγνω αὐτόν. Thus the realization of the Christian life is represented as the spontaneous fruit of this knowledge; 1 John iii. 6, πᾶς ὁ ἐν αὐτῷ μένων οὐχ ἁμαρτάνει πᾶς ὁ ἁμαρτάνων οὐχ ἑώρακεν αὐτόν οὐδὲ ἔγνωκεν αὐτόν; iv. 7, 8, ii. 3.

Almost without analogy in classical Greek (yet cf. γνωστός, *known to, befriended*), but in keeping with the meanings already given, and anticipated in the corresponding use of the Hebrew שָׁנָא, is that pregnant saying in Matt. vii. 23, οὐδέποτε ἔγνων ὑμᾶς; John x. 14, γινώσκω τὰ ἐμὰ καὶ γινώσκουσίν με τὰ ἐμὰ, καθὼς γινώσκει με ὁ πατήρ καὶ γὰρ γινώσκω τὸν πατέρα (cf. xvii. 25); ver. 27; 1 Cor. viii. 3; Gal. iv. 9; Phil. iii. 10; 2 Tim. ii. 19; 2 Cor. v. 21. See οἶδα. It is clear that the negative assertion of Matt. vii. 23 denies any, even the remotest, connection with the object, cf. Matt. xxvi. 72, οὐκ οἶδα τὸν ἄνθρωπον; because the necessary condition of any such connection, viz. acquaintance, is denied. Cf. 2 Cor. v. 21, τὸν μὴ γνόντα ἁμαρτίαν. It is, as we say, to have no inkling, no idea of a thing, to know nothing about it. See Rom. vii. 7, τὴν ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἔγνων, cf. ver. 8; Matt. xxiv. 50; Rev. iii. 3; Wisd. iii. 18. In all these passages we have the denial not merely of a close and special, but of any relation whatever to the object. The positive γινώσκειν τινά affirms, on the contrary, that the basis of union, and therefore the union itself, exists, that the object is not strange or foreign to the subject. Cf. Xen. *Cyrop.* i. 4. 27, ἐμὲ μόνον οὐ γινώσκεις, ὦ Κῦρε, τῶν συγγενῶν. (The use of the expression to denote sexual intercourse, occurring often in the O. T., in classical Greek in Plut., in the N. T. Matt. i. 25, Luke i. 34, is quite in keeping with this; cf. especially Luke i. 34.) Γινώσκειν, used in such connections, denotes therefore to take notice of any one, to form a connection or stand in union with any one. Cf. Ps. i. 6; Hos. xiii. 5; Nah. i. 7; Ps. cxliv. 3, τί ἐστὶν ἄνθρωπος ὅτι ἐγνώσθης αὐτῷ καὶ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ὅτι λογίξῃ αὐτόν; So in Heb. xiii. 23, γινώσκετε τὸν ἀδελφὸν Τιμόθεον; cf. Amos iii. 2; 1 Cor. viii. 3, εἰ δέ τις ἀγαπᾷ τὸν θεόν, οὗτος ἔγνωσται ὑπ' αὐτοῦ; Gal. iv. 9, γνόντες θεόν, μᾶλλον γνωσθέντες ὑπὸ θεοῦ; 2 Tim. ii. 19; Num. xvi. 5. Hence it is evident that, e.g., John x. 27, καὶ γὰρ γινώσκω αὐτὰ καὶ ἀκολουθοῦσίν μοι, is a logical inference from the thought expressed, ver. 14, by γινώσκουσίν με τὰ ἐμὰ. Cf. John i. 10 with ver. 11. The connection, therefore, of this meaning with that explained above, where γινώσκειν equally denotes a personal relation to the object, is evident.

Γνωστός, ἡ, ὄν, in later Greek with a *passive* sig. = *known*, for which in Homer and the poets γνωτός. In the N. T. John xviii. 15, ἦν γνωστός τῷ ἀρχιερεῖ; ver. 16; Acts i. 19, γνωστὸν ἐγένετο πᾶσιν; ii. 14, iv. 10, ix. 42, xiii. 38, xv. 18, xix. 17, xxviii.

22, 28; γνωστὸν σημεῖον, Acts iv. 16. Οἱ γνωστοί, acquaintances, friends, Luke ii. 44, xxiii. 49; cf. Ps. lxxxvii. 8; Neh. v. 10. The "facultative" meaning, capable of being known, always in Plato, where (e.g. *Rep.* vii. 517 B) it corresponds with νοητός, parallel to ὁρατός: ἐν τῷ γνωστῷ τελευταία ἡ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ἰδέα καὶ μόγις ὁράσθαι, ὁφθεῖσα δὲ ξυλλογιστέα εἶναι; ὡς ἄρα πᾶσι πάντων αὕτη ὀρθῶν τε καὶ καλῶν αἰτία, ἐν τε ὁρατῷ φῶς καὶ τὸν τούτου κύριον τεκοῦσα ἐν τε νοητῷ αὕτη κυρία ἀλήθειαν καὶ νοῦν παρασχομένη. In this sense it is probably to be taken also in *Oed. R.* 362; Xen. *Hell.* ii. 3. 18; doubtful in Xen. *Cyrop.* vi. 3. 4; Arrian. *diss. Epict.* ii. 20. 4. The question now is, whether we are to take it in this sense in Rom. i. 19, τὸ γνωστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ φανερόν ἐστιν ἐν αὐτοῖς. In biblical Greek we can only cite in support of this rendering, Ecclus. xxi. 7, γνωστὸς μακρόθεν ὁ δύνατος ἐν γλώσση, and perhaps Acts iv. 16, ὅτι μὲν γὰρ γνωστὸν σημεῖον γέγονεν δι' αὐτῶν, πᾶσιν τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν Ἱερουσαλὴμ φανερόν, καὶ οὐ δυνάμεθα ἀρνήσασθαι. Still, as is clear even in these two passages, the meanings, capable of being known, and known, do not, in many cases, lie very far asunder; and so also in Rom. i. 19, if only the construction there be rightly understood, so that we need the comparison of analogous passages in order to decide its import. Τὸ γνωστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ is not an unusual form of expression; the neuter substantival of the adj., with the genitive following instead of the simple concord of adj. with subst., gives prominence to the former as the main thought, cf. Phil. iii. 8, τὸ ὑπερέχον τῆς γνώσεως; Heb. vi. 17, τὸ ἀμετάθετον τῆς βούλης; Rom. ii. 4, τὸ χρηστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ; and the genitive τοῦ θεοῦ is not *gen. partit.* = "what is knowable or known of God," but as in all these cases the *gen. possess.* = "God, as He is knowable or known"—"that God is knowable or known." Cf. Krüger, § 47, 10. Judging from the course of St. Paul's argument in Acts xvii. 26, 27, it more probably means knowable. Taking this view of the construction, the γνωστὸν τ. θ. forms very appropriately the first step in the argument, of which ver. 21, γινόντες τὸν θεόν, is the second. 1st. "They could know God," God has provided for this; 2d. "They do know God, but," etc.

Γνώσις, εως, ἡ, strictly knowing or recognition, Thuc. vii. 44. 2, εἰκὸς τὴν μὲν ὄψιν τοῦ σώματος προορᾶν, τὴν δὲ γνώσιν τοῦ οἰκείου ἀπιστεῖσθαι. Hence the knowledge or understanding of a thing, always, with the genitive, expressed and understood. Luke i. 77, τῆς σωτηρίας; 2 Cor. ii. 14, x. 5, τοῦ θεοῦ; iv. 6, τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ; Phil. iii. 8, Χριστοῦ; 2 Pet. iii. 18, τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν. The genitive is to be supplied, 1 Cor. viii. 1, τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων, *sc.* ὅτι οὐδὲν εἰδωλὸν ἐν κόσμῳ, ver. 4; cf. ver. 8. So also vv. 7, 10, 11. (Ver. 7 explains itself in relation to ver. 1 by the change in the subject of the γνώσις; for there the apostle directs his admonition solely to those who possess the γνώσις in question; cf. ver. 10, σὲ τὸν ἔχοντα γνώσιν.) (α) Without the *gen. obj.* absolutely = knowledge, understanding, in the formal sense, 1 Cor. viii. 1, ἡ γνώσις φυσιοῖ, repeating the abstract idea underlying the preceding γνώσιν, *sc.* τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων ἔχομεν. In this sense, e.g. Plato, *Rep.* vi. 508 E, where γνώσις καὶ ἀλήθεια occur together as denoting

form and substance; cf. what precedes, τὸ τὴν ἀλήθειαν παρέχον τοῖς γινγνωσκομένοις καὶ τῷ γινγνώσκοντι τὴν δύναμιν ἀποδιδόν. Also Eph. iii. 19, γινῶναι τὴν ὑπερβάλλουσαν τῆς γνώσεως ἀγάπην τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Likewise absolutely, but (b) in a material or concrete sense = insight, like γινώσκειν, "to have discernment," "to be clever;" it does not occur in classical Greek, indeed γινώσκειν in this sense is rare. It is thus used in Rom. xi. 33, ὦ βάθος πλούτου καὶ σοφίας καὶ γνώσεως θεοῦ; 1 Pet. iii. 7, συνοικούντες κατὰ γνώσιν ὡς κ.τ.λ.; 2 Pet. i. 5, ἐπιχορηγήσατε ἐν τῇ ἀρετῇ τὴν γνώσιν, ἐν δὲ τῇ γνώσει τὴν ἐγκράτειαν; Rom. xv. 14, μεστοί ἐστε ἀγαθοσύνης, πεπληρωμένοι πάσης γνώσεως, δυνάμενοι καὶ ἀλλήλους νοουθετεῖν; 2 Cor. vi. 6, ἐν ἀγνότητι, ἐν γνώσει, ἐν μακροθυμίᾳ. It means the insight which manifests itself in the thorough understanding of the subjects which come before it, and in the conduct determined thereby; which hits on what is right, in that it allows itself to be guided by the right knowledge of the object with which it has to do. Cf. Ecclus. i. 19, φόβος κυρίου γνώσιν συνέσεως ἐξώμβρησε; Prov. xxix. 7, ὁ ἀσεβὴς οὐ νοεῖ γνώσιν; Prov. xiii. 16, πᾶς πανούργος πράσσει μετὰ γνώσεως. Joined with σοφία in Rom. xi. 33; 1 Cor. xii. 8; Col. ii. 3. Γνώσις requires existent objects in distinction from σοφία, which is not, like γνώσις, an act or behaviour, but an attribute determining the behaviour. In the passages thus far quoted we have found no occasion for understanding γνώσις of a knowledge whose subject-matter is Christian truth, God's salvation. But there are texts in which this reference is undeniable; where γνώσις denotes an insight which manifests itself in the understanding of saving truth, Mal. ii. 7, χεῖλη ἱερέως φυλάσσεται γνώσιν; Luke xi. 52, ἤρατε τὴν κλεῖδα τῆς γνώσεως; Rom. ii. 20, ἔχειν τὴν μόρφωσιν τῆς γνώσεως καὶ τῆς ἀληθείας ἐν τῷ νόμῳ; 1 Cor. xii. 8, xiii. 2; 1 Tim. vi. 20, ἀντιθέσεις τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως. Now as, for example, 2 Cor. vi. 6, 2 Pet. i. 5, Rom. xv. 14 certainly refer to an insight belonging especially to Christians, we shall not err if we take γνώσις, wherever it is used absolutely, to denote an insight or discernment conditioned by Christian truth, whether it manifest itself ἐν λόγῳ, cf. 1 Cor. i. 5, 2 Cor. viii. 7, xi. 6, 1 Cor. xii. 8, or ἐν ἔργῳ, as in 1 Pet. i. 5, 6.

Ἄγνωστος, unknown, Wisd. xi. 18, xviii. 3; 2 Macc. i. 19, ii. 7. Also = not knowable, what withdraws itself from being known, unrecognisable; often in Plat., e.g. Theaet. 202 B, Parmen. 135 A.—In the N. T. with a passive signification in Acts xvii. 23, εὗρον βωμὸν ἐν ᾧ ἐπεγέγραπτο, Ἄγνωστω θεῷ. Cf. Pausan. Attic. i. 1. 4, ἐνταῦθα καὶ βωμοὶ θεῶν τε ὀνομαζομένων ἀγνώστων; Philostr. Apollon. vi. 3, σωφρονέστερον τὸ περὶ πάντων θεῶν εὐ λέγειν, καὶ ταῦτα Ἀθήνησιν, οὐ καὶ ἀγνώστων δαιμόνων βωμοὶ ἵδρυνται; Pausan. Eliac. v. 14, ἐπὶ τῇ Φαληρῷ . . . Ἀθηναῖς ναός ἐστι καὶ Διὸς ἀποτέρῳ, βωμοὶ δὲ θεῶν τῶν ὀνομαζομένων ἀγνώστων καὶ ἡρώων; Lucian, Philopatr. 9, Νῆ τὸν Ἄγνωστον! *ibid.* 29, ἡμεῖς δὲ τὸν ἐν Ἀθήναις Ἄγνωστον ἐφευρόντες κ.τ.λ. These quotations do not say that there were altars in Athens with the inscription ἀγνώστοις θεοῖς, but not with the inscription of Acts xvii. 23; but, comparing them with that passage, they say that altars erected to unknown gods might here and there be found, or, at all events, an altar erected to

some unknown god. Cf. Winer, *Realwörterb.*, s.v. Athen.; De Wette *in loc.*; Neander, *Pflanzung*, p. 246; Baumgarten, *Apostelgesch.* § 27. The testimony of the *Philopatris* of the Pseudo-Lucian is of special value. This treatise probably had its origin in the time of Julian, and the play upon the expression proceeding from an opponent of Christianity can only confirm the fact mentioned in the Acts. The critical school, which demands clear proof of the existence of such an altar (Baur, *Paulus*, p. 175 sqq.), takes for granted that if there were altars in several places with the inscription ἀγνώστῳ θεῷ, they must always refer to one and the same unknown God; and accordingly they demand proof that the worship of one indefinite, unknown, nameless God prevailed among the Athenians,—a proof which is not needed for Acts xvii. 23, because in the discourse that follows the unity of God is set prominently forth in opposition to *polytheism*, and there was no need to lay stress upon the affirmation, “There is only **one** God unknown to you.” Still more superfluous is this proof if we read what follows, as it probably should be read, thus, ὁ (instead of ὃν) οὖν ἀγνοοῦντες εὐσεβεῖτε, τοῦτο (instead of τοῦτον) κ.τ.λ. — See *δεδιδαίμεν*.

Ἀγνοσία, ἡ, ignorance, opposed to γνώσις. In a formal sense in classical Greek to denote *being acquainted with anything*, cf. Plat. *Rep.* v. 477 A, εἰ ἐπὶ μὲν τὸ ὄντι γνώσις ἦν, ἀγνοσία δ' ἐξ ἀνάγκης ἐπὶ τῷ μὴ ὄντι. In the N. T., on the contrary, corresponding to the use of γιγνώσκειν, which = *to be influenced by one's knowledge of an object*, it signifies not merely an intellectual, but a moral defect or fault; 1 Cor. xv. 34, ἐκνήψατε δικαίως καὶ μὴ ἁμαρτάνετε· ἀγνοσίαν γὰρ θεοῦ τινὲς ἔχουσιν, where the τινὲς do not belong to the ἄθεοι ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, Eph. ii. 12, but to those who had undergone the change described in Eph. ii. 13. Again, in 1 Pet. ii. 15, φιμοῦν τὴν τῶν ἀφρόνων ἀνθρώπων ἀγνοσίαν, it clearly denotes more than an intellectual defect, and corresponds to γνώσις in the sense of discernment. Comp. Prov. xxix. 7.

Ἀναγινώσκω, accurately to perceive, later also = to recognise; in Attic Greek usually = to read, and so always in the N. T., LXX. = ἔγρ, Ex. xxiv. 7; 2 Kings xxiii. 2; Deut. xxxi. 11; Dan. v. 7, 8, 16. Hence

Ἀνάγνωσις, ἡ, reading, and, indeed, in Acts xiii. 15, 2 Cor. iii. 14, of the public reading of Holy Scripture, cf. Neh. viii. 8, to which ἀναγινώσκειν is not limited. Without the *gen. obj.*, 1 Tim. iv. 13, πρόσεχε τῇ ἀναγνώσει, τῇ παρακλήσει, τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ, where, in connection with παρακλ. and διδ., it also refers to public reading, and (seeing that it can only be for the same purpose as παρ. and διδ.) absolutely to the public reading of O. T. Scripture, as it is used in patristic Greek of the public reading in church of the Holy Scriptures, or of the portion of Scripture appointed to be read in public (ἀνάγνωσμα); hence the readers in the church, upon whom originally devolved the duty of reading and expounding or application of the portion chosen, were called ἀναγνοσταί; cf. Justin Martyr, and Chrys. in Suic. *Thes.* s.v.

Ἐπιγινώσκω, *to give heed, to notice attentively, to take a view of, to recognise*, e.g. of spectators; then generally = *to know*, like γινώσκω, e.g. Xen. *Hell.* v. 4. 12, ὄσους ἐπέγνωσαν τῶν ἐχθρῶν ὄντας; vi. 5. 17, ἐγνώσθησαν φίλοι ὄντες. So Mark ii. 8 (comp. Luke viii. 46); Luke v. 22, xxiv. 16; Matt. xvii. 12; Mark vi. 33, 54, etc. As its primary meaning grew weaker, this word began to be used in cases when, though a stronger perception or knowledge was meant, there was no reason for laying stress upon it, see Acts iii. 10, ix. 30, xii. 14, xxii. 24, etc.; Gen. xxxvii. 31, xxxviii. 25. So also in Rom. i. 32, οἵτινες τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπιγινόντες, this word was probably designedly chosen; whereas in ver. 21, γινόντες τὸν θεόν is used in order to hint that they could not avoid having the knowledge. Cf. Wisd. xii. 27; Ecclus. xxxiii. 5; 2 Cor. xiii. 5, ἡ οὐκ ἐπιγινώσκετε ἑαυτοὺς, ὅτι Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς ἐν ὑμῖν. Whilst γινώσκειν sometimes means *to take notice* merely, or *to recognise a thing unintentionally*, ἐπιγιν. implies at least a special participation in the thing known, cf. Deut. i. 17, οὐκ ἐπιγνώσῃ πρόσωπον ἐν κρίσει, and xvi. 19; but like γινώσκειν in certain cases only, so that ἐπιγινώσκειν has a narrower sphere of use, but when used gives greater weight to what is said. Cf. John viii. 32, γνώσεσθε τὴν ἀληθείαν καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια ἐλευθερώσει ὑμᾶς, with 1 Tim. iv. 3, οἱ πιστοὶ καὶ ἐπεγνωκότες τὴν ἀλήθειαν (see ἐπίγνωσις); Col. i. 6, ἐπέγνωτε τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ, with 2 Cor. viii. 9, γινώσκετε τὴν χάριν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν; 2 Pet. ii. 21, κρείττον ἦν αὐτοῖς μὴ ἐπεγνωκέναι τὴν ὁδὸν τῆς δικαιοσύνης, ἢ ἐπιγνοῦσιν ἐπιστρέφαι κ.τ.λ., with Rom. iii. 17, ὁδὸν εἰρήνης οὐκ ἔγνωσαν; Col. ii. 2 with ver. 3; Matt. xi. 27, οὐδεὶς ἐπιγινώσκει τὸν υἱόν, τὸν πατέρα, corresponding to the Johannine γινώσκειν. It is therefore a stronger antithesis to ἀγνοεῖν than the simple γινώσκειν, 2 Cor. vi. 9, ὡς ἀγνοοῦμενοι καὶ ἐπιγινωσκόμενοι, *as unknowing and yet well knowing*. Hence also opposed to ἐκ μέρους, γινώσκειν, 1 Cor. xiii. 12, ἄρτι γινώσκω ἐκ μέρους, τότε δὲ ἐπιγνώσομαι, καθὼς καὶ ἐπεγνώσθην, of a knowledge which perfectly unites the subject with the object, cf. 1 Cor. viii. 3; Gal. iv. 9 (under γινώσκω); 1 Cor. xvi. 18. In some cases the verb is best rendered by *understand*; 1 Cor. xiv. 37; 2 Cor. i. 13, 14; cf. Acts xxv. 10, σὺ κάλλιον ἐπιγνώσκεις; Ecclus. xii. 12, ἐπ' ἐσχάτῃ ἐπιγνώσῃ τοὺς λόγους μου; xxii. 27, and often. So also sometimes, though seldom, in classical Greek, where, however, in general the stronger meaning was not without influence in determining the choice of this word instead of the simpler form; e.g. Plato, *Euthyd.* 301 E; Soph. *El.* 1297. See Lexicons. — In the LXX. = ידע; נכר, Piel, Hiph., which means, according to Fürst, “to be marked” or “delineated,” Hiph. “to penetrate vigorously into a thing,” i.e. *to know a thing by finding out its distinctive marks*.

Ἐπίγνωσις, ἡ, *knowledge*; clear and exact knowledge, more intensive than γνώσις, because it expresses a more thorough participation in the object of knowledge on the part of the knowing subject. Rom. iii. 30, διὰ νόμου ἐπίγνωσις ἁμαρτίας; cf. vii. 7, τὴν ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἔγνω ἐἰ μὴ διὰ νόμου, and the remarks on this passage, s.v. γινώσκειν; Rom. i. 28, τὸν θεὸν ἔχει ἐν ἐπιγνώσει, stronger than γινώσκειν τὸν θ., ver. 21. In the N. T. it appears only in the Pauline writings and in Heb. x. 26, 2 Pet. i. 2, 3, 8, ii. 20, and

always of a knowledge which very powerfully influences the form of the religious life = a knowledge laying claim to personal sympathy, and exerting an influence upon the person. Cf. Judith ix. 14. Thus, as Delitzsch says (*Hebræerbr.* 493), we may speak of a false γνῶσις, but not of a false ἐπίγνωσις. Seldom in classical Greek, Herodian, vii 6. 15, ἡ τῶν σφραγίδων ἐ; Plut., ἡ τῆς μουσικῆς ἐ.

I. c. gen. οἰj. ἀληθείας. 1 Tim. ii 4; 2 Tim. ii 25, iii 7; Tit. i 1, κατὰ ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας τῆς κατ' εὐσεβείαν; Heb. x. 26; θεοῦ, Eph. i. 17; Col. i 10; 2 Pet. i 2, cf. ver. 3; Eph. iv. 13, εἰς τὴν ἐνότητα τῆς πίστεως καὶ τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ υἱοῦ τ. θ.; Col. ii 2, εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ θεοῦ, ἐν ᾧ εἰσὶν πάντα οἱ θησαυροὶ τῆς σοφίας καὶ τῆς γνώσεως ἀπόκρυφαι, in order to attain the treasures of the γνῶσις, the ἐπίγνωσις is needed; Col. i. 9, ἐ τοῦ θελήματος τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ συνέσει πνευματικῇ, the elements which constitute the ἐπίγν. For ἐ as evincing the relation of the person knowing to the object of his knowledge, see 2 Pet. i 8, ταῦτα ὑμῶν ὑπάρχοντα . . . οὐκ ἀργοῖς οὐδὲ ἀκάρποις καθίστησιν εἰς τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐπίγνωσιν. As affecting the religious blessings possessed by the subject, see 2 Pet. i 2, 3, Eph. i 17; as determining the manifestations of the religious life, 2 Pet. ii 20, ἀποφυγόντες τὰ μιάσματα τοῦ κόσμου ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ κυρίου καὶ σωτήρος κ.τ.λ.

II. Without object; in a formal sense, Rom. i 18, ἔχει ἐν ἐπίγν.; Col. iii. 10, ἐνδυσάμενοι τὸν νεὸν τὸν ἀνακαινούμενον εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτόν, where κατ' εἰκόνα κ.τ.λ. gives a more precise definition of ἐπίγνωσις as a knowledge "which is determined by," or "which regulates itself according to," etc.; so that the difference mentioned in ver. 11 disappears, as far as it is concerned. Comparing, however, Col. ii 2, 23, it seems more appropriate to take ἐπίγνωσις here, as elsewhere, in a material sense as denoting the discernment genetically connected with the knowledge and possession of salvation, which determines the moral conduct; cf. Phil. i. 9, ἵνα ἡ ἀγάπη ὑμῶν . . . περισσεύῃ ἐν ἐπιγνώσει καὶ πάσῃ αἰσθήσει, εἰς τὸ δοκιμάζειν τὰ διαφέροντα, where αἰσθήσις denotes the tact obtained by experience; so ἐπίγν. refers to that clearness of consciousness which enables one to avoid error. Cf. Rom. x. 2, ξῆλον θεοῦ ἔχουσιν, ἀλλ' οὐ κατ' ἐπίγνωσιν. See γνῶσις, 2 Pet. i 5; Rom. xi. 33. Thus in Col. iii. 10, κατ' εἰκόνα is a second and closer defining of ἀνακαινούμενον, side by side with κατ' ἐπίγνωσιν. Ἐπίγνωσις here stands in contrast with the sins enumerated in the preceding verses, and we may fairly compare Eph. iv. 22, ὁ παλαιὸς ἄνθρ. ὁ φθειρόμενος κατὰ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τῆς ἀπάτης.

Προγινώσκω, to perceive or recognise beforehand, to know previously, to foreknow. (The correlative of time is given in the context.) Plat. Rep. iv. 426 C, προγινώσκων τὰς σφετέρας βουλήσεις; Theaet. 203 D, προγινώσκειν τὰ στοιχεῖα ἅπανα ἀνάγκη τῷ μέλλοντί ποτε γνῶσεσθαι ξυλλαβήν; Xen. Apol. 30, προγ. τὰ μέλλοντα; Aristot. eth. Nic. vi. 3, ἐκ προγινωσκομένων πᾶσα διδασκαλία. So 2 Pet. iii. 17, ὑμεῖς οὖν προγινώσκοντες φυλάσσεσθε, ἵνα μὴ κ.τ.λ.; Acts xxvi. 5, τὴν μὲν οὖν βίωσίν μου τὴν ἐκ νεότητος ἴσασι πάντες οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, προγινώσκοντές με ἄνωθεν. Likewise in the Apocrypha, Wisd. vi. 14, φθάνει

(sc. ἡ σοφία) τοὺς ἐπιθυμοῦντας προγνωσθῆναι, "to those who desire her, she gives in anticipation to know her;" viii. 8, σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα προγινώσκει καὶ ἐκβάσεις καιρῶν καὶ χρόνων; xviii. 6, ἐκείνη ἡ νύξ προσεγνώσθη πατράσιν; cf. Judith ix. 6, ἡ κρίσις σου ἐν προγνώσει; xi. 19, ταῦτα ἐλαλήθη μοι κατὰ πρόγνωσίν μου.

As to the use of the word in Rom. viii. 29, ὅτι οὗς προέγνω, καὶ προώρισε συμμόρφους τῆς εἰκόνης τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, εἰς τὸ εἶναι κ.τ.λ., xi. 2, οὐκ ἀπόσπαστο ὁ θεὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ, ὃν προέγνω, it is simplest to take προγιν. in accordance with the meaning of γινώσκειν in similar texts, Hos. xiii. 5, Amos iii. 2, 1 Cor. viii. 3, Gal. iv. 9, 2 Tim. ii. 19, ἔγνω κύριος τοὺς ὄντας αὐτοῦ, Matt. vii. 23, John x. 14, as denoting a knowing which precedes the knowledge expressed in these passages, that is, as equivalent to "unite oneself before with some one." Cf. Rom. xi. 2, "God has not cast away His people with whom He had before joined Himself," i.e. before this union was historically realized. The only question is, to what does the προ carry us back? to a logical past,—as might perhaps be inferred from Rom. xi. 2,—which would materially weaken the force of the argument supplied by ὃν προέγνω in proof of the main clause, or to the present in view of its relation to the future,—as might be inferred from Rom. viii. 29,—did not the context there suggest the union of the divine foreknowledge with the divine πρόθεσις. As this latter word denotes God's saving decree preceding and forming the foundation of its temporal realization, so προγινώσκειν denotes the divine γινώσκειν as already present in the divine decree before its manifestation in history, i.e. the union between God and the objects of His sovereign grace implied in His decree of salvation, and accordingly already in existence before its accomplishment; so that προγινώσκειν corresponds with the ἐκλέγεσθαι πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, which in Eph. i. 4 precedes the προορίζειν, just as προγιν. in Rom. viii. 29. Προγιν., however, essentially includes a self-determining on God's part to this fellowship (Rom. viii. 29, whom God had beforehand entered into fellowship with), whereas ἐκλέγ. merely expresses a determining directed to the objects of the fellowship; cf. 1 Pet. i. 2, ἐκλεκτοὶ κατὰ πρόγνωσιν θεοῦ. Προγινώσκειν, like γινώσκειν, is a conception complete in itself, the purport of which does not need to be indicated beforehand, as it would have to be if in the places quoted it meant a decision come to concerning any one. Against this meaning it cannot be objected that γιν. and προγιν. in this sense would not be joined to the accusative of the person (cf. Dem. xxix. 58, προγινωσμένος ἀδικεῖν παρὰ τῷ διαιτητῇ, in accordance with which 1 Pet. i. 20, προεγνωσμένου μὲν πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, might be explained), but rather that a specification of the purport or contents would be requisite in order to make it complete. We may better compare the last-named passage with Luke ix. 35, ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἐκλελεγμένος, and xxiii. 35, ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκλεκτός (cf. 1 Pet. ii. 4), because the statement concerns the historical Person of the Messiah; see Χριστοῦ, ver. 19.

Πρόγνωσις, ἡ, the foreknowing, recognising beforehand; in 1 Pet. i. 2, ἐκλεκτοὶ κατὰ πρόγνωσιν θεοῦ, it denotes the foreordained relation of fellowship of God with the

objects of His saving counsel; God's self-determining towards fellowship with the objects of His sovereign counsel preceding the realization thereof. In Acts ii. 23, τοῦτον τῇ ὀρισμένη βουλῇ καὶ προγνώσει τοῦ θεοῦ ἔκδοτον κ.τ.λ., it is simplest to take πρόγνωσις as = a resolution formed beforehand, though this meaning is foreign to classical Greek; or, quite generally, as = *foreknowledge, prescience*, cf. Judith ix. 6, ἡ κρίσις σου ἐν προγνώσει, because an explanation answering to the interpretation given above of 1 Pet. i. 20 seems too remote, and little in harmony with the connection.

Ἀγνοέω, not to recognise, not to know, to be unacquainted with, usually followed by the accusative, as in Acts xvii. 23, ὃν ἀγνοοῦντες εὐσεβεῖτε; 2 Cor. ii. 11, οὐ γὰρ τὰ τοῦ σατανᾶ νοήματα ἀγνοοῦμεν; Rom. x. 3, ἀγν. τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην; Rom. xi. 25, τὸ μυστήριον. Followed by περί, *to be in ignorance concerning anything*, 1 Cor. xii. 1, περὶ τῶν πνευματικῶν; 1 Thess. iv. 13, περὶ τῶν κοιμωμένων. In 2 Pet. ii. 12, ἐν οἷς ἀγνοοῦσιν βλασφημοῦντες, it is simplest to assume a construing of ἀγν. with ἐν, as in Eccus. v. 15, ἐν μεγάλῳ καὶ ἐν μικρῷ μὴ ἀγνοεῖ. Otherwise we must render it, ἐν τούτοις, ἃ ἀγν., βλασφ. Followed by ὅτι, Rom. i. 13, ii. 4, vi. 3, vii. 1; 1 Cor. x. 1; cf. Rom. xi. 25, ἀγν. τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο, ὅτι; 2 Cor. i. 8, ἀγν. ὑπὲρ τῆς θλίψεως ὅτι. Passive, *to be unknown, unrecognised*, or in antithesis with ἐπιγινώσκειν, *to be mistaken, misunderstood*, cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 38; 2 Cor. vi. 9, ὡς ἀγνοούμενοι καὶ ἐπιγινωσκόμενοι; Gal. i. 22, ἀγνοούμενος τῷ προσώπῳ. Then = *to be ignorant, to have no discernment of, not to understand*, cf. Xen. Mem. i. 2. 33, ὁ δὲ Σωκράτης ἐπῆρετο αὐτῷ, εἰ ἐξείη πυνθάνεσθαι, εἴ τι ἀγνοοῖτο τῶν προηγορευμένων. So Mark ix. 32; Luke ix. 45, τὸ ῥήμα; Acts xiii. 27, τὸν λόγον τῆς σωτηρίας; cf. 1 Cor. ii. 8; 1 Tim. i. 13, ἀγνοῶν ἐποίησα; 1 Cor. xiv. 38, εἰ δέ τις ἀγνοεῖ, ἀγνοεῖτω, in contrast with ver. 37, ἐπιγινώσκειν. Lastly, it signifies, *to err, to commit a fault*,—of faults arising from the want of discernment, or knowledge, or insight, e.g. Polyb., πάλιν τὸν Ἀννίβαν ἀναστάντα φάναι φασὶν ἀγνοεῖν, καὶ συγγνώμην ἔχειν, εἴ τι παρὰ τοὺς ἐθισμοὺς πράττει. It denotes conduct the result and import of which is unperceived by the agent; Luke xxiii. 34, οὐ γὰρ οἶδασιν τί ποιοῦσιν. Thus especially in later writers. In the LXX. = נִשְׁכַּח, Lev. v. 18; נִשְׁכַּח, Lev. iv. 13, ἀγνοεῖν ἀκουσίως; 1 Sam. xxvi. 21; נִשְׁכַּח, Hos. iv. 15; cf. Tob. iii. 3.—In Heb. v. 2, μετριοπαθεῖν τοῖς ἀγνοοῦσιν καὶ πλανωμένοις, the two terms denote those collectively for whom the functions of the high priest are exercised, ἀγνοοῦντες referring to those whose acts are not the result of previous conscious thought (see ἀγνόημα, ἄγνοια), cf. Rom. vii. 7, 8, 13, so that their conduct cannot be regarded as deliberate and intentional opposition (Heb. חַטָּא תַּבְּעָא), though in consequence of the interposition of the law it has become παραβάσις, i.e. involves guilt. Rom. vii. 7, τὴν ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἔγνων εἰ μὴ διὰ νόμον; ver. 8, ἀφορμὴν δὲ λαβοῦσα ἡ ἁμαρτία διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς κατειργάσατο ἐν ἐμοὶ πᾶσαν ἐπιθυμίαν χωρὶς γὰρ νόμον ἁμαρτία νεκρά. The ἀγνοοῦντες, accordingly, are those who are under the power of sin, and therefore sin perhaps against knowledge and will, but are passively subject to it; cf. ἀσθένεια, Heb. v. 3. Their consciousness is passive, not active, in relation to sin; cf. Aristot. Rhet.

i. 10, ἔστω δὴ τὸ ἀδικεῖν τὸ βλάπτειν ἐκόντα παρὰ τὸν νόμον . . . ἐκόντες δὲ ποιοῦσιν ὅσα εἰδότες καὶ μὴ ἀναγκαζόμενοι. ὅσα μὲν οὖν ἐκόντες, οὐ πάντα προαιρούμενοι, ὅσα δὲ προαιρούμενοι εἰδότες ἅπαντα οὐδεὶς γὰρ ὃ προαιρεῖται ἀγνοεῖ.

Ἀγνόημα, τό, mistake, oversight, Strabo; moral delinquency, sin, committed κατ' ἀγνοίαν, not κατὰ προαίρεσιν, κατὰ πρόθεσιν, cf. Raphel, *annott. Polyb. on Acts* iii. 17, but ἀκουσίως, Lev. iv. 13; cf. Heb. x. 26, ἐκουσίως ἁμαρτάνειν . . . μετὰ τὸ λαβεῖν τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τῆς ἀληθείας. According to the analogy of Scripture, it denotes not only unconscious sin, but generally all sin wherein consciousness is passive,—sin which perhaps may enter into consciousness, but which does not proceed from consciousness, cf. Heb. v. 2, and ἀγνοεῖν; Heb. ix. 7, αἷμα προσφέρει ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ καὶ τῶν τοῦ λαοῦ ἀγνοημάτων. Cf. Tob. iii. 3; Eccles. li. 19, xxiii. 2; 1 Macc. xiii. 39.

Ἀγνοια, ἡ, want of knowledge, ignorance, which leads to mistaken conduct, and forbids unconditional imputation of the guilt of the acts performed; 1 Pet. i. 14, αἱ πρότερον ἐν τῇ ἀγνοίᾳ ὑμῶν ἐπιθυμίαι; Acts iii. 17, κατὰ ἄγνοιαν ἐπράξατε; cf. Luke xxiii. 34; 1 Cor. ii. 8. Cf. Xen. *Cyrop.* iii. 1. 21, οὐ γὰρ κακονοία τινὶ τοῦτο ποιεῖ, ἀλλ' ἀγνοία· ὅποσα δὲ ἀγνοία ἄνθρωποι ἁμαρτάνουσι, πάντα ἀκούσια ταῦτ' ἐγὼ νομίζω. This ἄγνοια is with St. Paul the characteristic of heathendom, Acts xvii. 30, Eph. iv. 18, compare ver. 17, and is a state which renders repentance necessary, Acts xvii. 30, χρόνους τῆς ἀγνοίας ὑπεριδὼν ὁ θεὸς τὰ νῦν παραγγέλλει μετανοεῖν, and therefore eventually furnishes ground for blame, Eph. iv. 18, as otherwise for forbearance. LXX. = ἀγνόημα, for $\alpha\gamma\eta\mu\alpha$, Gen. xxiv. 10, ἐπήγαγε ἀν' ἐφ' ἡμᾶς ἄγνοιαν; 2 Chron. xxviii. 13. Ps. xxv. 7 = $\alpha\gamma\eta\mu\alpha$; Lev. v. 18, xxii. 14, Eccles. v. 5 = $\alpha\gamma\eta\mu\alpha$. The expression blends together guilt and exculpation. See John xv. 21 sqq., xvi. 3; Rom. i. 20.

Γλώσσα, ἡ, the tongue, Luke xvi. 24, Rev. xvi. 10, Acts ii. 3, as the organ of speech (λόγων ἄγγελος, Euripid. *Suppl.* 203), Mark vii. 33, 35; Luke i. 64; Jas. i. 26, iii. 5, 6, 8; 1 Pet. iii. 10; 1 John iii. 18; Rom. iii. 13; 1 Cor. xiv. 9, xiii. 1.—Rom. xiv. 11, Phil. ii. 11, ἵνα πᾶσα γλώσσα ἐξομολογήσῃται κ.τ.λ., is a figurative way of expressing the thought that every one ought to share in this ἐξομολ.; cf. in both texts the preceding πᾶν γόνυ, as also Acts ii. 26. Then = language, dialect, e.g. Xen. *Mem.* iii. 14. 7, ἔλεγε δὲ καὶ ὡς τὸ εὐωχεῖσθαι ἐν τῇ Ἀθηναίων γλώττῃ ἐσθίειν καλοῖτο. Often in Herod., e.g. i. 57, βάρβαρον γλώσσαν ἰέντες; ix. 16, Ἑλλὰδα γλώσσαν ἰέντα, etc. So Rev. v. 9, vii. 9, x. 11, xi. 9, xiii. 7, xiv. 6, xvii. 15, joined with ἔθνος, λαός, φυλή. Acts ii. 11, ἀκούομεν λαλούντων αὐτῶν ταῖς ἡμετέραις γλώσσαις τὰ μεγαλεῖα τοῦ θεοῦ. Accordingly the corresponding γλώσσαις, ver. 4, ἤρξαντο λαλεῖν ἐτέραις γλώσσαις, is to be understood as meaning, "they began to speak in other languages." We must not, however, conclude that this gift consisted in speaking in foreign languages which had not been learned; the account is given from the standpoint of the hearers mentioned in vv. 8–11, while ver. 13, ἕτεροι δὲ διαχλευάζοντες ἔλεγον ὅτι γλεύκους μεμεστωμένοι εἰσίν. To those

who understand the phenomenon, it appeared as a speaking in their own languages, but to others as the stammering of drunkards; cf. Isa. xxviii. 11, xxxiii. 19; 1 Cor. xiv. 21. As this speaking with tongues was not intended as an address to others (cf. Acts ii. 14 seq.), but to God either in praise or prayer, Acts x. 46, ἤκουον αὐτῶν λαλούντων γλώσσαις καὶ μεγαλυνόντων θεόν, cf. ii. 11; 1 Cor. xiv. 2, ὁ γὰρ λαλῶν γλώσση οὐκ ἀνθρώποις λαλεῖ ἀλλὰ τῷ θεῷ; 1 Cor. xiv. 14, προσεύχεσθαι γλώσση; as it served not for the profit of others, but for the edification of the speakers themselves, 1 Cor. xiv. 4, cf. ver. 18,—we may suppose as the foundation of the phenomenon the gift of a language produced by the Holy Ghost (καθὼς τὸ πνεῦμα ἐδίδου ἀποφθέγγεσθαι αὐτοῖς), specially serving and fitted for intercourse with God, independently of the process of thought carried on in the νοῦς, by which the clothing of the thoughts is ordinarily conditioned (1 Cor. xiv. 19; cf. Plut. Mor. 90 B, γλώσσα ὑπήκοος τῷ λογισμῷ), a speaking in a form of language produced by the Holy Ghost which blended in one comprehensive expression the various languages of mankind,—indeed, the list of nations given in Acts ii. 9–11 is clearly meant to convey the idea of universality. As analogous passages, we may refer to Rom. viii. 26, αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα ὑπερεντυγχάνει στεναγμοῖς ἀλαλήτοις; 2 Cor. xii. 4, ἤκουσεν ἄρρητα ῥήματα ἃ οὐκ ἐξὸν ἀνθρώπῳ λαλεῖν; Rev. xiv. 3, ᾄδουσιν ᾠδὴν καινὴν . . . καὶ οὐδεὶς ἠδύνατο μαθεῖν τὴν ᾠδὴν, εἰ μὴ . . . οἱ ἠγορασμένοι ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς, v. 9. In this miracle we have an anticipation of the future of the kingdom of God,—a future which thus reflected itself at the outset of its realization on earth, and indeed in a manner corresponding to the contrast between the present and the future; cf. 1 Cor. xiii. 8, γλώσσαι παύσονται. At first the susceptible could understand it, as is evident not only from Acts ii. 12, but also from Acts x. 46, xix. 6; but it gradually became more alien to the habit and life of the Church, for though the possibility of interpretation of what was said on the part of some remained (1 Cor. xii. 10), it was not even necessary that the speaker himself should understand what he uttered (1 Cor. xiv. 10). Thus the miracle became more and more isolated and rare, until, as the gospel spread, it had vanished in the age when church history began. It also tells in favour of the above (viz. that the miracle was not the actual speaking of foreign languages), that the expression ἐτέραις γλώσσαις λαλεῖν occurs only in the account of its first appearance, Acts ii. 4. This suggested the name of the miracle as γλώσσαις λαλεῖν, Acts x. 46, xix. 6; cf. Mark xvi. 17, γλώσσαις λαλήσουσιν καινὰς; whence it is clear that γλώσσα is always to be taken to mean *language*; the plural γλώσσαι includes the idea that this kind of speaking is a blending of various, perhaps of all, human languages, representing the γένη γλώσσων of 1 Cor. xii. 10, 28, but is not identical with the various languages; cf. as the designation of the latter, γένη φωνῶν, 1 Cor. xiv. 10. The sing. γλώσση λαλεῖν, which is used only of individuals, 1 Cor. xiv. 2, 4, 13, 14, 19, 27, cf. ver. 26, γλώσσαν ἔχει, while the plural is used both of one person and of several, 1 Cor. xv. 5, 6, 18, must be taken to mean *language*, i.e. the language of the Spirit, and gives prominence to the specialization of the manifoldness, as it is manifested in an individual. (Considering its connection with γλώσσαις λαλ.,

we cannot explain the sing. as meaning gift of language, as in classical Greek it may denote the power of speech or the gift of eloquence.)

Γράφω, γράψω, ἔγραψα, second aor. pass. ἐγράφη, primarily *to grave, to engrave* (*dig in*), Hom. *Il.* xvii. 599; *to write*, 2 Thess. iii. 17; Gal. vi. 11; Mark x. 4; John xxi. 25; Luke i. 63, etc. With Luke x. 20, τὰ ὀνόματα ὑμῶν ἐγράφη ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς (Tisch. ἐγγέγραπται), cf. Ps. lxxxvii. 6, lxix. 29; Ezek. xiii. 9. The writing of names in heaven means that God remembers and will not forget the individuals named, because generally by writing the name the recollection of the person is fixed; cf. in classical Greek, γράφειν εἰς ὕδωρ, ἐν ὕδατι, of what is given over to oblivion. A correlative expression also occurs Jer. xvii. 13, πάντες οἱ καταλιπόντες σε καταισχυνθήτωσαν, ἀφεστηκότες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς γραφήτωσαν, with which cf. 1 Sam. iii. 19, xiv. 45, xxvi. 20; Isa. xxvi. 5, xlvii. 1.—The use of γέγραπται, γεγραμμένον, absolutely, of what is found written in Holy Scripture, finds its explanation in the use of γράφειν to denote legislative act or enactment, cf. Xen. *Mem.* i. 2. 44, ὅσα ἄρα τύραννος μὴ πείσας τοὺς πολίτας ἀναγκάζει ποιεῖν γράφων, and often; Plat. *Pol.* 295 E, κατὰ τοὺς τῶν γραψάντων νόμους, 299 C, μαυθάνειν γεγραμμένα καὶ πάτρια ἔθνη κείμενα; Dem. lviii. 24, τὰ γεγραμμένα = νόμοι; Aristot. *Rhet.* i. 10, νόμος δ' ἐστὶν ὁ μὲν ἴδιος ὁ δὲ κοινός· λέγω δὲ ἴδιον μὲν καθ' ὃν γεγραμμένον πολιτεύονται, κοινὸν δὲ ὅσα ἄγραφα παρὰ πᾶσιν ὁμολογεῖσθαι δοκεῖ. Cf. Luke xx. 28, Μωσὴς ἔγραψεν ὑμῖν; Rom. ii. 15; 1 John ii. 7. In the sphere of revelation the written records hold this authoritative position, and γέγραπται always implies an appeal to the indisputable and normative authority of the passage quoted, cf. Matt. iv. 4, 6, 7, 10, xi. 10, etc. It is completed by additions such as ἐν νόμῳ, Luke ii. 23, x. 26; ἐν βιβλίῳ λόγων Ἡσαίου, Luke iii. 4; ἐν τοῖς προφήταις, John vi. 45, etc. Hence Rom. xv. 4, ὅσα γὰρ προεγράφη, εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν διδασκαλίαν ἐγράφη; 1 Cor. x. 11, ἐγράφη δὲ πρὸς νοουθεσίαν ἡμῶν.—The reference of a prophecy taken into consideration is for the most part indicated by περὶ, c. gen., Matt. xi. 10, xxvi. 24; also by ἐπὶ τινα, Mark ix. 12, 13; ἐπὶ τινι, John xii. 16; and once by the dative, Luke xviii. 31; cf. Matt. xiii. 14.

Γράφη, ἡ, that which is written, the writing, both the characters and the document written, 1 Chron. xxviii. 19, *letter*, 2 Chron. ii. 19; *written order or direction*, 2 Chron. xxxv. 4; 1 Esdr. i. 4; *document, e.g. γρ. γενική, table of genealogy*, 1 Esdr. v. 39.—The N. T. use of ἡ γραφή to denote the collection of the γραφαὶ ἁγίαι, Rom. i. 2, θεόπνευστοι, 2 Tim. iii. 16, one part of which are called γρ. προφητικαί, Rom. xvi. 26, τῶν προφητῶν, Matt. xxvi. 56, implies the idea expressed in γέγραπται, viz. a reference to the authoritative character of the Scriptures as a whole, which gives them a special and unique position; indeed, they are everywhere termed ἡ γραφή in an authoritative sense. In this sense (I.) ἡ γρ. is used of a single text, Mark xii. 10, οὐδὲ τὴν γραφὴν ταύτην ἀνέγνωτε; Luke iv. 21, πεπλήρωται ἡ γρ. αὕτη; Acts i. 16, viii. 35, John xix. 37, ἑτέρα γραφή. Without any qualifying reference, Mark xv. 28, John xiii. 18, ἵνα ἡ γρ. πληρωθῇ ὁ

τρώγων κ.τ.λ. ; John xix. 24, 36, xx. 9 ; Jas. ii. 8, 23. Then (II.) the plural αἱ γραφαί, with predominant reference to all writings or declarations of this character coming under consideration, Matt. xxi. 42, xxii. 29, xxvi. 54 ; Mark xii. 24, xiv. 49 ; Luke xxiv. 27, διερμήνευεν ἐν πάσαις ταῖς γραφαῖς τὰ περὶ αὐτοῦ ; xxiv. 32, 45 ; John v. 39 ; Acts xvii. 2, 11, xviii. 24, 28 ; Rom. xv. 4 ; 1 Cor. xv. 3, 4 ; 2 Pet. iii. 16. Lastly (III.) the sing. ἡ γραφή, to denote *Scripture as a whole*, John ii. 22, vii. 38, 42, x. 35, οὐ δύναται λυθῆναι ἡ γραφή ; John xix. 28 ; Acts viii. 32 ; Rom. iv. 3, ix. 17, x. 11, xi. 2 ; Gal. iii. 8, 22, iv. 30 ; 1 Tim. v. 18 ; 1 Pet. ii. 6 ; 2 Pet. i. 20. In Jas. iv. 5 there is no reference to an apocryphal book. The declaration referred to is probably given in ver. 6, and ver. 5 must be read thus, ἡ δοκεῖτε ὅτι κενῶς ἡ γραφή λέγει, πρὸς φθόνον ἐπιποθεῖ τὸ πνεῦμα . . . μερίζονα δὲ δίδωσιν χάριν διὸ λέγει, ὁ θεὸς κ.τ.λ. In the first sentence λέγειν = *to speak*, as in Rom. iii. 5, vi. 19 ; 1 Cor. i. 10, ix. 10 ; 2 Cor. vi. 13, xi. 21, etc. The πρὸς φθόνον . . . χάριν is a N. T. way of expressing the quotation given in ver. 6.

Γράμμα, τό, *that which is written, a letter of the alphabet, a book, letter, bond, etc.* Luke xxiii. 38 ; Gal. vi. 11 ; Luke xvi. 6, 7 ; Acts xxviii. 21 ; John x. 47. *The Holy Scriptures*, τὰ ἱερὰ γράμματα, is a name distinct from ἡ γραφή, describing them as the object of study or of knowledge ; whereas γραφή describes them as an authority, 2 Tim. iii. 15 ; cf. Joseph. *Antt.* iii. 7. 6, xiii. 5. 8, v. 1. 17, τὰ ἀνακείμενα ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ γράμματα. It cannot be proved that τὰ γράμματα without the qualifying word signifies Holy Scriptures ; at least there is no sufficient reason for taking it thus in the single passage, John vii. 15, where it occurs,—occurs, too, without the article. There we read, πῶς οὗτος γράμματα οἶδεν μὴ μεμαθηκώς ; The expression means knowledge contained in writings, learning, or usually the elements of knowledge ; at a later period too = *science* ; and the words simply say, “How has this man attained knowledge or science which he has not acquired by pursuing the usual course of study ?” Cf. Acts xxvi. 24, τὰ πολλὰ σε γράμματα εἰς μανίαν περιτρέπει, perhaps = “thou hast studied too much.” Plat. *Apol.* 26 D, γραμμάτων ἄπειρον εἶναι ; Plut. *Cic.* 48, etc. That the Jews meant by this word Scripture-learning κατ’ ἐξ., is evident from the view they took of γράμματα μανθάνειν, *vid.* γραμματεῦς.—Paul is wont to contrast γράμμα and πνεῦμα ; Rom. ii. 29, περιτομή καρδίας ἐν πνεύματι οὐ γράμματι ; vii. 6, δουλεύειν ἐν καινότητι πνεύματος, καὶ οὐ παλαιότητι γράμματος ; 2 Cor. iii. 6, διάκονοι καινῆς διαθήκης, οὐ γράμματος, ἀλλὰ πνεύματος· τὸ γὰρ γράμμα ἀποκτείνει, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ζωοποιεῖ. This antithesis may be explained thus : γράμμα denotes the law in its written form (see γράφειν as used of legislative acts), whereby the relation of the law to the man whom it concerns is the more inviolably established ; see Rom. ii. 27, κρινεῖ . . . σὲ τὸν διὰ γράμματος καὶ περιτομῆς παραβάτην νόμου ; 2 Cor. iii. 7, ἡ διακονία τοῦ θανάτου ἐν γράμματι ἐντετυπωμένη λίθοις ἐγενήθη ἐν δόξῃ ; and hence it was at the same time used to express the antithesis between the external, fixed, and governing law, and the πνεῦμα, the inner, effective, energizing, and divine principle of life. Cf. Melancthon on Rom. vii. 6, *ideo dicitur litera, quia non est verus et*

vivus motus animi, etc. In classical Greek we may compare Aristot. *Polit.* iii. 15, κατὰ γράμματα ἄρχειν, iii. 16, κατὰ γράμματα ἰατρεύεσθαι; Plut. *Lucull.* 10, στήλην τινὰ δόγματα καὶ γράμματα ἔχουσιν; Plat. *Polit.* 302 E, Μοναρχία τοίνυν ζευχθεῖσα μὲν ἐν γράμμασιν ἀγαθοῖς, οὗς νόμους λέγομεν; Legg. vii. 823 A, τοῖς τοῦ νομοθετοῦντος . . . πειθόμενος γράμμασιν, ix. 858 E, xi. 922 A, τὰ τῶν ἀγαθῶν νομοθετῶν γράμματα τιμᾶν.

Γραμματεὺς, ὁ, writer, 2 Chron. xxvi. 11, xxxiv. 13; 2 Sam. viii. 17, xx. 25; 1 Kings iv. 3; Neh. xiii. 13; in public service among the Greeks, and the reader of the legal and state papers; hence Hesych., γραμμ. ὁ ἀναγνώστης. As to the distinction between the γρ. of the towns of Asia Minor and those of Greece, and of the higher authority of the former, cf. Deyling, *Observatt. scr.* iii. 382 sqq. Cf. Ex. v. 6, 10; Num. xi. 16. In the LXX. γραμματεὺς corresponds to the Hebrew רִשָּׁב, Ezra vii. 6, 11, 12, 21, Neh. viii. 4, 9, 13, from רִשָּׁב, *book*, not from רִשָּׁב, which does not occur, therefore = *literatus, scholar*. In Ezra vii. always with an addition, ver. 6, γρ. ταχὺς ἐν νόμῳ Μωυσῆ ὃν ἔδωκε κύριος ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραὴλ; ver. 11, γρ. βιβλίου λόγων ἐντολῶν κυρίου καὶ προσταγμάτων αὐτοῦ; ver. 12, γρ. νόμον κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ. In Nehemiah, on the contrary, in the places above named, with no addition, though in the same sense, cf. Ezra vii. 21, γρ. τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ; Ecclus. xxxviii. 24; 2 Macc. vi. 18. Accordingly it primarily denotes one well versed in the law (a clever scribe, ready in the Scriptures, comp. especially Ezra vii. 6). Winer (*Realwörterb.*, art. "Schriftgelehrte") has ably shown how, during the exile and afterwards, the knowledge of the law supplied the place of the relatively independent מִשְׁנֵה. The γραμμ. were well versed in the law, i.e. in the Holy Scriptures, and expounded them, Matt. vii. 29, xvii. 10, xxiii. 2, 13, Mark i. 22, and elsewhere; πατρίων ἐξηγηταὶ νόμων, Joseph. *Antt.* xvii. 6. 2, are, according to the true idea of them, acquainted with and interpreters of God's saving purpose, Matt. xiii. 52, πᾶς γραμματεὺς μαθητευθεὶς τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν; Matt. xxiii. 34, ἀποστέλλω πρὸς ὑμᾶς προφῆτας καὶ σοφοὺς καὶ γραμματεῖς; but, in fact, in the time of Jesus they were opposers of it. Where they appear clothed with special authority, or side by side with those in authority (Matt. ii. 4, xx. 18, xxiii. 2, xxvi. 57; Mark xiv. 1; Luke xxii. 2, 66, xxiii. 10), they can hardly be regarded as in legal possession of any such authority. Their authority seems rather to have been granted to them in a general way only by virtue of their occupation, cf. John vii. 15, Matt. xiii. 52, 1 Macc. vii. 12, though simply as γραμματεῖς they could not have possessed any decisive power. The possessors of power seem to have allied themselves with them, and to have had them about them, merely for the sake of the respect attaching to them on account of their knowledge of the law. Cf. 1 Macc. vii. 12, ἐπισυνήχθησαν . . . συναγωγὴ γραμματέων ἐκζητῆσαι δίκαια. Synonymous with γραμματεὺς are νομικός, νομοδιδάσκαλος; cf. Mark xii. 28 with Matt. xxii. 35. See also Winer as above. Leyrer in Herzog's *Realencykl.* xiii. 731 sqq., where the literature of the subject is fully given.

Ἐπογραμμός, ὁ, only in biblical and later Christian Greek = a writing-copy, pattern; Ammon. = πρόγραμμος; Hesych. = τύπος, μίμημα. 2 Macc. ii. 29, τὸ ἐπιπο-

ρεύεσθαι τοῖς ὑπογραμμοῖς τῆς ἐπιτομῆς διαπονοῦντες = *rule*. 1 Pet. ii. 21, ὑμῖν ὑπολιμπάνων ὑπογραμμὸν ἵνα ἐπακολουθήσητε τοῖς ἔχουσιν αὐτοῦ. The signification connects itself with the use of ὑπογράφειν, with the meaning *to write a copy, to teach to write*, literally, *to write under*, since the writing copy of the teacher was to be followed by the scholars; cf. Plat. Prot. 227 D, ὥσπερ οἱ γραμματισταὶ τοῖς μήπω δεινοῖς γράφειν τῶν παιδῶν ὑπογράψαντες γραμμὰς τῇ γραφίδι αὐτῷ τὸ γραμμάτιον διδῶσι, καὶ ἀναγκάζουσι γράφειν κατὰ τὴν ὑφήγησιν τῶν γραμμῶν ὥς δὲ καὶ ἡ πόλις νόμους ὑπογράψασα, ἀγαθῶν καὶ παλαιῶν νομοθετῶν εὐρήματα, κατὰ τούτους ἀναγκάζει καὶ ἄρχειν καὶ ἄρχεσθαι.

Γυμνός, ἡ, ὄν, *naked, unclothed, and simply poorly clad*, Matt. xxv. 36, 38, 43, 44; Mark xiv. 51, 52; Acts xix. 16; Jas. ii. 15; Rev. xvii. 16. *Without outer garments*, John xxi. 7; *unveiled*, Heb. iv. 13; cf. Job xxvi. 6. Joseph. Antt. vi. 13. 4, τὰ δ' ἔργα γυμνὴν ὑπ' ὄψει τὴν διάνοιαν τίθησι. Of the seed corn, which when sown is still without τὸ σῶμα τὸ γενησόμενον, the blade and the ear being regarded as its clothing (1 Cor. xv. 37, cf. ver. 38), an emblem of the resurrection. But in 2 Cor. v. 3 γυμνός can hardly be understood of the want of the resurrection body,—a view in favour of which Plato, Crat. 403 B, ἡ ψυχὴ γυμνὴ τοῦ σώματος ἀπέρχεται, Orig. c. Cels. ii. 43, Χριστὸς . . . γυμνῇ σώματος γενόμενος ψυχῇ ταῖς γυμναῖς σωμάτων ὠμίλει ψυχαῖς, and other passages, have been quoted, but which can scarcely be said to suit the context (ver. 10). If we read εἴ γε καὶ ἐνδυσάμενοι οὐ γυμνοὶ εὐρεθισόμεθα, οὐ γυμνοὶ is co-ordinate with the ἐνδυσάμενοι, which must not be confounded with the ἐνδεδυμένοι. If we read ἐκδυσάμενοι as denoting the putting off the earthly body, οὐ γυμνοὶ is set over against it. In either case, εἴ γε οὐ γυμνοὶ εὐρεθ. is a condition necessary to the ἐπενδύσασθαι of ver. 2, named specially as the self-evident presupposition thereof, and then the γυμνός must (if we would avoid a tautology) be taken in that ethical sense in which it occurs in Rev. iii. 17, xvi. 15, cf. Ezek. xvi. 22, Hos. ii. 3, synonymous with ἀσχημονῶν, Ezek. xvi. 22, inasmuch as nakedness reveals the results of sin, as shame and disgrace, Gen. iii. 11; cf. Rev. xvi. 15, μακάριος ὁ τηρῶν τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ, ἵνα μὴ γυμνὸς περιπατῇ καὶ βλέπωσιν τὴν ἀσχημοσύνην αὐτοῦ. In this sense γυμνός not only signifies *guilty* (Ewald on 2 Cor. v. 3), but *deformed by sin, deprived of righteousness* (cf. Rev. xix. 8). According to this view, ἐνδυσάμενοι must be explained as corresponding with ὁ τηρῶν τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ in Rev. xvi. 15, without having to supply a definite object such as Χριστόν or the like.—The subst. ἡ γυμνότης occurs in the same ethical sense, Rev. iii. 18, συμβουλεύω σοι ἀγοράσαι . . . ἱμάτια λευκὰ, ἵνα περιβάλῃ, καὶ μὴ φανερωθῇ ἡ αἰσχύνῃ τῆς γυμνότητός σου. Cf. Job xxix. 14; Isa. lxi. 10.

Δ

Δαίμων, ὁ and ἡ, in the N. T. only ὁ, Matt. viii. 31; Mark v. 12; Luke viii. 29 (Rev. xvi. 14, xviii. 2, Received text). Elsewhere, instead of this, τὸ δαιμόνιον, in the same sense. Δαίμων was with the Greeks originally = θεός; but it is doubtful in what sense,

whether from δαίμων, *clever* (Plato, Plut.), or from δαίωμα, *to assign or award*, i.e. one's lot in life, = διαιτηται καὶ διοικηται τῶν ἀνθρώπων, they who rule and direct human affairs, *vid. Suic. Thes.* According to Schenkl and others, it is in root akin to δῖος, Sanscrit, *div*, *to shine, heaven*; *dīvas, God*; Zend, *div, to lighten*; *daēva, daemon*. All that can be asserted is, that while in earliest times the names δαίμονες and θεοί were convertible terms, and were used as synonyms (even still in Homer, *e.g. Od. xxi. 195, 201, vi. 172-174*), yet, from Homer onwards, "δαίμων, answering to the Latin *numen*, signifies divine agency generally, the working of a higher power which makes itself felt without being regarded as a definite or nameable person, *e.g. Xen. Cyrop. vii. 5. 81, ὁ δαίμων ἡμῶν ταῦτα συμπαρασκεύακεν*; Isocr. ix. 25, ὁ δαίμων ἔσχε πρόνοιαν, for which we often read the abstract τὸ δαιμόνιον; while, on the other hand, the Socratic δαιμόνιον is, in Xen. *Apol. 8*, synonymous with οἱ θεοί," Nägelsbach, *Nachhomer. Theol. ii. 10, p. 112*; cf. Nitzsch *on the Odyssey*, i. p. 89, ii. 64, iii. 391. Δαίμων bears the same relation to θεός as *numen* does to *persona divina* (Nägelsbach, *Homer. Theol. i. 47*). Θεός designates the Godhead as *personality*, δαίμων as *might*. Originally a *vox media*, the effort to degrade it *in malam partem* prevailed, and it came to denote a destructively working power, with or without the addition of στυγερός, κακός, χαλεπός. This is especially evident in the Homeric use of the adj. δαιμόνιος, which, while in Pindar it is used alike of saving and destructive divine agencies, cannot even in Homer be exchanged for θεῖος, and is always used in a more or less reproachful sense, or with the idea of sorrow. Cf. *Od. xviii. 406, δαιμόνιοι, μαίνεσθε*, perhaps = *O possessed, ye rage!* as Nägelsbach (*Homer. Theol.*) renders it, who thus sums up the result of his investigations: "δαίμων and δαιμόνιος, in particular, are frequently used to express that kind of divine influence on men which is not only dark and mysterious, but ungracious and hostile." The Tragic Poets use δαίμων to denote *fortune* or *fate*, frequently *bad fortune*, *e.g. Soph. Oed. R. 828, Oed. C. 76*, also *good fortune*, if the context represents it so. Generally, and in prose also, δαίμων is associated with the idea of a destiny independent of man, gloomy and sad, coming upon and prevailing over him; cf. *Pind. Ol. viii. 67, δαίμονος τυχή*; and in Plato, Dem., and others, δαίμων and τυχή are often combined; hence the thought of an inexorable and therefore fearful power naturally grew to be the prevailing one. *Lys. ii. 78, ὁ δαίμων ὁ τὴν ἡμετέραν μοῖραν εἰληχῶς ἀπαραίτητος*; *Dem. Phil. iii. 54, πολλάκις γὰρ ἔμουγ' ἐπελήλυθε καὶ τοῦτο φοβεῖσθαι, μὴ τι δαιμόνιον τὰ πράγματα ἐλαύνῃ*. As direct relations between the gods and men fell into the background, the notion of a fate (genius) connected with each particular individual was almost of necessity developed, and (most probably through Oriental influences) grew by degrees into a dualistic doctrine of demons as good or evil spirits and mediators between the gods and men, *vid. Plut. de def. orac.* The name τὸ δαιμόνιον, *numen*, being abstract and generally less used than δαίμων, fell more and more into disuse as a belief in or doctrine of demons became more and more defined and concrete, *Plat. Apol. 26 B, θεοὺς διδάσκοντα μὴ νομίζειν οὐδ' ἡ πόλις νομίζει, ἕτερα δὲ δαιμόνια καινά*. *Xen. Mem. i. 1. 1, καινὰ δαιμόνια εἰσφέρειν*. Cf. *Acts xvii. 18, ξένων δαιμονίων καταγγελεύς*. In biblical Greek, on

the contrary, the use of δαιμόνιον prevailed probably for the same reason, that strange gods, on account of their remote relations and dark mysterious essence, were called δαιμόνια (not δαίμονες) instead of θεοί, the nature of the evil spirits thus designated being obscure to human knowledge, and alien to human life. The LXX. do not use δαίμων; the N. T. only in the places named.

While the LXX. employ δαιμόνιον in a bad sense = דִּמּוֹן, Ps. xcvi. 5; דִּמּוֹן, Isa. xxxiv. 14; דִּמּוֹן, Isa. xlii. 21; דִּמּוֹן, Ps. cvi. 37, Deut. xxxii. 15, and even in contrast with θεός, Deut. xxxii. 17, ἔθυσαν δαιμονίοις καὶ οὐ θεῷ, θεοῖς οἷς οὐκ ᾔδεισαν, cf. Ps. cvi. 37, of destructive powers, Ps. xci. 6, οὐ φοβηθήσῃ ἀπὸ δαιμονίου μεσημβρίνου, cf. Tob. iii. 8, vi. 18, viii. 3, where ἄγγελος stands in contrast with δαιμόνιον, Philo endeavours still to identify the Greek view concerning heroes and demons with the Scripture view of angels, —an attempt to lessen the difference between the sphere of profane literature and the Bible, which we find also in Josephus, *de Bell. Jud.* vii. 6. 3, τὰ γὰρ καλούμενα δαιμόνια πονηρῶν ἐστὶν ἀνθρώπων πνεύματα, τοῖς ζῶσιν εἰσδύμενα καὶ κτείνοντα τοὺς βοηθείας μὴ τυγχάνοντας. We can only regard it as a modification of these views when Justin Martyr and the pseudo-Clementines find the origin of demons in Gen. vi. Cf. Hesiod, *O.* 121, according to whom demons are the souls of men who lived in the golden age, now the guardian spirits of men. *Vid.* Lactant. *Instit.* ii. 14, 15, 17.

An evil meaning was usually associated with the word even in profane literature, which held its ground, *e.g.*, in δαιμονιάω (N. T. δαιμονίζομαι), even when the doctrine of good and evil daemons had in later times developed itself. Thus Plut. and Xen. use δαιμονιάω = *to be deranged*, syn. παραφρονεῖν; in the Tragedians = *to be in the power of a demon*, i.e. *to be unhappy, to suffer*. It is not therefore to be wondered at that in the sphere of Scripture, where the idea of angels as spirits serving in the divine economy of redemption was included in the name, the word δαίμων or δαιμόνιον was applied specially to evil spirits (דִּמּוֹן, Ps. lxxviii. 49; cf. Prov. xvi. 14; 1 Sam. xix. 9?), πνεύματα ἀκάθαρτα, *vid.* ἀκάθαρτος. Thus δαίμων or δαιμόνιον is parallel to πν. ἀκάθ., Mark v. 12, comp. vv. 2, 8, iii. 30, ὅτι ἔλεγον Πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον ἔχει; cf. ver. 22, ἔλεγον ὅτι Βεελζεβούλ ἔχει καὶ ὅτι ἐν τῷ ἄρχοντι τῶν δαιμονίων ἐκβάλλει τὰ δαιμονία. So in Luke viii. 29; Rev. xviii. 2. Cf. Rev. xvi. 13, πνεύματα τρία ἀκάθ., with ver. 14, εἰσὶν γὰρ πνεύματα δαιμονίων. Luke iv. 33, πνεῦμα δαιμονίου ἀκαθάρτου; viii. 2 = πνεύματα πονηρά. They make their appearance in connection with Satan, Luke x. 17, 18, xi. 18, Matt. xii. 24 seq., Mark iii. 22 seq., cf. Matt. xii. 26, ὁ σατανᾶς τὸν σατανᾶν ἐκβάλλει, with the ἄρχων τῶν δαιμονίων, Matt. ix. 34, xii. 24, Mark iii. 22, Luke xi. 15, and are put in opposition in 1 Cor. x. 20, 21, as in Deut. xxxii. 17, with θεός and κύριος, cf. 1 Tim. iv. 1, ἀποστήσονται τινες τῆς πίστεως προσέχοντες πνεύμασιν πλάνοις καὶ διδασκαλίαις δαιμονίων; Jas. ii. 19, καὶ τὸ δαιμόνια πιστεύουσιν, καὶ φρίσσουσιν; in connection with idolatry (cf. Deut. xxxii. 17; Ps. cvi. 37), Rev. ix. 20, ἵνα μὴ προσκυνήσουσιν τὰ δαιμόνια καὶ τὰ εἰδῶλα τὰ χρυσᾶ κ.τ.λ., where the spiritual background of idolatry and a more spiritual form of idol-worship is described, cf. xvi. 13, 14. While in the doctrinal parts

of the N. T. demons are viewed in their morally destructive influence (1 Cor. x. 20, 21 ; 1 Tim. iv. 1 ; Rev. ix. 20, xvi. 14), they appear in the Gospels as in a special way powers of evil. As spirits (Luke x. 17, 20) in the service of Satan (Matt. xii. 26–28) we find them influencing the life, both physical and psychical, of individuals (see πνεῦμα, Nos. 3, 4), so that the man is no longer master of himself ; Luke xiii. 11, γυνή πνεῦμα ἔχουσα ἀσθενείας ; ver. 16, ἣν ἔδησεν ὁ σατανᾶς. They probably take possession of the place which belongs to the πνεῦμα in the human organism, for they cripple the πνεῦμα, cf. Mark v. 2, ἄνθρωπος ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ (see also Matt. xxii. 43 ; 1 Cor. xii. 3, 9), so that the action of the personal life is disturbed, either through the influence of the demon upon the corporeal organism (in disease), disordering thus the entire life of sensation and of impulse, or by finding free access to the moral centre of personality, Matt. xii. 43–45. Hence εἰσέρχεται or ἐξέρχεται τὸ δαίμ., the former Luke viii. 30, the latter Mark vii. 30 ; Luke viii. 38. ἀπό τινος, Matt. xvii. 18 ; Luke iv. 41, viii. 2, 33, 35 ; ἔκ τινος, Mark vii. 29.—ἔχει τις δαίμ., Matt. xi. 18 ; Luke vii. 33, viii. 27 ; John vii. 20, viii. 48, 49, 52, x. 20 ; cf. Luke iv. 33, 35, ix. 42. Demoniacal possession never seems to occur without some outward signs of derangement ; for when it is said of John the Baptist or of Jesus, δαιμόνιον ἔχει (Matt. xi. 18 ; Luke vii. 33 ; John vii. 20, viii. 48–52), it means nothing more than what is fully stated in John x. 20, δαιμόνιον ἔχει καὶ μαίνεται ; and accordingly x. 21, μὴ δαιμόνιον δύναται τυφλῶν ὀφθαλμοὺς ἀνοῖξαι, is to be understood thus, “can a demon—i.e. one deranged—open the eyes of the blind?” cf. Matt. xii. 24–26. This demoniacal violent overpowering of the man (*vid.* Acts x. 38, ἰώμενος πάντας τοὺς καταδυναστευομένους ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου) essentially differs from *Satanic influence*, John xiii. 2, 27, wherein the man becomes, like the demons, in the range of human activity analogously the instrument of Satan. The kingdom of God, including all divine influences obtained by Christ's mediation, tells effectually against that very demoniacal violence as the worst form of human suffering produced by Satan's agency (1 John iii. 8). See also Matt. xii. 28, εἰ δὲ ἐν πνεύματι θεοῦ ἐγὼ ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια, ἄρα ἔφθασεν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἡ βασ. τ. θ. Hence the expression ἐκβάλλειν τὸ δ., τὰ δ., see Matt. vii. 22, ix. 33, 34, x. 8, xii. 24, 27, 28 ; Mark i. 34, 39, iii. 15, 22, vi. 13, vii. 26, ix. 38, xvi. 9, 17 ; Luke ix. 49, xi. 14, 15, 18, 19, 20, xiii. 32.—See Neander, *Leben Jesu*, p. 181 seq. ; Delitzsch, *Bibl. Psychol.* iv. 16 ; Ebrard, art. “Dämonische” in Herzog's *Encyklop.* iii. 240 sq. ; Hofmann, *Schriftbeweis*, i. 445 sqq.

Δαιμονίζομαι, passive, for which in classical Greek usually δαιμονάω = *to be violently possessed by, or to be in the power of, a daemon* ; cf. Plut. *Sympos.* vii. 5. 4, ὥσπερ γὰρ οἱ μάγοι τοὺς δαιμονιζομένους κελεύουσι τὰ Ἐφέσια γράμματα πρὸς αὐτοὺς καταλέγειν καὶ ὀνομάζειν. In the N. T. Matt. iv. 24, viii. 16, 28, 33, ix. 32, xii. 22, xv. 22 ; Mark i. 32, v. 15, 16, 18 ; Luke viii. 36 ; John x. 21. The δαιμονιζόμενοι are distinguished from other sick folk in Matt. iv. 24 ; Mark i. 32.

Δαιμονιώθης, ὁ, ἡ, *belonging to demons, proceeding from them.* Jas. iii. 15, ἔστιν

αὕτη ἡ σοφία . . . ἐπίγειος, ψυχικὴ, δαιμονιώδης ; cf. ver. 6, ἡ γλῶσσα φλογίζομένη ὑπὸ τῆς γέεννης, see γεέννα, iv. 7.

Δεισιδαίμων, ο, ἡ, used originally in a good sense = θεοσεβής, Xen. *Cyrop.* iii. 3. 26, God-fearing, religious ; but in later Greek, in a secondary and bad sense, to denote *superstitious fear*, e.g. Diod. iv. 51, εἰς δεισιδαίμονα διάθεσιν ἐμβάλλειν, to lapse into a state of *superstitious dread*, corresponding to εἰς κατάπληξιν ἄγειν, *ibid.* i. 62.—With Acts xvii. 22, δεισιδαιμονεστέροις ὑμᾶς θεωρῶ (cf. ver. 23, ἀγνώστῳ θεῷ), cf. Plut. *de superst.* (περὶ δεισιδαιμονίας) c. 11, οὐκ οἶεται θεοὺς εἶναι ὁ ἄθεος ὁ δὲ δεισιδαίμων οὐ βούλεται, πιστεύει δὲ ἄκων ἀπιστεῖν γὰρ φοβεῖται.

Δεισιδαιμονία, ἡ, *dread of the gods*, usually in a condemnatory or contemptuous sense = *superstition*, cf. Plut. *περὶ δεισιδαιμονίας*.—Acts xxv. 19, ζητήματα δὲ τινα περὶ τῆς ἰδίας δεισιδαιμονίας εἶχον.

Δεξιός, ὁ, ὄν, on the right, what is on the right hand, οὗς, ὀφθαλμός, ποὺς, σιάγών, etc., Matt. v. 29, 39 ; Luke xxii. 50 ; John xviii. 10 ; Rev. x. 2. In classical Greek seldom joined with χεῖρ, as in Matt. v. 30 ; Luke vi. 6 ; Acts iii. 7 ; Rev. i. 16, x. 5, xiii. 16. Hence, and in the N. T. also, ἡ δεξιὰ, subst. *the right*, τὰ δεξιὰ (*sc. μέρη*, John xxi. 6), *the right side*, e.g. καθίζειν ἐκ δεξιῶν, ἐν τοῖς δεξιοῖς in the synoptical Gospels and Acts, καθίζειν ἐν δεξιᾷ, εἶναι ἐν δ. in the Epistles.—Δεξιός “through the root ΔΕΚΩ is akin to δέχομαι and δείκνυμι, because we both take hold of and point at anything with the right hand” (Passow, *Wörterb.*) ; accordingly, when giving or receiving is spoken of, preference is given to the right hand, Matt. vi. 3 ; Luke vi. 6 ; Rev. v. 7. In the case of division and apportionment, the right hand is first chosen as that which always comes first (Matt. v. 29, 30, 39 ; Rev. x. 2), both when the division is indifferent (see Matt. xx. 21, 23, Mark x. 37, 40 ; 2 Cor. vi. 7 ; cf. 1 Kings xxii. 19 ; 2 Sam. xvi. 6 ; 2 Chron. xviii. 18 ; Ezra ix. 43) and when preference is clearly given to one side, as in Matt. xxv. 33, 34. Cf. Plut. *Apophth.* 192 F, ἐπεὶ δὲ Λακεδαιμονίων ἐπιστρατευομένων ἀνεφέροντο χρησμοὶ τοῖς Θηβαίοις, οἱ μὲν ἤτταν, οἱ δὲ νίκην φέροντες, ἐκέλευε (Ἐπαμινώνδας) τοὺς μὲν ἐπὶ δεξιᾷ τοῦ βήματος θῆναι, τοὺς δὲ ἐπ’ ἀριστερᾷ. Generally, it seems a natural preference to choose the right hand or side instead of the left. In all important transactions, when definiteness must be given to the action, and the full participation of the actor made prominent, and also when energy and emphasis are intended, the right hand is employed (see Rev. i. 16, 17, 20, ii. 1, v. 1, 7). Hence, particularly in the O. T., it denotes God’s energizing and emphatic revelation of Himself, יְהוָה יִמְיָו, יְהוָה יִמְיָו, and so on ; e.g. Ex. xv. 6, 12 ; Ps. xvii. 1, xx. 7, xxi. 9, xlvi. 11, lx. 7, lxiii. 9, lxxvii. 11, cxviii. 15, 16, cxxxviii. 7 ; Isa. xli. 10, xlvi. 13, etc. Cf. Luke xi. 20, ἐν δακτύλῳ θεοῦ, parallel to ἐν πνεύματι θεοῦ, Matt. xii. 28. In solemn pledges, Gal. ii. 9, and in an oath, Rev. x. 5, Isa. lxii. 8, the right hand is used. Cf. Rev. xiii. 16, χάραγμα ἐπὶ τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῶν τῆς δεξιᾶς. Not only in the case of the actor, but also in that of the person acted upon, the right hand or side is preferred (cf. Acts iii. 7), and hence God is said to be at the

right hand of the person whom He helps, as the enemy is to the right of him whom he seeks to overcome, and the accuser to the right of the accused. By the right hand the whole man is claimed, whether in action or in suffering. Cf. Ps. cix. 6 with ver. 31; Acts ii. 25 quoted from Ps. xvi. 8; Ps. lxxiii. 23, cx. 5 (comp. ver. 1!), cxxi. 5; Isa. xli. 13; Zech. iii. 1.

He in high rank who puts any one on his right hand gives him equal honour with himself, and recognises him as of equal dignity; cf. 1 Kings ii. 19; Ps. xlv. 10; Ezra iv. 29, 30; Matt. xx. 21, 23, xxvii. 38; Rev. iii. 21. Compare also the custom of the kings of Arabia to let their governors sit on the right. Thus we must understand the session of Christ, or Christ's being on the right hand of God; and "the right hand of God" in this connection must not be confounded with the before-mentioned use of the phrase to denote God's manifestation as full of energy. Christ's being on the right hand of God follows necessarily upon His exaltation, Acts ii. 33, τῇ δεξιᾷ οὖν τοῦ θεοῦ ὑψωθείς (where ver. 34 clearly forbids our taking the dative as *dat. instr.*, cf. Winer, § xxxi. 5), v. 31; Eph. i. 20; indeed, this exaltation is an elevation to equal honour and dignity, cf. Heb. i. 13, πρὸς τίνα δὲ τῶν ἀγγέλων εἶρηκέν ποτε Κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου κ.τ.λ., quoted from Ps. cx. 1, cf. Acts ii. 34, Matt. xxii. 44, and parallels. Hence Matt. xxvi. 64, ὄψεσθε τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρ. καθήμενον ἐκ δεξιῶν τῆς δυν.; Mark xiv. 62; Luke xxii. 69; Acts vii. 55, 56. The expression denotes the contrast between Christ's humiliation and His exaltation, and as it gives prominence to Christ's participation in God's honour and glory (cf. Heb. ii. 9 with i. 13), Heb. i. 3, viii. 1, x. 12, xii. 2, the import of Christ's exaltation in its bearing upon us is strongly insisted upon, 1 Pet. iii. 22; Rom. viii. 34; Col. iii. 1. Athanasius, *quaest.* 45, *de parabolis scripturae*, justly says, δεξιὰν δὲ τοῦ θεοῦ ὅταν ἀκούσης, τὴν δόξαν καὶ τὴν τιμὴν τοῦ θεοῦ εἶναι νόει.—The phrase does not occur in St. John's writings; we have instead, John xvii. 5, δόξασον μὲ σύ, πάτερ, παρὰ σεαυτῷ τῇ δόξῃ κ.τ.λ., ver. 24.

Δέομαι, *to be deprived of, to need*. The active δέω, *to be deprived of, to want, to need*; used chiefly in the impersonal form δεῖ, *it is necessary, it ought or must be*, for which Homer always (excepting *Il.* ix. 337) uses *χρή*. **Δέομαι**, by some construed as passive = *to be reduced to want*, is perhaps more correctly to be regarded as middle = *to be in want of for oneself, to need*. The first aorist oftener in the passive form ἐδεήθην, which seems to be the basis of the form adopted by Lachm. ἐδεεῖτο, instead of ἐδέετο, Luke viii. 38; ἐδεεῖτο (Gen. xxv. 21), which occurs also again in some manuscripts in Job xix. 16. To the meaning, *to be in want of, to need*, the signification, *to desire, to pray*, which is peculiar to biblical Greek, easily attaches itself,—a signification which occurs in classical Greek only side by side with the first meaning. As to form, the Scripture usage of the word presents no peculiarities. (I.) In general, *to pray, to desire*, with the genitive of the person and infinitive following, Luke viii. 38, ix. 38, comp. Acts xxvi. 3; 2 Cor. x. 2; with following accusative, 2 Cor. viii. 4; ὅπως, Matt. ix. 38; Luke x. 2, comp. Acts

viii. 24; *ἴνα*, Luke ix. 40, comp. xxi. 36, xxii. 32;—*μή*, Luke viii. 28. The request is included in direct address, Acts viii. 34, xxi. 39, comp. 2 Cor. v. 20; Gal. iv. 12.—With Acts viii. 24, *δεήθητε ὑμεῖς ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ πρὸς τὸν κύριον, ὅπως κ.τ.λ.*, comp. Ps. lxiv. 1, xxx. 9, Isa. xxxvii. 4, where, in like manner, *δέομαι πρὸς τινα* occurs; 1 Kings viii. 60, *δεδέχμαι ἐνώπιον κυρίου*. Further, Ecclus. li. 13, *δ. ὑπὲρ τινος*; Gen. xxv. 21; Isa. xxxvii. 4; Luke xxii. 32, *περί τινος*.—Without mention of the person, Luke xxi. 36, xxii. 32; Acts iv. 31 (Acts xxvi. 3, Lachm., Tisch.); Rom. i. 10; 2 Cor. v. 20, x. 2; 1 Thess. iii. 10. Worthy of note are the combinations, 1 Thess. iii. 10, *δεόμενοι εἰς τὸ ἰδεῖν ὑμῶν τὸ πρόσωπον*; Rom. i. 10, *δεόμενος εἴ πως κ.τ.λ.*; comp. Acts viii. 22, *δεήθητε τοῦ θεοῦ εἰ ἄρα*.—(II.) Specially of prayer, see *αἰτέω*. Thus for the most part comparatively, frequently *without* specification of the person, Luke xxi. 36, xxii. 32; Acts iv. 31; Rom. i. 20; 1 Thess. iii. 10. Besides these, in Matt. ix. 38; Luke x. 2; Acts viii. 22, 24, x. 2. Conjoined with *προσευχή*, Ps. lxiv. 1, *εἰσάκουσον τῆς προσευχῆς μου ἐν τῷ δέεσθαι με πρὸς σέ*; Rom. i. 10, and often. *Προσευχή* expresses the general conception. As to the distinction between the synonyms named, see *αἰτέω*.—LXX. = עָרַב, נָחַ, Hithpael, נִחַפְּתָא נִחַפְּתָא, without any special fixing of the usage.

Δέσις, *ἥ*, with the signification need in biblical Greek, Ps. xxii. 25; elsewhere always = request, as *δέομαι* occurs there only in this sense. Aristot. *Rhet.* ii. 7, *δεήσεις εἰσὶν αἱ ὀρέξεις, καὶ τούτων μάλιστα αἱ μετὰ λύπης τοῦ μὴ γιγνομένου*; not simply therefore the request of need, but stronger still, the entreaty of *want*. In the N. T. only of prayer, and this in conjunction with *προσευχή*, Acts i. 14, Received text; Eph. vi. 18; Phil. iv. 6; 1 Tim. ii. 1, v. 1; comp. 2 Chron. vi. 19; Ps. vi. 9, xvi. 1, lxiv. 1, lv. 1, 2, lxxxvi. 6; Jer. xi. 14; Dan. ix. 3; 1 Macc. vii. 37; Ecclus. xxxii. 20, 21, and often. Further, with *αἶτημα*, Phil. iv. 6; *ἱκετηρία* (supplication for protection, and seeking help), Heb. v. 7; comp. Job xl. 22. *Δέσις* does not denote simply a *kind* of prayer, namely, *petition*; but it characterizes also and describes *prayer* generally, the *προσευχή*, which by virtue of the relation of man to God is request and supplication, *διὰ δεήσεως προσεύχεσθαι*, Eph. vi. 18; comp. Luke ii. 37, *νηστεύει καὶ δεήσας λατρεύουσα*; v. 33, *οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου νηστεύουσιν πυκνὰ, καὶ δεήσεις ποιοῦνται . . . οἱ δὲ σοὶ ἐσθίουσιν καὶ πίνουσιν*. Further, comp. Jas. v. 16 with 17; Heb. v. 7, *δέξω. προσφέρειν*. Besides the places cited, it occurs Luke i. 13; 2 Cor. i. 11; Phil. i. 19; 2 Tim. i. 3; 1 Pet. iii. 12; *δέξω. ὑπὲρ τινος*, Rom. x. 1; 2 Cor. ix. 14; Phil. i. 4; 1 Tim. ii. 1; *περί τινος*, Eph. vi. 18; *δ. ποιέσθαι*, Luke v. 33; Phil. i. 4; 1 Tim. ii. 1; *προσφέρειν*, Heb. v. 7.

Δέχομαι, fut. *δέξομαι*, aor. *ἐδεξάμην*, perf. *δεδέχμαι*, (I.) to accept. Synon. *λαμβάνειν*, with which, for the sake of emphasis, it is sometimes joined. Ammon. p. 87, *λαβεῖν μὲν ἐστὶ τὸ κείμενόν τι ἀνελέσθαι, δέξασθαι δὲ τὸ διδόμενον ἐκ χειρός*. So in Luke ii. 28, xvi. 6, 7, xviii. 17; Mark x. 15; Acts xxviii. 21; Eph. vi. 17; *χάριν δέχεσθαι*, to receive or accept a kindness or favour, cf. 2 Cor. vi. 1, *τὴν χάριν τοῦ θ.* (II.) *Hospitably to receive any one*, guest, beggar, or fugitive, Matt. x. 14, 40, 41; Heb. xi. 31; and often

in contrast with *to repulse* (Sturz, *excipere, vel epulis, vel aliis amicitiam declarandi modis*). In classical Greek, *e.g.*, of Hades which receives the dead, *e.g.* Soph. *Trach.* 1085, ὧναξ Ἄϊδην, δέξαι μ'. Accordingly in Acts iii. 21, ὃν δεῖ οὐρανὸν μὲν δέξασθαι κ.τ.λ., not ὃν, but οὐρανόν, had better be taken as the accusative subject, "whom the heaven must receive," and thus the connection with ver. 20 will be more correct, cf. ver. 15; Acts vii. 59. (III.) *To admit, to approve, to allow* (a remark, a word, etc.), *to recognise or give one's approval to*, Matt. xi. 14, εἰ θέλετε δέξασθαι, αὐτός ἐστιν Ἡλίας; 1 Cor. ii. 14, ψυχικὸς ἄνθρ. οὐ δέχεται τὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ θ., μωρία γὰρ αὐτῷ ἐστίν; 2 Cor. viii. 17. In this signification δεχ. serves to denote the recognition of the word preached and a yielding to its influence, δέχεσθαι τὸν λόγον τοῦ θ., τὸν λόγον, τὸ εὐαγγ.; Acts viii. 14, xi. 1; 1 Thess. ii. 13; Luke viii. 13; Acts xvii. 11; 2 Cor. xi. 4; 1 Thess. i. 6; 2 Thess. ii. 10; Jas. i. 21. Cf. ἀποδέχεσθαι τὸν λόγον, Acts ii. 41 = *to put faith in; αποδόχη*, 1 Tim. i. 15, iv. 9; often in similar combinations in classical Greek, *e.g.* ἀποδ. διαβολάς, μῦθον. It implies that a decision of the will towards the object presented has taken place, and that the result of this is manifest. Cf. Xen. *Anab.* i. 8. 17, ὁ δὲ Κῦρος ἀκούσας, Ἀλλὰ δέχομαι τε, ἔφη, καὶ τοῦτο ἔστω. Frequently in Thucyd.—Thus it answers to the Heb. נָצַח, Lev. vii. 18 (8), xix. 7, xxii. 23, 25, 27; Deut. xxxiii. 11.

Ἀπεκδέχομαι, a Pauline expression, seldom occurring in classical Greek; for which otherwise ἐκδέχομαι is used in the sense, *to wait for or expect*, Heb. x. 13; John v. 3; Acts xvii. 16; 1 Cor. xi. 33, xvi. 11; Heb. xi. 10; Jas. v. 7. — ἀπεκδέχομαι = *to wait for*, a suitable expression for Christian hope, including the two elements of *hope* and *patience*. Rom. viii. 25, εἰ δὲ ὃ οὐ βλέπομεν, ἐλπίζομεν, δι' ὑπομονῆς ἀπεκδεχόμεθα. In Rom. viii. 23 the object is *υἱοθεσία*, as it will be realized in the ἀπολύτρωσις τοῦ σώματος, ver. 19, Gal. v. 5, ἐλπίδα δικαιοσύνης; Phil. iii. 20, σωτήρα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, ὃς μετασχηματίζει τὸ σῶμα τῆς ταπεινώσεως ἡμῶν κ.τ.λ.; 1 Cor. i. 7, Heb. ix. 28.—Cf. 1 Pet. i. 20, ἀπεξεδέχετο ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ μακροθυμία.

Παραδέχομαι, *to accept, to receive*; in the N. T. with an object, like ἀποδέχεσθαι in classical Greek, *e.g.* τὸν λόγον, Mark iv. 20, cf. Acts xvi. 21; τὴν μαρτυρίαν, Acts xxii. 18, κατηγορίαν, 1 Tim. v. 19, cf. Ex. xxiii. 1. With personal object = *in amicitiam recipere*, Polyb. xxxviii. 1. 8, παραδεδεγμένοι τὸ ἔθνος. So in Heb. xii. 6, υἱὸν ὃν παραδέχετο; Heb. נָצַח, Prov. iii. 12. The aorist παρεδέχθην, Acts xv. 4 (*al.*, ἀπεδέχθην), in a passive signification, cf. Krüger, lii. 10, 11.

Προσδέχομαι, *to accept, to receive*, Heb. xi. 35; *favourably to receive*, Luke xv. 2, ἁμαρτωλούς, cf. Ex. xxii. 11, Ps. vi. 10; Rom. xvi. 2; Phil. ii. 29. The reading in Heb. xi. 13, μὴ προσδεξάμενοι τὰς ἐπαγγελίας, is difficult (Received text and Tisch., λαβόντες), because προσδέχ. is usually in such a connection = *to wait for, to expect*, as in Luke ii. 38, etc. Still, as προσδέχεσθαι τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν = *to receive the redemption*, while προσδ. λύτρωσιν, Luke ii. 38, = *to wait for redemption*, so also in Heb. xi. 13, προσδ. τὰς ἐπαγγελίας may be taken in a different sense from its meaning in Acts xxiii. 21. This

is not certainly "a false gloss," for the reading, according to general usage, is too unaccountable, and it is more reasonable to suppose that the more difficult expression was exchanged for the more ordinary λαμβάνειν or καμίζειν (*vid. ἐπαγγελία*). Προσδέχομαι is otherwise used, as in classical Greek since Homer's time, with the signification, *to expect, to wait for*, Acts xxiii. 21, Luke xii. 36, and joined with the object of the Christian's hope (cf. ἀπεκδέχομαι); Luke ii. 38, λύτρωσιν; ver. 25, παράκλησιν τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ; Mark xv. 43, τὴν βασ. τ. θ.; Luke xxiii. 51; Acts xxiv. 15, ἐλπίδα ἀναστάσεως; Tit. ii. 13, τὴν μακαρίαν ἐλπίδα; Jude 21, τὸ ἔλεος τοῦ κυρίου κ.τ.λ.

Δεκτός, a verbal adjective with the signification of the perf. part. pass. of δέχομαι = *to decide favourably* = elected, acceptable, of one regarding whom there is or has been a favourable decision of the will. This is its meaning in the peculiar usage of the LXX., e.g. Ex. xxviii. 38, δεκτὸν αὐτοῖς ἔναντι κυρίου, Lev. i. 3 (otherwise with the dat. of the person who has resolved upon anything, Deut. xxxiii. 24; Lev. i. 4, δεκτὸν αὐτῷ ἐξιλάσασθαι περὶ αὐτοῦ); Isa. lvi. 7, lx. 7; Mal. ii. 13, λαβεῖν δεκτὸν ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν ὑμῶν. Particularly of a sacrifice; not, indeed, to distinguish it from sacrifices which are not accepted, but to specify it as the object of the divine approval, cf. Mal. ii. 13; Lev. i. 3, 4; Isa. lx. 7; Phil. iv. 18. Joined with καιρός, ἐνιαυτός, Luke iv. 19, 2 Cor. vi. 2, to be explained according to Isa. lviii. 5, ἡμέρα δεκτὴ τῷ κυρίῳ, יוֹם הַיְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ (parallel with ἐκλέγεσθαι), xlix. 8, lxi. 2 = *a time which God has pleasure in, which God Himself has chosen* (Vulgate, *tempus placitum*). Of men, Deut. xxxiii. 24, Luke iv. 24 = *liked, valued* (Ecclus. ii. 5, iii. 17); Acts x. 35. — Very seldom in classical Greek.

Ἀπόδεκτος, *acceptable*, 1 Tim. ii. 3, v. 4 (cf. i. 15, iv. 9). Not in the LXX.

Εὐπρόσδεκτος, a very strong affirmation of δεκτός, *favourably accepted*. Predicated, like δεκτός, of the time of grace, Rom. xv. 31; 2 Cor. viii. 12. Predicated of sacrifice, Rom. xv. 16; 1 Pet. ii. 5. Not in the LXX. Plut. *præc. Ger. Reip.* iv. (801 C), ὅπως εὐπρ. γένηται ὁ λόγος τοῖς πολλοῖς.

Καραδοκέω, from καρ, *κάρα, κάρη, head*, and δοκεύω, δέχομαι = *to expect with outstretched head*. Rarely in Attic prose; once in Xenophon, occasionally in Herodotus, also in Euripides and Aristophanes, and often in Polybius, Plutarch, Diodorus, Philo, and Josephus. Phavor. *Etym. M.*, τῇ κεφαλῇ προβλέπειν καὶ ἐλπίζειν τὸ ἐκδεχόμενον. There attaches to the word, as a plastic expression, a certain intensity, denoting either the tension of waiting, the attention, or the patience involved, without, however, giving special prominence to these. This intensity, denied by some (as e.g. by Schleusner), appears in Eurip. *Rhes.* 143, 144, ἐὰν δ' ἀπαίρωσ' εἰς φνγὴν ὀρμώμενοι, σάλπιγγος αὐδὴν προσδοκῶν καραδόκει, ὥς οὐ μενοῦντα μ'. Xen. *Mem.* iii. 5. 6, οὐ μόνον τὰ κελευόμενα πάντα ποιοῦσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ συγῶσι καραδοκούντες τὰ προσταχθεσόμενα. Cf. Polyb. xviii. 31. 4, ἵνα μὴ δοκῇ τοῖς καιροῖς ἐφεδρεύων ἀποκαραδοκεῖν τὴν Ἀντιόχου παρουσίαν. In like manner the use which Aquila makes of the word in Ps. cxxx. 5, cxlii. 8, tells for this, as answering

to the ὑπομένειν chosen by the LXX., comp. *καραδοκία*. In biblical Greek it does not elsewhere occur. Eurip. *Trö.*, *καραδοκεί ὅταν στράτευμ' Ἀργείων ἐξίη καλῶς*. Herod. vii. 163, *καραδοκῆσόντα τὴν μάχην κῆ πεσέεται*, vii. 168. 2, *καραδοκέοντες τὸν πόλεμον κῆ πεσέεται, ἀελπτέοντες μὲν τοὺς Ἕλληνας ὑπερβαλέεσθαι, δοκέοντες δὲ τὸν Πέρσην κατακρατήσαντα πολλὸν ἄρξειν πάσης τῆς Ἑλλάδος*; viii. 67; Polyb. iii. 13, Ἀννίβας δὲ πάντα προνοηθεὶς περὶ τῆς ἀσφαλείας . . . λοιπὸν ἐκαραδοκεί καὶ προσδέχετο τοὺς κ.τ.λ.; iii. 34, i. 33, x. 37, 39, ii. 52, *καραδοκῶν τὸ μέλλον*. See Wetstein on Rom. viii. 19.

Καραδοκία, ἡ, *expectation, hope*. Aquila, Prov. x. 28, where Symmachus has ὑπομονή = ἡλπίς. Ps. xxxix. 8, LXX., ὑπομονή. Not in classical Greek. In the N. T. Phil. i. 20, *κατὰ τὴν καραδοκίαν καὶ ἐλπίδα μου*, where, however, most, and the best, MSS. read ἀποκαραδοκία.

Ἀποκαραδοκία, ἡ, *earnest, fixed, or strained expectation*; Luther, Rom. viii. 19, *das aengstliche Harren, the painful waiting*. Only in Rom. viii. 19, Phil. i. 20, and transferred thence into patristic Greek, yet but seldom even there. Chrysostom, ἡ μεγάλη καὶ ἐπιτεταμένη προσδοκία. The intensity of the expression is clear from what has been said under *καραδοκῶ*, and from the force of the preposition, which, as Hofmann on Rom. viii. 19 remarks, cannot well signify anything else than what it means in ἀποθαρρῆν, ἀποθανυμάζειν, namely, a strengthening of the verbal conception, *to expect on and on, to the end*; comp. ἀπασπείρω, *to struggle on or away, to die of convulsions*.—The verb ἀποκαραδοκῶ is, in like manner, rare in classical Greek, Polyb. xviii. 31. 4 (see *καραδοκ.*), xxii. 19. 3, ἀπεκαραδοκεί τοὺς ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ἐπὶ τίνος ἔσονται γνώμης; xvi. 1. 8, αὐτὸς ὑπὸ τὰς νησίδας ἀναχωρήσας . . . ἀπεκαραδοκεί τὸν κίνδυνον = *to wait for*, Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* iii. 7. 26.

Διάκονος, ὁ, ἡ, *servant, specially waiter at table*. Derivation uncertain; according to the ancients, from διὰ-κόνις, *in the dust, labouring or running through dust*, cf. ἐγκονίς, *a female servant*; but the prosody, διάκονος, is against this. Accordingly Buttmann, *Lexilog.* i. 219, derives it from διάκω = διήκω, *to hasten*, akin to διώκω. Comp. Curtius, p. 60, 587.—Heb. מַלְאָכָה, Esther i. 10, ii. 2, vi. 3.—Matt. xxii. 13; John ii. 5, 9. Synon. with δούλος, ὑπηρέτης, *θεράπων*. While, however, in δούλος the relation of dependence upon a master is prominent, and a state of servitude is the main thought, in διάκονος the main reference is to the service or advantage rendered to another (serviceableness), even as ὑπηρέτης refers to labour done for (serving) a lord (villenage); *θεράπων* originally includes, according to Passow, the idea of voluntary subjection and honourable rendering of service, therefore the opposite of δούλος, of a slave; “διάκονος represents the servant in his activity *for the work*, not in his relation, either servile, as that of the δούλος, or more voluntary, as in the case of the *θεράπων, to a person*,” Trench, *Synonyms of the N. T.*; see under διακονεῖν, which, in a special sense, denotes one of the occupations of the δούλος, in like manner the combination of διάκονος καὶ σύνδουλος, Col. iv. 7; on Matt.

iv. 11, ἄγγελοι διηκόνουν αὐτῷ, cf. Gregor., ὑπ' ἁγγέλων ὑπηρετεῖται. — Thus διακονός means: (I.) *the servant of him whom the labour benefits*, e.g. διάκονος περιτομῆς, of Christ, Rom. xv. 8 (εἰς τὸ βεβαιῶσαι τὰς ἐπαγγελίας τῶν πατέρων), likewise Gal. ii. 17, Χριστὸς ἁμαρτίας διάκονος, *a promoter of sin*; cf. 2 Cor. xi. 15, διάκ. τῆς δικαιοσύνης; iii. 6, διάκ. καινῆς διαθήκης; Eph. iii. 7; Col. i. 23, τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, Col. i. 25, δ. ἐκκλησίας. Connected with this is the idea of subordination under others, Mark ix. 35, εἴ τις θέλει πρῶτος εἶναι, ἔσται πάντων ἔσχατος καὶ πάντων διάκονος, x. 43, Matt. xx. 26, xxiii. 11, and accordingly διάκ. τινός denotes (II.) *the servant of an employer*, as is said of the magistrate he is θεοῦ διάκονος. Rom. xiii. 4, he acts in the employ of God, 1 Tim. iv. 6, καλὸς ἔσῃ δ. Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, Col. i. 7; 2 Cor. vi. 4, xi. 15, 23; 1 Thess. iii. 2; John xii. 26, ἐὰν ἐμοὶ τις διακονῇ, ἐμοὶ ἀκολουθεῖτω, καὶ ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγώ, ἐκεῖ καὶ ὁ διάκονος ὁ ἐμὸς ἔσται. — In the Pauline writings (where alone, except in the Gospels, the word occurs) διάκ. always denotes, as is clear from the passages cited, one employed in God's service to advance His saving health, so called both in his relation to the Lord of salvation, who entrusts to him the service, and in his relation to those to whom salvation is given, and whom his labour serves. Cf. Col. i. 7, πιστὸς ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διάκονος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ; 1 Cor. iii. 5, διάκονοι δι' ὧν ἐπιστεύσατε, parallel with ver. 9, θεοῦ συνεργοί.

(III.) As a *term. techn.* side by side with ἐπίσκοπος, 1 Tim. iii. 8, 12, Phil. i. 1 = *helper* (*vid.* διακονεῖν), it denotes those who stood by the bishops (or presbyters) as helpers, on account of which they probably received the name *deacons*, as Tychicus is so called in his relation to Paul (Col. iv. 7; Eph. vi. 21; cf. Acts xix. 22). The origin of this relationship we find in Acts vi. 1–4, though we cannot therefore infer that the name *deacon* was derived from the διακονεῖν τραπέζαις, for see vi. 4, διακονία τοῦ λόγου. In confirmation of this view it is to be remembered, that in order διακονεῖν τραπέζαις men must have been chosen *who were specially qualified*, in the duties to which they were called, *to stand side by side with the apostles, and afterwards with the bishops or presbyters as assistants*, just as Stephen and Philip, chosen in the first instance as distributors of alms, soon appear side by side with the apostles, and as helpers of them as evangelists, Acts vi. 8–10, viii. 5–8. We have no definite account of the nature and range of the duties of this office; even those chosen in Acts vi. 1 sq. were not called by this name; nor can ἀντιλήψεις (Rom. xii. 7; 1 Cor. xii. 28) be taken as implying anything more definite. The similarity of the exhortations given to the deacons (1 Tim. iii. 8–12) and to the presbyters confirms the above view of their relation, according to which, the presbyters being distinct officers, the care of the churches devolved upon the deacons as their helpers. Such were the beginnings of the diaconate in the early church; by degrees the duties of the office were more clearly defined and limited, as the distinction between clergy and laity became more formal and marked. *Vid.* Suiceri, *Thes.*; Jacobson in Herzog's *Real-Encyclop.* iii. 365 seq. — In Rom. xvi. 1, a woman, Phoebe, is named as διάκονος τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἐν Κεγχρεαῖς, cf. 1 Tim. v. 10 (not ver. 9) with Rom. xvi. 2, 1 Tim. iii. 11, a passage which for preponderating reasons must be taken as referring to deaconesses.

Διακονέω, imperf. διηκόνουν for the Attic ἐδιακόνουν, likewise διηκόνησα; cf. Krüger, § xxviii. 14. 13, to serve, to render service, to wait upon; an occupation of the δούλοι, see Plat. Legg. vii. 805 E, γεωργεῖν τε καὶ βουκολεῖν καὶ ποιμαίνειν καὶ διακονεῖν μηδὲν διαφερόντως τῶν δούλων. In its narrowest sense = to wait at table, to serve at dinner; as often διάκονος denotes κατ. ἐξ. a waiter at table, Luke iv. 39, x. 40, xii. 37, xvii. 8; Matt. viii. 15, Mark i. 31; John xii. 2. Hence διακονῶν opposed to ἀνακείμενος, Luke xxii. 26, 27; John xii. 2. According to this usage, we may probably understand Christ's words, Matt. xx. 28, Mark x. 45, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἦλθεν διακονηθῆναι, ἀλλὰ διακονῆσαι κ.τ.λ., cf. the parallel in Luke xxii. 27, ἐγὼ δὲ εἰμὶ ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν ὡς ὁ διακονῶν. (Cf. Rev. iii. 20.) Generally, to do any one a service, to care for any one's needs, Matt. iv. 11, xxv. 44, xxvii. 55; Mark i. 13, xv. 41; Luke viii. 3, διηκόνουν αὐτῷ ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐταῖς. The διακονεῖν τοῖς ἀγίοις is a beautiful expression for compassionate love towards the poor within the Christian fellowship, cf. Rom. xv. 25 and διακονία. — Acts vi. 2, διακονεῖν τραπέζαις, to attend to tables (i.e. to provision or food). — Διακονεῖν differs from δουλεύειν as "to serve, to work for any one," differs from "to be subject to;" both may co-exist, cf. Dem. xix. 69, δεσπότη διακονεῖν, still there is always in διακονεῖν, as distinct from δουλεύειν, a reference to the work done, as service rendered, bringing advantage to others, cf. Athen. 6, εἵθισται γὰρ ἐν ταῖς οἰκιακαῖς διακονεῖν τοὺς νεωτέρους τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις, Philem. 13. Thus in John xii. 26, ἐὰν ἐμοὶ διακονῇ τις, to work by commission of some one. Directly = to help, Acts xix. 22, where Timothy and Erastus are described as δύο τῶν διακονούντων τῷ Παυλῷ. Vid. διάκονος, helper; διακονεῖν, to denote the work of the deacons, 1 Tim. iii. 10, 13. But we can hardly limit 1 Pet. iv. 11, εἴ τις διακονεῖ κ.τ.λ., to this; it refers to the good work done by all "the brethren," like iv. 10, where διακονεῖν τινὶ τι = to minister to any one in anything. — The passive, 2 Cor. iii. 3, ἐπιστολὴ Χριστοῦ διακονηθεῖσα ὑφ' ἡμῶν; viii. 19, 20, χάρις διακονηθεῖσα ὑφ' ἡμῶν = serviceable labour bestowed upon anything, is to be explained by reference to the predilection which St. Paul evinces for the words διάκονος and διακονία when speaking of any labour in connection with and in the service of the gospel; as also 1 Pet. i. 12, iv. 10.

Διακονία, ἡ, (I.) serviceable labour, service, Luke x. 40; Heb. i. 14; assistance, 2 Tim. iv. 11, ἔστιν (i.e. Μάρκος) μοι εὐχρηστος εἰς διακονίαν, cf. Acts xix. 22; 2 Cor. xi. 8. In the combination ἡ διακ. εἰς τοὺς ἀγίους we have a very delicate and fine expression for the exercise of compassionate love towards the needy within the Christian community, the rendering of which in German, "Unterstützung," is too strong and blunt; cf. Acts vi. 1, ἡ διακ. ἡ καθημερινή, with ver. 4, ἡ διακ. τοῦ λόγου. 2 Cor. ix. 12, ἡ διακ. τῆς λειτουργίας ταύτης . . . προσαναπληροῦσα τὰ ὑστερήματα τῶν ἀγίων; vv. 1, 13, viii. 4; Rev. ii. 19; Acts xi. 29, xii. 25; Rom. xv. 31; 1 Cor. xvi. 15. (II.) Every business, every calling, so far as its labour benefits others, is a διακονία, as Plato says of those whose work it is to buy and sell the products of the land and the necessities of life, Rep.

ii. 371 C, *ἐαυτοὺς ἐπὶ τὴν διακονίαν τάττουσι ταύτην*; Aeschin. *in Ctesiphont.* lv. 33, *ὅσα τις αἰρετὸς ὢν πράττει κατὰ ψήφισμα, οὐκ ἔστι ταῦτα ἀρχή, ἀλλ' ἐπιμέλειά τις καὶ διακονία*. In this sense Paul, and Luke in the Acts, use the word to designate the vocation of those who preach the gospel and have the care of the churches,—a term so applied to them not only with reference to those who derive benefit from the service, but (like *διάκονος*) with reference to the Lord who has called them to this work; cf. *θέμενος εἰς διακονίαν*, 1 Tim. i. 12; Acts xx. 24, *τελειῶσαι τὴν διακονίαν ἣν ἔλαβον παρὰ τοῦ κυρίου, διαμαρτύρασθαι κ.τ.λ.*; cf. 1 Cor. xii. 5, *διαιρέσεις διακονιῶν εἰσὶν, καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς κύριος*; Col. iv. 17, *βλέπε τὴν διακονίαν ἣν παρέλαβες ἐν κυρίῳ, ἵνα αὐτὴν πληροῖς*; 2 Tim. iv. 5, *τὴν διακονίαν σου πληροφόρησον*; Rom. xi. 13. With *ἀποστολή*, Acts i. 25, comp. ver. 17. *Διακονία* is, accordingly, office or ministration in the Christian community viewed with reference to the labour serviceable to others conferred therein, both in the case of individuals (1 Cor. xii. 5 and elsewhere) and generally as a general conception including all branches of service, Rom. xii. 7; Eph. iv. 12; 1 Tim. i. 12; 2 Cor. vi. 3, iv. 1. This ministration in the O. T. economy is called *διακονία τοῦ θανάτου, τῆς κατακρίσεως*, to distinguish it from that of the N. T. *διακονία τοῦ πνεύματος, τῆς δικαιοσύνης*, 2 Cor. iii. 8, 9; *τῆς καταλλαγῆς*, v. 18, reference being made to the characteristic element of it in its operations.

Διδάσκω, *διδάξω*, *ἐδίδαξα*, *ἐδιδάχθην*, “from the same theme as *δείκνυμι*; comp. *docere*, properly *διδασκ-σκω*; comp. *disco*” (Schenkl) = to teach, to give instruction or direction, Matt. xxviii. 15, 20; Luke xi. 1, xii. 12; Acts xv. 12; 1 Cor. xi. 14; Rev. ii. 14; *διδ. τινά*, Matt. v. 2; Mark ii. 13; John vii. 35; once with the dative *τινί*, Rev. ii. 14, *ἐδίδασκεν τῷ Βαλὰκ βαλεῖν σκάνδαλον κ.τ.λ.*, either answering to the Hebrew *יָרָא*, Job vi. 24, *יָרָא*, xxi. 22, or because *διδάσκειν* is here akin to *συμβουλευεῖν* (de Wette); *τί*, Matt. xv. 9, xxii. 16; Acts xxi. 21, and elsewhere; *περί τινος*, 1 John ii. 27; followed by *ὅτι*, Mark viii. 31, by the infinitive, Matt. xxviii. 20; Luke xi. 1; Rev. ii. 14; *τινά τι*, Heb. v. 12; cf. *ἐδιδάχθην αὐτό*, Gal. i. 12; 2 Thess. ii. 15.—The communication of gospel knowledge (which St. Paul did not himself gain in this way, Gal. i. 12, *οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐγὼ παρὰ ἀνθρώπου παρέλαβον αὐτό οὔτε ἐδιδάχθην, ἀλλὰ δι' ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*) results from *διδάσκειν* and *κηρύσσειν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας*, Matt. iv. 23, ix. 35, cf. xi. 1; in Luke, *διδ. καὶ εὐαγγελίζεσθαι*, xx. 1, Acts v. 42, xv. 35; indeed, while *κηρύσσειν* denotes the mere communication or call included therein (e.g. *μετανοεῖτε*, cf. Matt. xxiv. 14, *κηρυχθήσεται τὸ εὐαγγέλιον εἰς μαρτύριον*) to which the *ἀκούειν* corresponds, *διδάσκειν* signifies that closer instruction which examines the subject, illustrating and establishing, and thus calculated to influence the understanding, to which therefore *μανθάνειν* corresponds; cf. Matt. x. 24, 25; Luke vi. 40, xix. 39. See Acts xxviii. 31, *κηρύσσων τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ διδάσκων τὰ περὶ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*; xviii. 25, *ἐδίδασκεν ἀκριβῶς τὰ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ*; iv. 2, *διδάσκειν τὸν λαὸν καὶ καταγγέλλειν ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ τὴν ἀνάστασιν κ.τ.λ.*; Col. i. 28; Acts iv. 18; 1 Tim. iv. 11. Joined

with *νοθετεῖν*, Col. i. 28, iii. 16; with *παρακαλεῖν*, 1 Tim. vi. 2; cf. iv. 13; Tit. i. 9, *παρακαλεῖν ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ τῇ ὑγιαίνουσῃ*. As the object of the *διδάσκειν* is "the way of God" (Mark xii. 14), the *διδ.* itself is the leading into that way. The thing aimed at is to beget a determining of the will by the communication of the knowledge spoken of; Rev. ii. 20, *διδάσκει καὶ πλανᾷ τοὺς ἐμούς*; Col. i. 28; Acts xxi. 21; Matt. v. 19. It is used absolutely, as of Christ's teaching, e.g. John xviii. 20; Mark ix. 31, x. 1, etc.; as also of instruction in the object of Christian faith, of Christian teaching, Acts xi. 26; Rom. xii. 7; Col. i. 28; Heb. v. 12; 1 Tim. ii. 12, etc.; cf. Acts v. 28, *διδάσκειν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ*.

Διδακτικός, *ή, όν*, apt to teach, e.g. ἀρετὴ διδακτική in Philo, *de praem. et virt.* 4; named as a requisite in an ἐπίσκοπος, 1 Tim. iii. 2, 2 Tim. ii. 23, of course with reference to the subject-matter of Christian teaching, cf. Acts xviii. 24, 25. Theodoret, *ό τὰ θεία πεπαιδευμένος καὶ παραινεῖν δυνάμενος τὰ προσήκοντα*.

Διδαχή, *ή, ή*. (I.) In an *active* sense = the act of teaching, teaching, instructing, instruction, tuition, Herod. iii. 134, *ἐκ διδαχῆς ἔλεγε, ut erat edocta*. Plato, *Phaedr.* 275 A, *ἀνεὺ διδαχῆς*, "to have grown up without instruction." So 2 Tim. iv. 2, *ἐλεγον, ἐπιτίμησον, παρακάλεσον, ἐν πάσῃ μακροθυμίᾳ καὶ διδαχῇ*. It is unnecessary to render *manner of teaching* in Mark iv. 2, *καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς ἐν τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ*. Ἀκούετε κ.τ.λ.; Mark xii. 38.—II. In a *passive* sense, the teaching which is given, *that which any one teaches*, Matt. vii. 28, and often. Absolutely, *ή διδαχή* denotes the *διδ.* Ἰησοῦ, 2 John ix. 10; κυρίου, Acts xiii. 12; τῶν ἀποστόλων, Acts ii. 42; Tit. i. 9, *ό κατὰ τὴν διδαχὴν πιστός λόγος*; 2 John 9, *ό μένων ἐν τῇ διδ.*; cf. Rom. xvi. 17, *ή διδ. ἣν ὑμεῖς ἐμάθετε*; vi. 17, *ὑποκούσατε εἰς ὃν παρεδόθητε τύπον διδαχῆς*.

Διδάσκαλος, *ό*, teacher, Heb. v. 12, Rom. ii. 29, correlative with *μαθητής*, Matt. x. 24, 25; Luke vi. 40. When used in addressing Jesus, *διδάσκαλος* answers to the Hebrew רַבִּי, cf. John i. 39, Matt. xxiii. 8, a name of respect given to the Jewish γραμματεῖς (cf. Luke ii. 46) = *vir amplissimus* (cf. 2 Kings xxv. 8; Esth. i. 8), which seems to have been introduced and established in the time of Christ; "*ante tempora Hilleliana in usu non fuisse fastuosum hoc titulum Rabbi, satis patet ex eo quod doctores praecedentes nudo suo nomine vocarentur*," Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr.* on Matt. xxiii. 8. Hence the opposition of Jesus, Matt. xxiii. 8–10, against this and the other titles רַבִּי and רַבִּי, πατήρ and καθηγήτης or κύριος (cf. John xiii. 13, 14), which were similarly used, though not so widely or in such an official manner, has special weight. The objection urged against the authenticity of the Gospels, that the name Rabbi did not come into common use till after the destruction of Jerusalem, is removed by the consideration that the word must have begun to naturalize itself in our Lord's time, for it is officially given to Gamaliel in the Talmud, and the name "Rabbi" must at any rate have preceded the more definite word "Rabban" (רַבָּן, *our Rabbi*), which Simeon the son of Gamaliel was the first to introduce. Cf. Winer, *Realwörterb.* art. "Rabbi;" Pressel, art. "Rabbinismus," in Herzog's

Real-Encycl. xii. 470; Lightfoot, *l.c.* In accordance with the fact that "Rabbi" was a title given to the γραμματεῖς, we find in Matt. xxiii. 34 σοφοὶ καὶ γραμματεῖς side by side with προφῆται, and in Acts xiii. 1 διδάσκαλοι with προφῆται; and from this we may conclude that in the Christian church (in which the διδάσκαλοι appear as having a special function, Acts xiii. 1; 1 Cor. xii. 28, 29; Eph. iv. 11; Jas. iii. 1) these διδ. answer to the Jewish γραμματεῖς, and are to be viewed, like them, as in a special sense acquainted with and interpreters of God's salvation; cf. Matt. xiii. 52. Upon them devolved the duty of giving progressive instruction in God's redeeming purposes,—a function which, with that of ποιμήν, seems to have been united in one person, Eph. iv. 11; cf. the ἡγουμένοι of Heb. xiii. 7, 17; and as ποιμένες the διδάσκαλοι seem to have been members of the presbytery, cf. 1 Tim. iii. 2; 2 Tim. ii. 24; Acts xx. 28. The διδάσκαλος was distinct from the κήρυξ and the εὐαγγελιστής, Eph. iv. 11; 1 Tim. ii. 7; see διδάσκω. Side by side with them false teachers appear, not only without, but probably within the presbytery, 2 Tim. iv. 3; 1 Tim. i. 3; cf. ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι, 2 Pet. ii. 1; ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖν, 1 Tim. i. 3, vi. 3. —St. Paul calls himself, besides κήρυξ and ἀπόστολος, with special emphasis διδάσκαλος ἐθνῶν, 1 Tim. ii. 7; 2 Tim. i. 11; cf. ὁ διδ. τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ, John iii. 10; and as to the fact, not only Gal. ii. 7 sqq., but especially Eph. iii. 8, 9.

Διδασκαλία, ἡ, that which belongs to a διδάσκαλος (comp. διδασκάλιον, *teacher's pay*), *that which is taught*, like εὐαγγελία, εὐαγγέλιον, properly an adjective, εὐαγγέλιος, that which belongs to an εὐάγγελος = *teaching, instruction*, and for the most part in the objective, and therefore passive sense, *that which is taught, the doctrine*, distinguished from διδαχή, inasmuch as it refers to the authority of the teacher. Xen. *Cyrop.* viii. 7. 24, παρὰ τῶν προγεγενημένων μανθάνετε αὕτη γὰρ ἀρίστη διδασκαλία. But also actively of the act of teaching = *teaching, instructing*, Xen. *Oec.* xix. 15, ἄρα ἡ ἐρώτησις διδασκαλία ἐστίν. In the N. T. (I.) objectively doctrine, the διδασκαλαίαι ἀνθρώπων, Col. ii. 22; Matt. xv. 9, Mark vii. 7; cf. Eph. iv. 14 (see ἄνθρωπος, IV); δαιμονίων, 1 Tim. iv. 1, in antithesis Tit. ii. 10, ἡ διδασκ. τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ; absolutely, as ἡ διδασκαλία, 1 Tim. vi. 1, ἡ δ. βλασφημεῖται (cf. Tit. ii. 10); Tit. ii. 7; 1 Tim. iv. 16; Rom. xii. 7; more exactly ἡ κατ' εὐσέβειαν διδ., 1 Tim. vi. 3, ἡ καλὴ διδ., iv. 6, in distinction from the teaching of the ἑτεροδιδάσκαλοι ἡ ὑγαιίνουσα διδ., 1 Tim. i. 10; 2 Tim. iv. 3; Tit. i. 9, ii. 1; cf. 1 Tim. vi. 4, νοσῶν περὶ ζητήσεις καὶ λογομαχίας, ἐξ ὧν γίνεται φθονος κ.τ.λ., with i. 10.—(II.) Of *teaching, instruction, information, tuition*, Rom. xv. 4, ὅσα προεγράφη, εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν διδ. προεγράφη, 2 Tim. iii. 16, ὠφέλιμος πρὸς διδ., πρὸς ἔλεγχον κ.τ.λ.; 2 Tim. iii. 10, παρηκολούθηκας μοῦ τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ. With 1 Tim. v. 17, οἱ κοπιῶντες ἐν λόγῳ καὶ διδασκαλίᾳ, cf. Plut. *c. Epicuri doctrin.* 1096 A, οἱ περὶ χορῶν λόγοι καὶ διδασκαλαίαι, *disputationes et doctrinae*.

Ἑτεροδιδασκαλέω, only in 1 Tim. i. 3, vi. 3, and thence adopted into ecclesiastical Greek = *to teach a different kind of teaching, a teaching different from what is κατ' ἐξ. διδασκαλία* and the duty of a διδάσκαλος in the Christian church. Cf. Gal. i. 6, 7, μετατίθεσθε . . . εἰς ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον, ὃ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλο, where the exclusiveness of the

apostolic teaching is still more fully—comp. Plato, *Theaet.* 190 E, *δόξαν εἶναι ψευδῇ τὸ ἐτεροδοξεῖν*—insisted upon. In classical Greek the word is simply used of numerical difference (ἄλλος), not of difference in kind; cf. Acts xvii. 19, 20.

Δίκη, ἡ, connected with δείκνυμι, *dicere*, *zeigen*, originally = *manner, tendency*; so still in the absolute accusative δίκην, *after its kind, manner*, not rare in Pindar, Plato, and the Tragedians; e.g. Plato, *Phaedr.* 249 D ὄρνιθος δίκην βλέπων ἄνω. So also in Homer, e.g. *Od.* xix. 43, xxiv. 255, αὕτη τοι δίκη ἐστὶν θεῶν, and often, as = *manner*. See Curtius, p. 125. Hence δίκη gradually became the designation for the right of established custom or usage, and was personified as the daughter of Zeus and Themis; comp. Acts xxviii. 4, ὃν διασωθέντα ἐκ τῆς θαλάσσης ἡ Δίκη ξῆν οὐκ εἴασεν. This personification was transferred to Jewish soil, Wisd. i. 8, οὐδὲ παροδεύσῃ αὐτὸν ἡ δίκη. Suidas, ὀπισθόπους δίκη, ἡ μεθ' ἡμέραν ἀκολουθοῦσα τοῖς ἀδικήμασιν. The use of this word in its entire range is based upon the important idea here involved, that right in human society asserts itself essentially as judgment and vengeance. Thus is it when δίκη signifies *lawsuit, process, or punishment, atonement, satisfaction*. In the LXX. = דִּין, Ps. ix. 5, ἐποίησας τὴν κρίσιν μου καὶ τὴν δίκην μου, ἐκάθισας ἐπὶ θρόνον ὁ κρίνων δικαιοσύνην = דִּין, Lev. xxvi. 25, μάχαιρα ἐκδικοῦσα δίκην διαθήκης; דִּין דִּין. Deut. xxxii. 41, ἀποδώσω δίκην = דִּין דִּין, Ezek. xxv. 12. It is used for דִּין in Job xxix. 16, Ps. xxxv. 23, where we have as its parallel דִּין = κρίσις. Of the combinations usual in classical Greek in which δίκη stands with special reference to a decided (or to be decided) violation of right or of legitimate custom, there appears in the N. T. δίκην αἰτεῖν κατὰ τινος, Acts xxv. 15 (Lachm., καταδίκην); δίκην ὑπέχειν, Jude 7, literally, *to render justice*, of those who suffer punishment in order to the re-establishing of the order violated by them; and δίκην τίνειν, 2 Thess. i. 10, literally, *to pay the right, to atone for or make reparation*, also in classical Greek something like ἀποτίνειν δίκην = *to be punished*. Aristotle derives δίκη from δίχα, *Eth. Nic.* v. 4, τὸ μὲν ἀγαθοῦ πλεόν τοῦ κακοῦ δ' ἐλαττον κέρδος, τὸ δ' ἐναντίον ζημία· ὃν ἦν μέσον τὸ ἴσον, ὃ λέγομεν εἶναι δίκαιον· ὥστε τὸ ἐπανορθωτικὸν δίκαιον ἂν εἴη τὸ μέσον ζημίας καὶ κέρδους. διὸ καὶ ὅταν ἀμφισβητῶσιν, ἐπὶ τὸν δικαστὴν καταφεύγουσιν τὸ δ' ἐπὶ τὸν δικαστὴν ἵεναι ἵεναι ἐστὶν ἐπὶ τὸ δίκαιον. ὁ γὰρ δικαστὴς βούλεται εἶναι οἷον δίκαιον ἔμψυχον καὶ ζητοῦσι δικαστὴν μέσον καὶ καλοῦσιν ἔνιοι μεσιδίους, ὡς ἐὰν τοῦ μέσου τύχωσι, τοῦ δικαίου τευξόμενοι. μέσον ἄρα τι τὸ δίκαιον, εἴπερ καὶ ὁ δικαστής. ὁ δὲ δικαστὴς ἐπανισοῖ, καὶ ὥσπερ γραμμῆς εἰς ἄνισα τετμημένης, ὃ τὸ μείζον τμήμα τῆς ἡμισείας ὑπερέχει, τοῦτ' ἀφείλε καὶ τῇ ἐλάττονι τμήματι προσέθηκεν. ὅταν δὲ δίχα διαιρεθῇ τὸ ὅλον, τότε φασὶν ἔχειν τὰ αὐτῶν, ὅταν λάβωσι τὸ ἴσον. τὸ δ' ἴσον μέσον ἐστὶ τῆς μείζονος καὶ ἐλάττονος κατὰ τὴν ἀριθμητικὴν ἀναλογίαν. διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ὀνομάζεται δίκαιον, ὅτι δίχα ἐστίν, ὥσπερ ἂν εἴ τις εἴποι δίκαιον, καὶ ὁ δικαστὴς διχαστής.

Δίκαιος, α, ον (δίκαιος), *what is right, conformable to right, pertaining to right* = just, i.e. answering to the claims of usage, custom, or right, Matt. xx. 4, 7; Col. iv. 1. It is noteworthy that the Greek δίκη, δίκαιος, the Hebrew דִּין, דִּינָא, and the German

Recht, gerecht, contain the same fundamental idea;—*δίκη*, *manner, direction*, *δίκαιος*, *what answers to manner or to its manner*,—*רצ*, according to its etymology (see Fuerst, *Concord. V. T. s.v.*) = *rectum, planum esse*, synonymous with *רצ* (comp. Ps. xxiii. 3 with xxvii. 11, xlv. 7); Arabic, *zadaqa, erectum esse*; "*gerecht*"—what is *right, adjusted (richt)*, *correct*: comp. "*zurecht weisen*," *to put right*, in the sense of guiding or reprimanding with the old "*Recht weisen*" of the judge. The fundamental idea is that of a **state or condition conformable to order**, apart from the consideration whether usage and custom or other factors determine the order and direction. Thus *δίκαιος* is synonymous with *ἀγαθός*, only that *δίκαιος* is a conception of a relation, and presupposes a norm, whereas the subject of *ἀγαθός* is his own norm, so that *ἀγαθός* includes the predicate *δίκαιος*, see under *ἀγαθός*. Thus *δίκαιος*, like *ἀγαθός*, may be joined, *e.g.*, with *ἵππος, βούς, ἄρμα, γῆδιον*; and while *ἀγαθός* in these combinations is = *capable, excellent of its kind, serviceable*, *δίκαιος* is = *serviceable*, answering to the claims or standards set up. Cf. Xen. *Mem.* iv. 4. 5, *φασὶν δέ τινες καὶ ἵππον καὶ βούν τῷ βουλομένῳ δίκαιους ποιήσασθαι πάντα μεστὰ εἶναι τῶν διδασκόντων ἐὰν δέ τις βούληται ἢ αὐτὸς μαθεῖν τὸ δίκαιον ἢ υἱὸν ἢ οἰκέτην διδάσασθαι, μὴ εἰδέναι ὅποι ἂν ἐλθὼν τύχοι τούτου* (comp. the German *gerecht* = fitting, *e.g. handgerecht, fussgerecht*, etc.); Lucian, *de Conser. Hist.* 39, *συγγραφεὺς δίκαιος*, a *correct writer*; Hippocrates, xix. 22, *ἰητρὸς δίκαιος*, a *capable physician*. It is in keeping with the relation between *δίκαιος* and *ἀγαθός*, that *δίκαιος* is never, like *ἀγαθός*, used catachrestically, never ironically applied. Comp. Plato, *Rep.* ii. 361, "a just man, as Aeschylus says, is one who will not seem good, but be good."

As to the import of the conception in a moral sense, there is a decisive difference, not to be mistaken, between the profane, and especially the Greek, usage and the biblical, and this difference arises from the different, nay, opposite standards by which it is estimated in the two spheres. Righteousness in the biblical sense is a condition of rightness the standard of which is God, which is estimated according to the divine standard, which shows itself in behaviour conformable to God, and has to do above all things with its relation to God, and with the walk before Him. It is, and it is called, *δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ* (*μαρτυρουμένη ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν*. Rom. iii. 21), i. 17,—righteousness as it belongs to God and is of value before Him, *Godlike righteousness*, see Eph. iv. 24 (see under *δικαιοσύνη*); with this righteousness, thus defined, the gospel (Rom. i. 17) comes into that world of nations, which had been wont to measure by a different standard. Righteousness in the Scripture sense is a thoroughly religious conception, designating the normal relation of men and their acts, etc., to God. Righteousness in the profane mind is a preponderatingly social virtue, only with a certain religious background.

With the Greeks, according to the saying of Protagoras, **man is the measure of all things**, Plato, *Crat.* 385 E, *Theaet.* 152 A, *φησι γάρ που πάντων χρημάτων μέτρον ἀνθρώπων εἶναι, τῶν μὲν ὄντων, ὡς ἔστι, τῶν δὲ μὴ ὄντων, ὡς οὐκ ἔστιν*; and how greatly this influences the conception of righteousness, is clear from Plato, *Legg.* iv. 716 C, *ὁ δὲ θεὸς ἡμῖν πάντων χρημάτων μέτρον ἂν εἴη μάλιστα, καὶ πολὺ μᾶλλον ἢ ποῦ τις ὡς φασιν*

ἄνθρωπος, in which very passage an attempt is made to make way for a deeper conception without really approaching the Scripture view, καὶ κατὰ τοῦτον δὴ τὸν λόγον ὁ μὲν σῶφρων ἡμῶν θεῷ φίλος, ὅμοιος γάρ, ὁ δὲ μὴ σῶφρων ἀνόμοιός τε καὶ διάφορος καὶ ἄδικος; it lacks personal relationship to God as the basis and the goal of the entire life movement, and stops short with the ὅμοιος, ἀκόλουθος θεῷ. Generally, usage and custom, the marked-out and prescribed direction or method, form the basis of right, just as δίκη denotes right as established custom and usage. Right is the sum of the historically formed relations of life as they manifest themselves in human society,—a view still current in modern jurisprudence; and it need scarcely be proved how much the claims of civil society determine the conception of righteousness,—take, for instance, the accusation and condemnation of Socrates. Righteousness perhaps includes a certain *religious* bearing, but even this with a preponderatingly *social* reference; comp. Xen. *Mem.* i. 1. 1, ἀδικεῖ Σωκράτης οὓς μὲν ἡ πόλις νομίζει θεοὺς οὐ νομίζων, with iv. 4. 13, where Socrates himself argues that that man does justly who obeys αἱ οἱ πολῖται, συνθέμενοι ἃ τε δεῖ ποιεῖν καὶ ὧν ἀπέχεσθαι ἐγράψαντο. Granting, indeed, that the conception of righteousness is not here exhausted, but only, so to speak, the juristic side of it presented,—while a deeper apprehension demands the inner personal relation to the claims of right, and Aeschylus, as above cited, says that a just man is he who will not only seem, but be good,—still a closer investigation will ever more fully show that righteousness is a virtue essentially social, since right fixes the limits of individual liking, as the life of the community as a higher necessity authenticates them. The δίκαιος is he who does not selfishly nor yet self-forgettingly transgress the bounds fixed for him, and gives to every one his own, yet still desires what is his, and does not in the least withdraw the assertion of his own claims,—a view which Christianity has continually to combat. How much this latter element is to be considered is clear from the frequent δίκαιος εἰμί with the infinitive, in the sense, *I am justified, entitled, worthy, I deserve, I have a right*, but rarely in the sense, *I am obliged, I am bound*; and so also τὸ ἐμὸν δίκαιον, τὰ ἐμὰ δίκαια = *my right, my rights* (Euripides, Thucydides, Demosthenes, Plutarch). The legitimate claim stands first, afterwards comes the obligation, the requisition of right (whereas the German view, for example, “mein Recht meine Pflicht,” “my right is my duty,” in which the obligation of right is emphasized, already closely approximates to the divine revelation). Further, how greatly the virtue of righteousness is confined to the sphere of social life, is evident from the contrast between βία and δίκη, *Il.* xvi. 388, *Od.* xiv. 84; from the use of ἀδικεῖν, in the sense, *to encroach upon one's right, to wrong*, as synonymous with βιάζεσθαι, βλάπτειν, comp. also Xen. *Mem.* iv. 6. 6, ὁρθῶς ἂν ποτὲ ἄρα ὀριζοίμεθα, ὀριζόμενα δικαίους εἶναι τοὺς εἰδότας τὰ περὶ ἀνθρώπους νόμιμα. Both elements, one's own right, and duty towards others, the *sum cuiusque* in a transitive and reflexive sense, are combined in Aristotle, *Rhet.* i. 9, ἔστι δὲ δικαιοσύνη μὲν ἀρετὴ δι' ἣν τὰ αὐτῶν ἕκαστοι ἔχουσι καὶ ὡς ὁ νόμος, ἀδικία δὲ δι' ἣν τὰ ἀλλότρια, οὐχ ὡς ὁ νόμος. Thus it is correct to say, that he is δίκαιος “who regards the rights of other men, and fulfils his duties

towards them" (Schenkl); in other words, δίκαιος is a social conception, and continues so even where it is so deeply apprehended as to border upon the Christian *love of our neighbour* (see Nägelsbach, *Nachhomer. Theol.* p. 239; see under πλῆσιον).

Withal, however, it must not be overlooked that the Greek δικαιοσύνη, though still far distant from the conception of a δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ, had nevertheless a certain religious background, which rendered possible its penetration with the fulness of Scripture meaning, and the deepening of its conception. Linguistic usage is already a proof of this, indicating as it does that it was not impossible, though very rare, to use ἀδικεῖν as the antithesis of εὐσεβεῖν (Eurip. *Phoen.* 527, cf. *Hymn. in Cer.* 367, where, as in Aeschylus, *Sept.* 580, δίκαιος stands in contrast with δυσσεβής), although Xen. *Cyrop.* viii. 8. 4, περὶ θεοῦς ἀσεβειαν, περὶ δὲ ἀνθρώπους ἀδικίαν, tells on the other side. Comp. Plato, *Legg.* ix. 854 E, περὶ θεοῦς ἢ περὶ γονέας ἢ περὶ πόλιν ἡδίκηκώς τῶν μεγάλων τινὰ . . . ἀδικιῶν. But it must specially be insisted upon, that with Homer he is δικαιοτάτος who best is master of his duties towards gods and men (Passow), that δίκη is a daughter of Zeus and Themis—that is, that the state of law and justice, "which the political and social culture of the Homeric manhood brought about, sprang not at all from human reflection or agreement, but from divine ordainment" (Nägelsbach, *Homer. Theol.* p. 227). There is, indeed, therefore but little change in the view of what δικαιοσύνη includes as a virtue asserting itself in human society, when in *Iliad.* xiii. 6 the Abii are designated δικαιοτάτοι ἄνθρωποι, *the best mannered people*. But though it cannot be added that righteousness was viewed as the normal state of relationship to God, it is nevertheless always worthy of observation that it at least appears, in the train of and in natural connection with the fear of God, that the two stand and keep their ground side by side; that is, as Nägelsbach in the place above cited puts it, "the characteristic standpoint of the Homeric Ethics is, that the spheres of law, of morals, and of religion are by no means separate, as if a man could be, e.g., δίκαιος without being θεουδής, but lie side by side in undeveloped unity." See the passage cited by Nägelsbach, *Od.* vi. 119 sqq., ὦμοι ἐγὼ, τέων αὐτε βροτῶν ἐς γαῖαν ἰκάνω; ἦ ῥ' οἷ γ' ὑβρισταί τε καὶ ἄγριοι οὐδὲ δίκαιοι, ἦ ἐ φιλόξενοι, καὶ σφιν νόος ἐστὶ θεουδής, where the predicates chiastically (crosswise) correspond, the duties of hospitality forming an essential part of δικαιοσύνη. We find the same thing, only more faintly, still later. On the one hand, it is true τὸ τὰ αὐτοῦ πράττειν καὶ μὴ πολυπραγμονεῖν δικαιοσύνη ἐστίν (Plato, *Rep.* iv. 333 A); and on the other, Plato in another place designates δικαιοσύνη inseparably linked with σωφροσύνη, as ἡ δημοτικὴ τε καὶ πολιτικὴ ἀρετὴ (*Phaedo*, 82 B). But as we saw above (Xen. *Mem.* i. 1. 1), a certain religious bearing belongs to social and civil righteousness, and though δίκαιος and εὐσεβής are distinct, they are not divorced, rather are they bound together in one whole like ὅσια καὶ δίκαια (see under ὅσιος), comp. Xen. *Mem.* iv. 8. 11, where Xenophon sums up his judgment concerning Socrates as ἄριστός τε ἀνὴρ καὶ εὐδαιμονέστατος, thus, ἐμοὶ μὲν δὴ . . . εὐσεβής μὲν οὕτως, ὥστε μηδὲν ἄνευ τῆς τῶν θεῶν γνώμης ποιεῖν, δίκαιος δέ, ὥστε βλάπτειν μὲν μηδὲ μικρὸν μηδένα, ὠφελεῖν δὲ τὰ μέγιστα τοὺς χρωμένους αὐτῷ κ.τ.λ. . . . ἐδόκει . . ., with Isocr. xii. 124,

ἡσκηκότας εὐσέβειαν μὲν περὶ τοὺς θεοὺς, δικαιοσύνην δὲ περὶ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους. Comp. further, the passages above cited from Eurip. *Phoen.* 527; Aeschylus, *Sept.* 580, where δίκαιος stands in antithesis with δυσσεβής; Xen. *Anab.* ii. 6. 26, ἀγάλλεται ἐπὶ θεοσεβείᾳ καὶ ἀληθείᾳ καὶ δικαιοσύνῃ. Thus ἀδικία becomes ἀσέβεια, though in and for itself it is not religious behaviour; δικαιοσύνη, however, was not regarded as separated from its religious accompaniment, comp. the passages cited by Nägelsbach, *Nachhom. Theol.* p. 238; Aristoph. *Plut.* 28, ἐγὼ θεοσεβὴς καὶ δίκαιος ὢν ἀνὴρ κακῶς ἔπραττον. "This θεοσεβὴς καὶ δίκαιος becomes in line 61 ἀνὴρ εὖορκος, a word which expresses right behaviour towards gods and men." Δικαιοσύνη is and remains a social virtue; there is, indeed, also an ἀδικεῖν περὶ θεοῦς (see above, Plato, *Legg.* ix. 854 E), but every ἀδικία is not already in and for itself ἀδικία περὶ τοὺς θεοὺς; δικαιοσύνη only pertains to the *ethico-religious* conduct.

Thus it appears how new, and yet not unprepared for, was the introduction of the Pauline δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ into the profane soil. That δικαιοσύνη must be a δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ, that God is the goal and standard of integrity, this is one of those unexpressed presuppositions and underlying thoughts of Holy Scripture to which Paul in this and other instances, with the peculiar acuteness and clearness which distinguish him in apprehending the ethico-religious contrast, has devoted the word. At the same time, it is a presentiment not attaining clearness, yet often felt and asserting itself in the Greek and, indeed, generally in the human mind (see above, Plato, *Legg.* iv. 717 C), which is inalienable so long as there exists in man the presentiment or the consciousness and intelligence more or less clear of a highest and final judgment (cf. Acts xvii. 31).

In the LXX. δίκαιος and δικαιοσύνη are constantly employed to render רָצָה, רָצִיתָ (with the exception of Isa. xi. 4, where the Hebrew expression is generalized as = κρίσις). But רָצָה is a rectitude whose standard is God,—Job iv. 17, xxxii. 2, and other texts,—and lays claim to the whole range of human life, so that, on the one hand, even measure and weight, רָצָה מִן הַמֶּזֶל, Lev. xix. 36, appear among the divine ordinances of a life leading to eternity; and, on the other hand, righteousness in general, in all stages of the history of redemption, signifies conduct and relationship answering to the contents of the divine revelation thus far made, Gen. vii. 1, vi. 9, 11, 12; accordingly it is to be observed that the manifestation of righteousness existing at the time orders itself after the standard of divine knowledge conditioned by the revelation, so that, for example, mention can be made of righteous men before the revelation of the δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ in the gospel was introduced.

I. Used of God Himself, δίκαιος designates before all His bearing towards mankind, and also His doings, not as answering to the claims to be made upon Him from men, in which case it could not be said, πιστός ἐστιν καὶ δίκαιος, ἵνα ἀφῇ ἡμῖν τὰς ἁμαρτίας, καὶ καθάρισή ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης ἀδικίας, 1 John i. 9 (comp. Luke xvi. 10, where πιστός stands in opposition to ἄδικος, and therefore as synonymous with δίκαιος), but as answering to the norm once for all established in and with Himself, so that holiness, in which God's nature manifests itself, is the presupposition of righteousness, cf. Rom. vii. 12, ἡ ἐντολὴ

ἀγία καὶ δικαία. It concerns the agreement between His nature, the norm for all, and His acting, *πιστός μένει· ἀρνήσασθαι γὰρ ἑαυτὸν οὐ δύναται*, 2 Tim. ii. 13; see *πιστός*. Comp. xxxii. 4, *θεὸς πιστὸς καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἀδικία ἐν αὐτῷ, δίκαιος καὶ ὅσιος κύριος*; Neh. ix. 8, *ἔστησας τοὺς λόγους σου, ὅτι δίκαιος σύ*; Isa. xxxiv. 16. Hence it at once follows that no judgment upon God's doings can establish any fault or want, Ps. li. 6, Rom. iii. 3, 4, where, in like manner, God's faithfulness and righteousness are united. Dan. ix. 7; Ps. cxlv. 17; Deut. xxxii. 4; John xvii. 25, *πάτερ δίκαιε, καὶ ὁ κόσμος σε οὐκ ἔγνω*; Rom. iii. 26; 2 Tim. iv. 8; 1 John ii. 29, iii. 7; Rev. xvi. 5.

II. Of men and their doings, it denotes their normal relation to the will and judgment of God. There are some Pauline texts in which *δίκαιος* appears still with the social narrowness of its meaning in profane Greek; but this does not involve any contradiction in the Scripture view, because the Scripture conception does not exclude the profane representation in itself, but only its narrowness. Thus in Rom. v. 7, *μόλις γὰρ ὑπὲρ δικαίου τις ἀποθανεῖται· ὑπὲρ γὰρ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ τάχα τις καὶ τολμᾷ ἀποθανεῖν* (see under *ἀγαθός*). Further, Phil. i. 7, *καθὼς ἔστιν δίκαιον ἐμοὶ τοῦτο φρονεῖν ὑπὲρ πάντων ἡμῶν*; Col. iv. 1, *οἱ κύριοι, τὸ δίκαιον καὶ τὴν ἰσότητα τοῖς δούλοις παρέχεσθε*. In Tit. i. 8 also the union of *δίκαιος* with *σώφρων* and *ὅσιος* perfectly agrees with the usage of classical Greek, and this passage is one of those instances of coincidences with profane usage in which the Pastoral Epistles are comparatively speaking so rich; see, for example, under *καλός*.

Apart from these passages, *δίκαιος* throughout the N. T. designates that person or thing which corresponds with the divine norm, whether, as the connection will show, the reference be to the person's conduct before or towards God, or to his relation to the claims and judgment of God. For the former, see Luke i. 17, *ἐπιστρέφει ἀπειθεῖς ἐν φρονήσει δικαίων, ἐτοιμάσαι κυρίῳ λαὸν κατεσκευασμένον*, and in all places where *δίκαιος* denotes the normal condition of the religious life (see below); for the latter, e.g. Rom. ii. 13, *οὐ γὰρ οἱ ἀκροαταὶ νόμου δίκαιοι παρὰ τῷ θεῷ, ἀλλ' οἱ ποιηταὶ νόμου δικαιωθήσονται*. We must distinguish between *δίκαιος* in the wider and in the narrower sense,—a distinction which often, though not always, coincides with that just described. Thus it is said in Luke i. 6, *ἦσαν δίκαιοι ἀμφότεροι ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ, πορευόμενοι ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐντολαῖς καὶ δικαιομασίαις τοῦ κυρίου ἄμεμπτοι*; and the same Paul who in Phil. iii. 6 says, *κατὰ δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐν νόμῳ γενόμενος ἄμεμπτος*, cf. 2 Tim. i. 3, says elsewhere, *οὐκ ἔστι δίκαιος οὐδὲ εἷς*, Rom. iii. 10, and ver. 20, *ἐξ ἔργων νόμου οὐ δικαιωθήσεται πᾶσα σὰρξ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ*; cf. ver. 19, *ἵνα πᾶν στόμα φραγῇ, καὶ ὑπόδικος γένηται πᾶς ὁ κόσμος τῷ θεῷ*. For the reconciling of such statements, see under *νόμος*. Accordingly we distinguish (a) *δίκαιος* in the wider sense, *answering to the demands of God in general*, of those who obey as their *norm* what they know of God or what has been revealed; thus, when in Matt. xiii. 17, x. 41, xxiii. 29, *προφῆται καὶ δίκαιοι* are joined together to express the sum of those who waited for the final salvation of God, the *προφῆται* are those who announced it, the *δίκαιοι* those whose conduct answered to this announcement. Cf.

Luke ii. 25, δίκαιος καὶ εὐλαβής, προσδεχόμενος παράκλησιν τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, not to be taken as parallel with Plato, *Vir. civ.* 311 A, τὰ μὲν γὰρ σωφρόνων ἀρχόντων ἦθη σφόδρα μὲν εὐλαβὴ καὶ δίκαια καὶ σωτήρια, where εὐλαβὴ, as synonymous with σώφρων, does not stand in a religious sense, whereas in Luke ii. 25 εὐλαβής denotes the fear of God; comp. Acts x. 22, Luke xxiii. 50, of Joseph of Arimathea, ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς καὶ δίκαιος, ὃς προσεδέχετο τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ. In all these cases δίκαιος is equivalent to *pious*; cf. Acts x. 22, ἀνὴρ δίκαιος καὶ φοβούμενος τὸν θεόν, with ver. 2, εὐσεβὴς καὶ φοβούμενος τὸν θεόν. How far this signification of δίκαιος is different from the narrower use of the word appears from a comparison of Peter's statement concerning Cornelius, Acts x. 35, ἐν παντὶ ἔθνει ὁ φοβούμενος τὸν θεὸν καὶ ἐργαζόμενος δικαιοσύνην δεκτὸς αὐτῷ ἐστίν, with the Pauline doctrine of justification, inasmuch as what Peter expresses concerning the δίκαιος καὶ φοβούμενος τ. θ. in the words δεκτὸς τῷ θεῷ appears in Paul as the *justifying act of God*. In the wider sense δίκαιος occurs again in Matt. v. 45, τὸν ἥλιον αὐτοῦ ἀνατέλλει ἐπὶ πονηροῦς καὶ ἀγαθοῦς, καὶ βρέχει ἐπὶ δικαίους καὶ ἀδίκους. In Scripture usage the conception of righteousness is more closely defined by its contrast with sin,—a contrast wanting in the profane sphere where neither the word *sin* nor the conception of it is defined with any sharpness; see under ἀμαρτάνω. Cf. 1 John iii. 7, ὁ ποιῶν τὴν δικαιοσύνην, δίκαιός ἐστιν, καθὼς ἐκεῖνος δίκαιός ἐστιν, with ver. 8, ὁ ποιῶν τὴν ἀμαρτίαν; Eccles. vii. 21, ἄνθρωπος οὐκ ἔστι δίκαιος ἐν τῇ γῇ, ὃς ποιήσει ἀγαθὸν καὶ οὐχ ἀμαρτήσεται. A relation to sin therefore enters into the conception of δίκαιος, cf. Luke xv. 7, ἐπὶ ἐνὶ ἀμαρτωλῷ μετανοοῦντι, ἢ ἐπὶ . . . δίκαιοις, οἳ τινες οὐ χρεῖαν ἔχουσιν μετανοίας; Matt. ix. 13, οὐ γὰρ ἦλθον καλεῖσαι δικαίους, ἀλλ' ἀμαρτωλοὺς; Mark ii. 17; Luke v. 32, where it is added, εἰς μετάνοιαν; cf. Luke xviii. 9, τοὺς πεποιθότας ἐφ' ἑαυτοῖς ὅτι εἰσὶν δίκαιοι, with ver. 14, κατέβη οὗτος δεδικαιωμένος ἢ γὰρ ἐκεῖνος. In these places the narrower meaning of δίκαιος already appears, and, without prejudice to the knowledge that he only is strictly speaking (negatively) δίκαιος who stands in no relation whatever to sin, and that there was not one such among the people for whom Christ appeared, this word is predicated of those in whom God's saving work in Christ had not yet been realized; so that δίκαιος in the wider sense must signify those whose freedom from sin is only a matter of principle, and is not yet completed (see above, Eccles. vii. 21). In this wider sense δίκαιος occurs again in Acts xxiv. 15, ἀνάστασιν μέλλειν δικαίων καὶ ἀδίκων; Luke xiv. 1, xx. 20; Matt. xiii. 43, οἱ δίκαιοι ἐκλάμψουσιν . . . ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῶν, cf. with vv. 41, 42, 49, 50, xxv. 37, 34, 46; 1 Pet. iii. 12, iv. 18; Jas. v. 16; 2 Pet. ii. 7, 8. In Matt. i. 19, Ἰωσήφ . . . δίκαιος ὢν, καὶ μὴ θέλων δειγματίσαι, δίκαιος is not so much = *kind*, which cannot be proved, but rather denotes *piety*, conduct conformable to God; comp. Matt. v. 44 sqq., ix. 13; Luke xiv. 12–14. In part, comp. Nägelsbach, *Nachhom. Theol.* v. 2. 32 sqq., "If a man finally becomes just to the needy, the unprotected, the unfortunate generally, so that he secures for them what is their due, his righteousness becomes compassion. The justice which he who needs help can lay claim to is a justice vouchsafed and guaranteed by the Deity. Pindar, *Olymp.* ii. 6, δίκαιος ὅπ' ξένων."

(*h*) δίκαιος in the narrower or stricter sense, *perfectly answering to the divine demands*; or, negatively, *rid of and free from all sin, guiltless*. The distinction of a stricter or deeper meaning, as it is found everywhere, is traceable also in profane Greek. We may compare with Matt. xxvii. 19, *μηδέν σοι καὶ τῷ δικαίῳ ἐκείνῳ* (ver. 24, Rec. text), Luke xxiii. 47, *ὅντως ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος δίκαιος ἦν*, the famous passage in Plato, *Rep.* ii. 362 A, *ἔρουσιν δὲ τάδε, ὅτι οὕτω διακείμενος ὁ δίκαιος μαστιγώσεται, στρεβλώσεται, δεδήσεται, ἐκκαυθήσεται τῷ φθαλμῷ, τελευτῶν πάντα κακὰ παθὼν ἀνασχιנדυλευθήσεται καὶ γινώσεται, ὅτι οὐκ εἶναι δίκαιον, ἀλλὰ δοκεῖν δεῖ ἐθελεῖν*. Either a positive or negative view of the conception may be prominent. The latter especially is so where a legislative judgment is treated of which establishes innocence, or acquits from accusation or guilt, and generally when a contrast with these is indicated, and where the sinner is spoken of; see δικαιοῶ. Comp. Rom. ii. 13, *οὐ γὰρ οἱ ἀκροαταὶ νόμου δίκαιοι παρὰ τῷ θεῷ, ἀλλ' οἱ ποιηταὶ νόμου δικαιοθήσονται*; v. 19; Gal. iii. 11. The conception itself, however, is not altered by the prevalence of one or the other aspect; cf. with the other passages, Rom. iii. 10; 1 Tim. i. 9; Rom. i. 17 (from Hab. ii. 4, as in Heb. x. 38), xi. 4, xii. 23; Matt. xxiii. 35. —1 John iii. 7, *ὁ ποιῶν τὴν δικαιοσύνην δίκαιός ἐστιν*; Rev. xxii. 11.—With the article, ὁ δίκαιος is used of Christ, Jas. v. 6, *κατεδικάσατε, ἐφονεύσατε τὸν δίκαιον*; Acts iii. 14, *ὡμεῖς δὲ τὸν ἅγιον καὶ δίκαιον ἠρνήσασθε, καὶ ἤτήσασθε ἄνδρα φονέα κ.τ.λ.*; vii. 52, *περὶ τῆς ἐλεύσεως τοῦ δικαίου, οὗ νῦν ὡμεῖς προδόται καὶ φονεῖς ἐγένεσθε*; ii. 14, *ἰδεῖν τὸν δίκαιον*. Without the article, in 1 Pet. iii. 18, *Χριστὸς . . ἔπαθεν, δίκαιος ὑπὲρ ἀδίκων*; 1 John ii. 1, *ἐάν τις ἀμάρτην παράκλητον ἔχομεν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν δίκαιον*. The reference is everywhere to the significance of Christ's character and its estimation or worth, cf. 1 John ii. 2.

Joined with common nouns, 1 John iii. 12, *ἔργα δίκαια*; John v. 30, vii. 24; 2 Thess. i. 5; Rev. xv. 3, xvi. 7, xix. 2, *κρίσις*. The neuter used as a substantive, Luke xii. 57, *τί δὲ καὶ ἀφ' ἐαυτῶν οὐ κρίνετε τὸ δίκαιον*; 2 Pet. i. 13; the same as predicate, Acts iv. 19, *εἰ δίκαιόν ἐστιν ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ κρίνατε*; Eph. vi. 1; Phil. iv. 8; 2 Thess. i. 6.

Δικαίως, Luke xxiii. 41; 1 Cor. xv. 34; 1 Pet. ii. 23; Tit. ii. 12; 1 Thess. ii. 10.

Δίκαιος stands in antithesis with παράνομος, Prov. iii. 32 = חָזָק, Job ix. 23 = חָזָק.—ἀσεβής, Gen. xviii. 23 = נָפֶשׁ. In the N. T. 1 Pet. iii. 12, *ποιῶντες κακά*; iv. 18, *ἀσεβὴς καὶ ἀμάρτωλος*; 2 Pet. ii. 7, *ἄθεσμος*; ver. 8, *ἀνομος*. Cf. 1 Tim. i. 9, *δικαίῳ νόμῳ οὐ κείται, ἀνόμοις δὲ καὶ ἀνυποτάκτοις, ἀσέβεισιν κ.τ.λ.* Elsewhere usually with ἄδικος. Synonyms, ἄγιος, ὁσιος, ἀγαθός.

Δικαιοσύνη, ἡ, the essence of δίκαιον, or δίκαιος, righteousness, as that relationship to δίκη which fulfils its claims, an actually present and realized conformity with the claims to be maintained. Cf. Plato, *Rep.* iv. 433, *τὸ τὰ αὐτοῦ πράττειν καὶ μὴ πολυπραγμανεῖν δικαιοσύνη ἐστίν*. Opposed to ἀνομία, Xen. *Mem.* i. 1. 24, *ἄνθρωποι ἀνομία μᾶλλον ἢ δικαιοσύνη χρώμενοι*. See 2 Cor. vi. 14. For the relation of the Greek view to that of Scripture, *vid.* δίκαιος. In its scriptural sense, both in the O. T. and N. T., righteousness

is the state commanded by God, and standing the test of His judgment (cf. 2 Cor. iii. 9), the character and acts of a man approved of Him, in virtue of which the man corresponds with Him and His will as his ideal and standard, cf. Eph. iv. 24; or more generally, it denotes the sum-total of all that God commands, of all that He appoints. As God Himself is thus the standard of this righteousness, it is δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ,—a righteousness which, as it belongs to God or to itself for God, is well pleasing to Him, *Godlike righteousness*, Jas. i. 20, ὁργὴ ἀνδρὸς δικαιοσύνην θεοῦ οὐ κατεργάζεται; Matt. vi. 33, ζητεῖτε δὲ πρῶτον τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὴν δικαιοσύνην αὐτοῦ. The genitive is *gen. possessionis* or *qualitatis*, as e.g. Plat. *Gorg.* 506 E, ψυχὴ κόσμον ἔχουσα τὸν ἐαυτῆς ἀμείνων τῆς ἀκοσμήτου; Xen. *Cyrop.* vii. 5. 74, εἰ μὲν τρεφόμεθα ἐπὶ ῥαδιουργίαν καὶ τὴν τῶν κακῶν ἀνθρώπων ἡδυνάθειαν; Dem., Ἄν τὰ ἔργα ἀδελφοῦ ποιῆς, δόξεις εἶναι συγγενῆς (in Krüger, § xlvii. 5. 13). Cf. μορφὴ δούλου, Phil. ii. 7. Just such a righteousness—a righteousness that ought to be the goal of human effort and desire, and the result of human conduct—St. Paul insists upon as, strictly speaking, the Scripture conception of δικαιοσύνη, Rom. iii. 21, δικ. θεοῦ . . . μαρτυρουμένη ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν, and as the result of the N. T. salvation realized or to be realized in man—as that which man finds in the gospel, Rom. i. 17 and elsewhere (see under II. α). The subject of it with Paul is always man. The Scripture view is so complete in itself, and so continually repeated, that it would be unnatural to take λόγος δικαιοσύνης (Heb. v. 13), with Michaelis, Zachariä, and Dindorf, as meaning merely *righteous discourse*, or, with Delitzsch, as = *words right to be taught and to be believed*, for which רַצְוֹנִיּוֹת, רַצְוֹנִיּוֹת are not examples in point; cf. רַצְוֹנִיּוֹת, Lev. xix. 36, under δίκαιος. Far rather, λόγ. δικ. means the word whose subject-matter and object are δικαιοσύνη, for the understanding of which what is stated in ver. 14 is requisite. Cf. ὁδὸς δικαιοσύνης, 2 Pet. ii. 21; Matt. xxi. 32.

We must now distinguish—

I. δικαιοσύνη = *righteousness in general, God-conformable uprightness*, including the whole range of this conception without reference to any particular form of its embodiment. Rom. xiv. 17, ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστὶν δικαιοσύνη καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ χαρὰ ἐν πν. ἀγ.; Acts xxiv. 25, διαλέγεσθαι περὶ δικαιοσύνης; John xvi. 8, 10, ἐλέγχειν περὶ δικ.; 2 Pet. ii. 5, δικαιοσύνης κήρυξ; Rom. ix. 31, νόμος δικ.; 2 Pet. ii. 21, ὁδὸς δικ., as in Matt. xxi. 32; ἐχθρὸς δικ., Acts xiii. 10; 2 Cor. xi. 15, διάκονος δικαιοσύνης; Heb. vii. 2, βασιλεὺς δικ.; 2 Tim. iv. 8, ὁ τῆς δικ. στέφανος; Gal. v. 5, ἐλπίς δικ.; 2 Cor. iii. 9, ἡ διακονία τῆς δικ. (For the special thought associated with the word in St. Paul's writings, see II. α.) Heb. i. 9, ἀγαπᾶν δικ.; 1 Pet. ii. 24, τῇ δικ. ζῆν. Righteousness in this sense is the sum of all that God requires, in opposition to ἁμαρτία (which see), and accordingly the strong expression is explained in 2 Cor. v. 21, ἵνα ἡμεῖς γενώμεθα δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ ἐν Χριστῷ; cf. 1 Cor. i. 30, Χριστὸς ἐγενήθη ἡμῖν σοφία ἀπὸ θεοῦ, δικαιοσύνη τε καὶ ἁγιασμὸς καὶ ἀπολύτρωσις; Rom. x. 4, τέλος γὰρ νόμου Χριστὸς εἰς δικαιοσύνην παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι. Comp. 1 John iii. 7 with ver. 8.—To these we may also add, ἡ πίστις λογίζεται εἰς δικαιοσύνην, Rom. iv. 3, 5, 9, 22; Gal. iii. 6; Jas. iii. 22

= faith which is taken into account or reckoned as righteousness (cf. in later Greek the often occurring *εἰς οὐδὲν λογισθῆναι*, to be accounted as nothing). Rom. iv. 6, 11, *λογίζεσθαι τινι δικ.*, to reckon righteousness to the account of any one, cf. *λογίζεσθαι ἁμαρτίαν, παραπτώματα*, Rom. iv. 8 ; 2 Cor. v. 19 ; 2 Tim. iv. 16.—It is incontestably clear from 2 Cor. v. 21 that the Pauline expression *δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ* is to be understood in this wide sense, and in the manner above explained. In connection with Pauline thought and doctrine, however, is to be taken the representation of what holds good of the *δικ. θεοῦ*, namely, that it is the righteousness which God not only demands, but gives to man (cf. *ἀποκαλύπτεται*, Rom. i. 17, 18, and Isa. xlviii. 18, where *δικαιοσύνη* appears side by side with *εἰρήνη* as God's gift), and which is appropriated by faith ; hence *δικ. πίστεως, ἐκ πίστεως*, so that there results a state of the man which may all the more be called *δικ. θεοῦ*, because it proceeds directly from God Himself, and is *δικ. ἐκ θεοῦ*. This last, however, is not primarily included in the conception ; it is only a representation associated with it, derived from the connection of the doctrine, as is evident from the comparison of Rom. x. 3 with 2 Cor. v. 21. In the latter passage, *δικ. θεοῦ* can only mean "a righteousness conformable to God." The same expression, with the same meaning, forms, in Rom. x. 3, an antithesis to *ἰδία δικ.*, so far as it is a *term. techn.* for that righteousness of which it had already been shown that it is in the fullest sense a *δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ ἐκ θεοῦ*. Thus the *δικ. θεοῦ* is a *δικ. ἐκ θεοῦ* ; but we must not regard these two expressions as identical.

In considering (II.) *righteousness in its more special and particular manifestations*, we must distinguish—

(a.) *δικαιοσύνη* as a state of the subject who stands God's judgment, who, having fulfilled all obligations, has no guilt to hide. Thus the word occurs in Matt. v. 20, *ἐὰν μὴ περισσέυσῃ ἡ δικ. ὑμῶν πλεῖον τῶν γραμματέων* ; Matt. v. 6, *οἱ διψῶντες τὴν δικ.* ; 2 Cor. ix. 9, 10 ; Gal. ii. 21, iii. 21 ; Rom. vi. 20, *ὅτε γὰρ δοῦλοι ἦτε τῆς ἁμαρτίας, ἐλευθεροὶ ἦτε τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ* ; Eph. vi. 14, *ἐνδυσάμενοι τὸν θώρακα τῆς δικ.* ; Rom. ix. 30, *ἔθνη τὰ μὴ διώκοντα δικαιοσύνην κατέλαβεν δικ.*, *δικ. δὲ τὴν ἐκ πίστεως* ; Jas. iii. 18, *καρπὸς δὲ δικαιοσύνης ἐν εἰρήνῃ σπείρεται τοῖς ποιοῦσιν εἰρήνην* ; cf. Heb. xii. 11, *διώκειν δικ.* ; 1 Tim. vi. 11 ; 2 Tim. ii. 22. Thus mention is made of *God's righteousness* so far as God is regarded as one who acts as He is bound (*sit venia verbo !*) by Himself to act, so that He does not contradict Himself, Rom. iii. 5, 25, 26. But that *δικ. θεοῦ*, which denotes a righteousness perfect before Him, is, as a state of the subject to whom it is communicated, more accurately described *δικ. ἐκ θεοῦ*, Phil. iii. 7 (*δωρεὰ τῆς δικ.*, Rom. v. 17), in contrast with *ἡ ἐμὴ δικ. ἡ ἐκ τοῦ νόμου*, cf. Rom. x. 5, Gal. iii. 21, which may indeed be held to be righteousness (Rom. x. 3 ; Phil. iii. 6), but which really is not (Gal. iii. 21 ; Rom. x. 5), but only bears the name inasmuch as it fulfils the claims set up by itself on a legal basis (*ἰδία δικ.*, Rom. x. 3), but does not satisfy God and His law. This is, however, one difference between the righteousness springing from the law and that righteousness of God which is imputed and imparted as a gift to man. The other difference is, that whereas the righteousness of the law is a state to be attained only by the fulfilling of the

law, the righteousness of God is a state called forth by God's act of justification, namely, by judicial disengagement or release from all that stands in the way of *δίκαιος εἶναι* (see *δικαιοῦν*),—a liberation of which man becomes partaker by means of faith. Hence *δικ. πίστεως*, Rom. iv. 11–13; *ἐκ πίστεως*, Rom. ix. 30, x. 6, to which expressions the others—*δικ. θεοῦ, ἐκ θεοῦ*—correspond. Cf. Heb. xi. 7, *τῆς κατὰ πίστιν δικ. κληρονόμος*. We see, therefore, that the Pauline conception of righteousness—which as to form always expresses a relation to the judgment of God—includes this special feature, namely, it denotes the state of the believing man called forth by the divine acquittal, and this is its force in all the passages in question, Rom. viii. 10; Eph. vi. 14, iv. 24; Rom. v. 21, vi. 16; 2 Cor. vi. 7, 14, etc. This conception is to be recognised also in 2 Pet. i. 1, *τοῖς ἰσότημον ἡμῖν λαχοῦσιν πίστιν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, where the absence of the article in *ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ* (which is more closely qualified by the following genitive, and therefore cannot be taken adverbially, as in Acts xvii. 31) makes it more difficult to understand *δικ. τ. θ. κ.τ.λ.* as the principle on which faith is communicated, and thus as the subjective righteousness of God.

(b.) Righteousness, as a state of the individual which determines his conduct, is accordingly a principle of action. Cf. Rom. xiv. 17, 18, *ἡ βασ. τ. θ. ἐστὶν . . . δικ. κ.τ.λ., ὁ γὰρ ἐν τούτῳ δουλεύων τῷ Χριστῷ*; vi. 13, *παραστήσατε τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν ὅπλα δικ.*, cf. ver. 19; ver. 18, *ἐλευθερωθέντες δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἐδουλώθητε τῇ δικ.*; 2 Cor. ix. 10, *γεννήματα τῆς δικ. ὑμῶν*; Phil. i. 11, *πεπληρωμένοι καρπὸν δικ.*; Luke i. 75, *λατρεύειν τῷ θεῷ ἐν ὁσιότητι κ. δικ.*; Acts xvii. 31, *κρίνειν ἐν δικ.*, as in Rev. xix. 11; Rom. ix. 28; 2 Tim. iii. 16; Tit. iii. 5.

(c.) This principle of righteousness, which expresses itself in action, is finally present in the result of action, so that *δικαιοσύνη* appears as expressing the object of action. So in Matt. iii. 15, *πληρῶσαι πᾶσαν δικ.*; Acts x. 35, *ἐργάζεσθαι δικ.*; Heb. xi. 33; Jas. i. 20. Peculiar to 1 John and the Revelation is the expression *ποιεῖν δικ.*, 1 John iii. 10, Rev. xxii. 11; *τὴν δικ.*, 1 John ii. 29, iii. 7. The expression *ποιεῖν τὴν δικ.* (with the article) embraces the entire sphere denoted by *δικαιοσύνη*; whereas, without the article, it refers merely to the result of the action; see under *ἁμαρτία* (I.).

Δικαίω, fut. *ώσω*, to bring forth a *δίκαιος*, or a *δίκαιον*; cf. *δουλόω, ἀξιόω*; in gen. the verbs in *ώω*. It denotes the activity which is directed to the restoration or production of a *δίκαιον*, primarily without regard to the mode in which it takes place. Cf. Plato, *Legg.* iv. 714 E, *ἔφαμεν ποῦ κατὰ φύσιν Πίνδαρον ἄγειν δικαιοῦντα τὸ βιαιότατον* = to make a *δίκαιον* out of the *βιαιότατον*. For the most part absolutely = *jus discernere*, to settle or decree what is right, to recognise as right, to reckon as right, *δίκαιον νομίζειν*. It cannot be shown, however, at all events not as a general rule, to denote in classical Greek—where the word occurs only rarely—"the reaction of violated justice against the offender," "to make any one righteous by doing away with his violation of law through his condemnation" = to judge, punish, chastise. In favour of this view, Herodotus, Plato, and Thuc. are

adduced; whereas in the N. T. it denotes the very opposite (see Kling in Herzog's *Realencycl.* xii. 583). Cf. against such a view, Krüger on *Herod.* i. 100: "With the meaning *to judge, to punish*, the word seems scarcely to be used in Attic prose, not even in Thucyd.; indeed, except in Thucyd., it occurs rarely at all." See, however, Plat. *Legg.* xi. 934 B, δίκην δὲ ἕκαστος πρὸς ἑκάστῳ τῷ κακουργήματι σωφρονιστύος ἕνεκα συνεπομένην προσεκτισάτω . . . βραβευτέραν, οὐχ ἕνεκα τοῦ κακουργήσαι διδούς τὴν δίκην (οὐ γὰρ τὸ γεγονὸς ἀγένητον ἔσται ποτέ), τοῦ δ' εἰς τὸν αὐθις ἕνεκα χρόνον ἢ τὸ παράπαν μισῆσαι τὴν ἀδικίαν αὐτόν τε καὶ τοὺς ἰδόντας αὐτὸν δικαιούμενον, where, therefore, δικαιούσθαι is the passive expression for δίκην προσεκτίνειν. In this very treatise there occurs, according to Krüger (*l.c.*), much that is unusual. The passage quoted from Thucyd. iii. 40, πειθόμενοι μὲν ἐμοὶ τά τε δίκαια ἐς Μυτιληναίους καὶ τὰ ξύμφορα ἅμα ποιήσετε, ἀλλῶς δὲ γρόντες τοῖς μὲν οὐ χαριείσθε ὑμᾶς δὲ αὐτοὺς μᾶλλον δικαιοῦσεσθε, where Elmsl. (on Eur. *Med.* 93) reads δικαιοῦσετε, Schol. δικαίως καθ' ὑμῶν ἀποδείξετε, ὅτι τυραννικῶς ἄρχετε, Krüger regards as faulty, on the ground that he elsewhere uses neither the middle nor the passive in the like sense and construction. Herod. i. 100, κατ' ἀξίην ἐκάστου ἀδικήματος ἐδικαίειν = *to re-establish the right, recognise what is right, to judge*; Thucyd. v. 105, οὐδὲν ἔξω τῆς ἀνθρωπείας τῶν μὲν ἐς τὸ θεῖον νομίσεως τῶν δ' ἐς σφᾶς αὐτοὺς βουλήσεως δικαιοῦμεν ἢ πράσσομεν; Eur. *Suppl.* 526, νεκροὺς θάψαι δικαίῳ; Thucyd. iv. 122, εἶχε δὲ καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια περὶ τῆς ἀποστάσεως μᾶλλον, ἢ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ἐδικαίουν; Herod. i. 89, ἐπεῖτε με οἱ θεοὶ δοῦλόν σοι ἔδωκαν, δικαίῳ, εἴ τι ἐνορέω πλέον, σημαίνειν σοι. So usually in Herodotus with the infinitive in the sense δίκαιον νομίζειν, *e.g.* ii. 172, 181, iii. 36, 79, 142, vi. 138, and often. Besides Plato in the places cited, there remain only Herod. iii. 29, οἱ δὲ ἱερεῖς ἐδικαιοῦντο; v. 92. 4, δικαιοῦσαι Κόρινθον, for the signification *to judge, or to punish*, inasmuch as right usually asserts itself as judgment and vengeance; comp. δίκη, κρίνειν, κρίσις. But this later usage is scarcely to be explained by the roundabout view above cited. Far rather is it quite possible that δικαίω, in the sense *to recognise as right, to judge as right*, once perhaps took the accusative of the person after it, which elsewhere in classical Greek is quite unused. Cf. Isa. i. 17. Its principal meaning therefore is, *to adjudge or settle as right, to recognise as right, i.e. according to the context, equivalent to to justify*. In ecclesiastical Greek it is used, *e.g.*, of the decrees of Councils, ἐδικαίωσεν ἡ ἀγία καὶ μεγάλη σύνοδος, *Can.* 17, *Conc. Nic.*

Biblical usage.

(I.) O. T. Quite isolated is Ps. lxxiii. 13, ἄρα ματαίως ἐδικαίωσα τὴν καρδίαν μου = תְּהִי, *to purify*. Jer. iii. 11, ἐδικαίωσεν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ = תְּהִי נַפְשִׁי תְּהִי, is differently taken in the Greek, see below. Elsewhere δικαιοῦν τι, τινά, *to find anything as right, to recognise or acknowledge any one as just, to set forth as right or just* = דָּרַשׁ, as the opposite of יָשַׁר, almost always, and herein differing from the usage of profane Greek, with personal object. So in Ex. xxiii. 7, ἀθῶον καὶ δίκαιον οὐκ ἀποκτενεῖς καὶ οὐ δικαιοῶεις τὸν ἀσεβῆ ἕνεκεν δώρων. Cf. 1 Kings viii. 32, κρινεῖς τὸν λαόν σου Ἰσραὴλ ἀνομηθῆναι ἄνομον δοῦναι τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ εἰς κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ δικαιοῦσαι δίκαιον δοῦναι αὐτῷ κατὰ τὴν

δικαιοσύνην αὐτοῦ. Δικαιοῦν, therefore, is one aspect of judicial activity, and that not merely = δίκαιον κρίνειν (Prov. xvii. 15 = כִּרְצֵה), but corresponding to our justify = to set forth as righteous by legal or judicial decision. Cf. Deut. xxv. 1, where the same Hebrew expression, עָשָׂה יְהוָה דִּכְאוּתָּא לְיִשְׂרָאֵל וְיִשְׁפָּטָם = δικαιοῶσιν τὸ (al. τὸν) δίκαιον καὶ καταγνώσι τοῦ ἄσεβοῦς. — Isa. l. 8, ἔγνω ὅτι οὐ μὴ αἰσχυνθῶ, ὅτι ἐγγίζει ὁ δικαιοῶσας με; xlv. 24, 25, ἀπὸ κυρίου δικαιοθήσονται καὶ ἐν τῷ θεῷ ἐνδοξασθήσεται πᾶν τὸ σπέρμα κ.τ.λ., cf. the Hebrew. Since the Hiphil was translated by δικαιοῦν, the Kal, כִּרְצֵה, to be righteous, could not be better rendered than by the perfect passive δεδικαιῶσθαι, which was all the easier as this part of the verb is used to denote a state which is the fruit of action; cf. from καλεῖν, κεκλησθαι, to have the name; from γινώσκειν ἐγνωκέναι, to know; so δεδικαιῶσθαι, to be found righteous, to stand as just, to be just. So in Gen. xxxviii. 26, δεδικαίωται Θαμάρ ἡ ἐγώ = כִּרְצֵה מִמֶּנִּי; Ps. xix. 10, τὰ κρίματα κυρίου ἀληθινὰ δεδικαιωμένα = יְרָצָה. Corresponding to the use of the future, as e.g. ἔξω, from ἔχω, I shall gain, and I shall possess, it acquires this same meaning. Ps. cxliii. 2, μὴ εἰσέλθῃς εἰς κρίσιν μετὰ τοῦ δούλου σου, ὅτι οὐ δικαιοθήσεται ἐνώπιόν σου πᾶς ζῶν = כִּרְצֵה אֲנִי; Mic. vi. 11, εἰ δικαιοθήσεται ἐν ζύγῳ ἄνομος (= כִּרְצֵה, Kal); so also the conjunctive aorist, which in independent and final clauses usually denotes neither time nor duration (Krüger, *Griech. Sprachl.* liii. 6. 4); Ps. li. 5, ὅπως ἂν δικαιοθῇς ἐν τοῖς λόγοις σου.—The reflexive Hithpael might also be rendered by the passive so far as the Greek passive was often used where the subject co-operated to produce his sufferings, e.g. βληθεὶς μετεστράφη, Xen. in Krüger, *l.c.* lii. 7. 1. So in Gen. xlv. 16, τί δικαιοθῶμεν; ὁ θεὸς δὲ εὔρε τὴν ἀδικίαν = כִּרְצֵה מִמֶּנִּי. Cf. Isa. xlii. 21, κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἐβουλεύσατο ἵνα δικαιοθῇ, explanatory translation of the Hebrew יְהוָה יִפְּחֵהוּ לְיָמָיו. We find therefore everywhere the root meaning of δικαιοῦν to be, to set forth as righteous, to justify, in a legal sense. Also in Ezek. xvi. 51, 52, it stands in this and not in a material sense, ver. 51, ἐδικαίωσας τὰς ἀδελφάς σου ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἀνομίαις σου αἷς ἐποίησας; ver. 52, ἐδικαίωσας αὐτὰς ὑπὲρ σεαυτήν . . . ἐν τῷ δικαιοῦσαί σε τὰς ἀδελφάς σου. Where כִּרְצֵה is rendered δικαιοῦν, the intended result of the action denoted by כִּרְצֵה is also expressed; Mic. vii. 9, כִּרְצֵה יְיָ = ἕως τοῦ δικαιοῦσαι αὐτὸν τὴν δίκην μου; cf. Prov. xxii. 23, where the same term is = κρίνειν τὴν κρίσιν; Isa. i. 17, כִּרְצֵה יְיָ = δικαιοῦσατε χήραν.—Not different is the usage of the O. T. Apocrypha; cf. Ecclus x. 29, xlii. 1, 2, xlii. 22, πλουσίου σφαλέντος πολλοὶ ἀντιλήπτορες. ἐλάλησεν ἀπόρρητα, καὶ ἐδικαίωσαν αὐτόν. The passive applied in the same way, Ecclus. xviii. 2, xxiii. 11, xxvi. 29, xxxiv. 5 sq. The passive with a middle signification, Ecclus. vii. 5 (present), ix. 12 (1st aor.), xviii. 22.—Absolutely, Tobit xii. 4, δικαιοῦται αὐτῷ, quod justum ac aequum est, ei tribuitur.

II. N. T. The meaning, to recognise, to set forth, as righteous, to justify, as a judicial act, therefore *sensu forensi*, is clear from Luke x. 29, ὁ δὲ θέλων δικαιοῦσαι ἑαυτόν; xvi. 15, ὑμεῖς ἐστὲ οἱ δικαιοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀνθρώπων; vii. 29, ἐδικαίωσαν τὸν θεόν. In the same sense also the passive = to be recognised, found, set forth as righteous, to be justified. Matt. xii. 37, ἐκ τῶν λόγων σου δικαιοθήσῃ καὶ ἐκ τῶν λόγων σου καταδικασθήσῃ;

Rom. ii. 13, οἱ ποιηταὶ νόμου δικαιωθήσονται (cf. ver. 13a, οὐ γὰρ οἱ ἀκροαταὶ νόμου δίκαιοι παρὰ τῷ θεῷ); iii. 20, ἐξ ἔργων νόμου οὐ δικαιωθήσεται πᾶσα σὰρξ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ. (The difference between the two utterances, Rom. ii. 13 and iii. 20, is that ii. 13 contains a norm, iii. 20 a matter of fact.) Rom. iv. 2, εἰ γὰρ Ἀβραὰμ ἐξ ἔργων ἐδικαιώθη. Here also the meaning, *to be recognised as, to be found righteous*, passes over into the other — *to appear or be righteous* (vid. supra); and the connection between the two cannot be mistaken; cf. 1 Tim. iii. 16, of Christ, ἐδικαιώθη ἐν πνεύματι; Tit. iii. 7, δικαιωθέντες τῇ ἐκείνου χάριτι; Gal. ii. 16, οὐ δικαιούται ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ἔργων νόμου . . ἐξ ἔργων νόμου οὐ δικαιωθήσεται πᾶσα σὰρξ; iii. 11, ἐν νόμῳ οὐδεὶς δικαιούται παρὰ τῷ θεῷ; Gal. v. 4, οὔτινες ἐν νόμῳ δικαιούσθε; Jas. ii. 21, 25, ἐξ ἔργων ἐδικαιώθη; ver. 24, ἐξ ἔργων δικαιούται ἄνθρωπος καὶ οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως μόνον (cf. ver. 22, ἐξ ἔργων ἢ πίστις ἐτελειώθη); Rom. iii. 4 from Ps. li. 6, ὅπως ἂν δικαιωθῇς ἐν τοῖς λόγοις σου κ.τ.λ. Respecting the relation of the Hebrew expression to the Greek, of the O. T. to the New, we may remark, that whereas in the former Hiphil presupposes Kal,—justification the being just,—the converse is true of the Greek expression, a circumstance which rendered the Greek peculiarly fitted for the use here referred to. First, however, we ought to adduce 1 Cor. iv. 1, οὐκ ἐν τούτῳ δεδικαίωμαι, *not in this am I righteous*, i.e. *this cannot exhibit me as, or prove me to be, righteous*; Luke xviii. 14, κατέβη οὗτος δεδικαιωμένος ἢ γὰρ ἐκεῖνος, cf. Gen. xxxviii. 26. —δικαιούσθαι ἀπὸ τίνος, *to be vindicated from anything*, so that it no longer stands in the way of the δίκαιος εἶναι, Acts xiii. 39, ἀπὸ πάντων ὧν οὐκ ἡδυνήθητε ἐν νόμῳ Μωϋσέως δικαιωθῆναι, ἐν τούτῳ πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων δικαιούται; Rom. vi. 7, δεδικαίωται ἀπὸ ἁμαρτίας (on which Basil M. *de baptismo*, i. 2, p. 657, ἀπήλλακται, ἡλευθέρωται, κεκαθάρισται πάσης ἁμαρτίας); Matt. xi. 19, Luke vii. 35, ἐδικαίωθη ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς must also be so explained, cf. Acts xx. 26, καθαρὸς ἐγὼ ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος πάντων; Ecclus. xxvi. 29, οὐ δικαιωθήσεται κάπηλος ἀπὸ ἁμαρτίας. Comp. the strange rendering of the LXX. of Jer. iii. 11, ἐδικαίωσεν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἢ ἀποστροφή Ἰσραὴλ ἀπὸ τῆς ἀσυνθέτου Ἰουδα = $\text{הָיָה יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּעֵינֵי הָאֱלֹהִים כְּיִשְׂרָאֵל בְּעֵינֵי הָאֱלֹהִים}$, *Israel appears just in comparison with Judah*. The words ἀπὸ τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς do not stand in the way, cf. Matt. viii. 12, οἱ υἱοὶ τῆς βασιλείας ἐκβληθήσονται. Comp. Matt. xiii. 41, συλλέξουσιν ἐκ τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ πάντα τὰ σκάνδαλα καὶ τοὺς ποιοῦντας τὴν ἀνομίαν. What is meant, therefore, is equivalent to *wisdom is free from guilt*, that is, *from culpability respecting her children*. Grammatically possible, but less appropriate to the context, is an explanation of ἀπὸ in agreement with Isa. xlv. 25, ἀπὸ κυρίου δικαιωθήσονται.

When, therefore, Paul in Rom. iv. 5 terms God τὸν δικαιούντα τὸν ἀσεβῆ, —cf. iii. 26, where this apparently unjustifiable procedure is justified, and finally the assertion is made, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν δίκαιον καὶ δικαιούντα τὸν ἐκ πίστεως, —and when from Gal. ii. 16, εἰδότες ὅτι οὐ δικαιούται ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ἔργων νόμου, ἐὰν μὴ διὰ πίστεως Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐπιστεύσαμεν, ἵνα δικαιωθῶμεν ἐκ πίστεως Χριστοῦ καὶ οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων νόμου, διότι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου οὐ δικαιωθήσεται πᾶσα σὰρξ (cf. with the passages adduced above), it is clear that the meaning of δικαιούν has remained the same, we may

conclude that the words in question (Rom. iv. 5) have the same force as in Ex. xxiii. 7, οὐ δικαιοῦσαι τὸν ἀσεβῆ, namely, by a judicial decision to free from guilt, from that which stands in the way of the δίκαιος εἶναι, and to represent as righteous; Rom. vi. 7, δικ. ἀπὸ ἀμαρτίας; Acts xiii. 39,—therefore to justify. Cf. Rom. v. 19, δίκαιον καθιστάναι, with ver. 18, δικαίωσις. A comparison of the words δικαιοῦν τὸν ἀσεβῆ and τὸν ἐκ πίστεως with the expressions Rom. iv. 3, ἐπίστευσεν . . . καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην; ver. 5, λογίζεται ἡ πίστις αὐτοῦ εἰς δικαιοσύνην, and other texts, shows that δικαιοῦν, even as used by Paul, denotes nothing else than the *judicial act* of God, whereby man is pronounced free from guilt and punishment, and is thus recognised or represented as a δίκαιος. Comp. the combination of δικαιοῦσθαι and χάρις, Rom. v. 1, 2. To the δικαιοῦν on God's side corresponds on the side of the object δίκαιος καθίστασθαι, Rom. v. 19, comp. ver. 18, or δικαιοῦσθαι, whose result is δικαιοῦσθαι, Rom. v. 1. As an element in the divine work of saving the individual, δικαιοῦν is specified in Rom. viii. 30, οὓς προώρισεν τούτους καὶ ἐκάλεσεν καὶ οὓς ἐκάλεσεν, τούτους καὶ ἐδικαίωσεν· οὓς δὲ ἐδικαίωσεν, τούτους καὶ ἐδόξασεν; 1 Cor. vi. 11, ἀπελούσασθε, ἡγιάσθητε, ἐδικαίωθήτε ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ καὶ ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν, cf. ver. 9 opposed to ἄδικοι.—Not only do we read δικαιοῖ ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἐκ πίστεως in Rom. iii. 26, but also in Gal. iii. 8, ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοῖ τὰ ἔθνη ὁ θεός, and correspondingly in Rom. v. 1, δικαιοθύντες οὖν ἐκ πίστεως, and Gal. ii. 16, εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐπιστεύσαμεν ἵνα δικαιοθῶμεν ἐκ πίστεως Χριστοῦ. So also iii. 24. The expression πίστει δικαιοῦσθαι has substantially the same meaning, the only difference being that ἐκ sets forth the divine act as taking place in consequence of faith, or man as determined by faith; cf. the passage from Lysias quoted by Krüger, *Gramm.* lxviii. 17. 10, ἐκ τῶν ἔργων χρῆ μᾶλλον ἢ ἐκ τῶν λόγων τὴν ψῆφον φέρειν. With the dat. the divine act is represented as effected by faith (dynamical dat.), cf. Rom. iv. 5, τῷ πιστεύοντι ἐπὶ τὸν δικαιοῦντα τὸν ἀσεβῆ λογίζεται ἡ πίστις αὐτοῦ εἰς δικαιοσύνην. Once διὰ τῆς πιστ., Rom. iii. 30. As we therefore read πίστει δικαιοῦσθαι, so also τῇ χάριτι, Tit. iii. 7; Rom. iii. 24. The combination with ἐν may be explained from that with ἐκ. When we read ἐξ ἔργων νόμου οὐ δικαιοθήσεται in Gal. ii. 16, Rom. iv. 2, and in Gal. iii. 11, ἐν νόμῳ οὐδεὶς δικαιοῦται, Gal. v. 4, in the former case ἔργα νόμου are the cause to which the οὐ δικαιοῦσθαι refers; in the latter case, νόμος is that in which the δικαιοῦσθαι rests; cf. Acts xiii. 39, ἀπὸ πάντων ὧν οὐκ ἠδυνήθητε ἐν νόμῳ Μωϋσέως δικαιοῦσθαι, ἐν τούτῳ (sc. ἐν Χριστῷ) πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων δικαιοῦται. So in Rom. v. 9, δικαιοθύντες ἐν τῷ αἵματι Χριστοῦ; 1 Cor. vi. 11, ἐδικ. ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ καὶ ἐν τῷ πν. κ.τ.λ.; Gal. ii. 17, δικαιοθῆναι ἐν Χριστῷ; cf. v. 4, κατηγορήθητε ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὅτινες ἐν νόμῳ δικαιοῦσθε. (If the δικαιοῦσθαι rest in something, the subject or person must also be found therein, cf. 1 Cor. iv. 4; Rom. iii. 4; 1 Tim. iii. 16.) James uses the word exclusively in this judicial sense, as is clear from chap. ii. 23. What he refers to is a mistaken view of πίστις, not a mistaken view of δικαιοῦν, cf. vv. 22, 26, and Paul's τὸ ἔργον τῆς πίστεως, 1 Thess. i. 3. In case we read in Rev. xxii. 11, ὁ δίκαιος δικαιοθήτω ἔτι, and not, as has been customary since Bengel, δικαιοσύνην ποιησάτω, the passive

δικαιοῦσθαι must be taken as a rendering of the Hebrew Hithpael (see above) in a middle sense, *to present or show oneself as righteous*.

Δικαίωμα, τος, τὸ, the product or result of the δικαιοῦν. In classical Greek in Plato, Isocrates, Aristotle, but not frequently, and indeed—

(I.) The establishing of right, firmly established or firmly standing right, brought about by law or judicial knowledge, *legitimate claim*; so in Thuc. i. 41, δικαίωματα μὲν οὖν τάδε πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἔχομεν, ἱκανὰ κατὰ τοὺς Ἑλλήνων νόμους; vi. 79. 2, 80. 1, οὐ γὰρ ἔργῳ ἴσον ὥσπερ τῷ δικαίωματί ἐστιν; Isoc. vi. 25. So in the LXX. = דִּקְיָוָה, 2 Sam. xix. 29, τί ἐστὶ μοι ἐτι δικαίωμα καὶ τοῦ κεκραγένοι ἐτι πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα. Further = דִּקְיָה, Jer. xi. 20, πρὸς σε ἀπεκάλυψα τὸ δικαίωμά μου.

(II.) The δίκαιον established by judicial knowledge, as punishment, Plato, *Legg.* ix. 884 E, τὴν μὲν βλάβην ἀποτίνετο, τῶν δὲ ἄλλων δικαιομάτων ἀφείσθω. This is the only passage in Plato, according to Krüger on Thuc. i. 41, where, in like manner, the word is = legitimate claim; but in Thucydides it is the legal claim which one makes good towards others; here, the legal claim which one has to satisfy. Then in Aristotle it is = restoration or re-establishing of the δίκαιον; *Eth. Nicom.* v. 10, καλεῖται δὲ τὸ κοινὸν μᾶλλον δικαιοπράγμα, δικαίωμα δὲ τὸ ἐπανόρθωμα τοῦ ἀδικήματος; *establishing of right*, *de Coel.* i. 10, τὰ τῶν ἀμφισβητούντων λόγων δικαίωματα.

(III.) Next, in a wider sense, generally, *legal deed of right*, as *fulfilling of the law*, Aristotle, *Rhet.* i. 3. 13; so Baruch ii. 19, οὐκ ἐπὶ τὰ δικαίωματα τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν . . . καταβάλλομεν τὸν ἔλεον; ver. 17, δώσουσιν δόξαν καὶ δικαίωμα τῷ κυρίῳ, therefore like δικαιοσύνη. So in the N. T. Rev. xix. 8, τὰ δικαίωματα τῶν ἁγίων; xv. 4, τὰ δικαίωματα σου ἐφανερώθησαν, where we must not render *judgments*, because δικαίωμα never denotes the act of judgment itself.

(IV.) *Statute of right*. Aristotle, *fragm.* 569, Ἀριστοτέλης ἐν τοῖς δικαιομασί φησιν οὕτως, cf. *Vita Arist. Marc.* f. 276, καὶ τὰ γεγραμμένα αὐτῷ δικαίωματα Ἑλληνίδων πόλεων ἐξ ὧν Φίλιππος τὰς φιλονεικίας τῶν Ἑλλήνων διέλυσε. Du Cange, δικαίωματα *recentioribus Graecis et in Basilicis appellantur privilegia, chartae, diplomata et instrumenta quibus jura in res asseruntur*; so, for the most part, with the exception of the places already cited in the LXX. as = דִּקְיָה, דִּקְיָה, דִּקְיָה, דִּקְיָה, 1 Macc. ii. 21. In the N. T. Heb. ix. 1, δικαίωματα λατρείας; ver. 10, δικαίωματα σαρκός (comp. vv. 9, 13); Rom. i. 32, τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ θεοῦ . . . ὅτι οἱ τοιαῦτα πράσσοντες ἄξιοι θανάτου εἰσὶν; ii. 26, τὰ δικαίωματα τοῦ νόμου φυλάσσειν (comp. Eph. ii. 15, ὁ νόμος τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασιν); Rom. viii. 4, ἵνα τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ νόμου πληρωθῇ ἐν ἡμῖν, *the legal ordainment of the law*, or, following I., *the legal claim of the law*.

And now as to the use of the word in Rom. v. 16, 18, most expositors, and even still Hofmann, *Die heilige Schrift. N. T.* iii. 202, Dietzsch, *Adam u. Christus*, Rom. v. 12-21, p. 146, contend that its signification there is *act of justification*. It is said to stand in Holy Scripture in the signification, rare in classical Greek, *legal act, justice* (see under III.

Besides the passages cited, there is Prov. viii. 20, where, instead of *δικαιοσύνη*, there is the reading *τρίβοι δικαίωματος* parallel with *ὁδοὶ δικαιοσύνης*). But apart from the fact, which is certainly of less importance, that Paul does not elsewhere use the word in this sense, the connection, and especially the contrast with *κατάκριμα*, show clearly that the word here stands in the usage arranged under II., with the modification following upon the distinctively Pauline use of *δικαιοῦν* with personal object = act of justification (cf. *ἐπανόρθωμα τοῦ ἀδικήματος* in Aristotle), *τὸ κρίμα ἐξ ἑνὸς εἰς κατάκριμα*, *τὸ δὲ χάρισμα ἐκ πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων εἰς δικαίωμα*. As *κατάκριμα* to *κρίμα*, so must *δικαίωμα* stand in relation to *χάρισμα*, strengthening and positively supplementing it. This would be all the more easy to a Greek-tutored ear when once *δικαίωμα*, in contrast with *παραπτωμα*, of itself awakened the idea of an *ἐπανόρθωμα τοῦ ἀδικήματος*; but then just in the immediate connection of this section the *δικαιοῦν* suggests this thought. The apostle's representation is only so far different from the usual one, that he has in his mind not so much an *ἐπανόρθωμα πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων, ἀδικημάτων*, as rather *ἀμαρτωλῶν ἀδικησάντων* (so that, strictly speaking, only the object of the *δικαίωμα* is different). In ver. 18, *δι' ἑνὸς δικαίωματος εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς δικαίωσιν*, it seems to me that it denotes what Christ has done in like manner in contrast with *παραπτωμα*, and according to its effects. The effect proceeding from the *δικαίωμα* of Christ is *δικαίωσις*. How greatly the element of justification prevails in *δικαίωμα* is very clearly shown in the note of Theodoret in Ps. cxviii. 2 in Suidas, *νόμον καλεῖ . . . δικαίωματα, ὡς δικαιοῦν τὸν κατορθοῦντα δυνάμενον*.

Δικαίωσις, ἡ, the act which establishes a *δίκαιον* or a *δίκαιος*, a sentence in law (therefore also justification); cf. LXX. Lev. xxiv. 22, *δικαίωσις μία ἔσται τῷ προσηλύτῳ καὶ τῷ ἐγγλωρίῳ*, *יְהוָה יִשְׁפֹּט בֵּין כָּל אֶחָד אֶל אֶחָד*. In profane Greek sometimes = *δικαιολογία*, cf. Thucyd. viii. 66. 2, *τῶν δρασάντων οὔτε ζήτησις οὐτ' εἰ ὑποπτοῖοντο δικαίωσις ἐγγύετο*, on which the Schol. *δικαίωσις ἀντὶ τοῦ κόλασις ἢ εἰς δίκην ἀπαγωγὴ ἥτοι κρίσις*, —a meaning, amongst the Attics, pretty obsolete, an example of which is adduced by Harpocrates from Lysias (*vid.* Krüger on Thucyd. l.c.). Thucyd. uses *δικαίωσις* in the sense of legal claim, demand, i. 141. 1, iii. 82. 3, iv. 86. 4, v. 17. 2,—to be explained in accordance with what was remarked under *δικαίω*. In later Greek it denotes, in particular, the view of what is just and right, e.g. Dion. Ant. R. i. 58, *παρελθὼν τὴν ἀπάντων ἀνθρώπων δικαίωσιν*. The N. T. use is naturally regulated by that of *δικαιοῦν*. As employed by Paul, it is the establishment of a man as just by acquittal from guilt; *vid.* *δικαιοῦν* —justification as an act to be performed or accomplishing itself on the man; as *δικαίωμα* in Rom. v. 16 means the act of justification accomplished on the man. Rom. iv. 25, *ἡγέρθη Ἰησοῦς διὰ τὴν δικαίωσιν ἡμῶν*; v. 18 opposed to *κατάκριμα ὡς δι' ἑνὸς παραπτώματος εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς κατάκριμα*, οὕτως καὶ δι' ἑνὸς δικαίωματος εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς δικαίωσιν ζωῆς. On this antithesis, *vid.* s.v. *κατάκριμα*.

Δικάζω = to exercise *δίκην*, and with the definite signification, to pronounce judgment,

to judge. LXX. = 𐤀𐤋 and 𐤀𐤋𐤁. Hence in the N. T. δικαστής, Cod. Vat. B. Luke vi. 37 for καταδικάζειν.

Δικαστής, οὗ, ὁ, Luke xii. 14 (Lachm. κριτής) parallel with μεριστής; and Acts vii. 27, 35, from Ex. ii. 14, ἄρχων καὶ δικαστής ἐπὶ τινα = 𐤀𐤋 𐤀𐤋𐤁 𐤀𐤋 𐤀𐤋𐤁 = judge, i.e. one who executes δίκη, who maintains law and equity; while, in so far as he arrives at a conclusion and gives final judgment, the judge is called κριτής, Pillon, *syn. gr.* "κριτής *juge, dans un sens très-général*; Xen. *Cyrop.* i. 3. 14, ὅποτε μὲν κατασταθῇ τὸ ἄρμόττοντος κριτής. δικαστής *juge nommé ou élu au sort pour faire partie d'un tribunal.* Xen. *Cyrop.* i. 3. 14, σὺν τῷ νόμῳ οὖν ἐκέλευεν αἰεὶ τὸν δικαστὴν τὴν ψήφον τίθεσθαι." Wyttenb. *bibl. crit.* iii. 2, p. 68, "De differentia, quae est inter δικαστὴν et κριτὴν *miror nil monuisse grammaticos. Uterque judicat ac decernit, sed δικαστής de re quae in jus vocatur, κριτής de aliis quibuscunque rebus ac certaminibus; ille secundum leges, hic aequitate. Ita intelligendus,* Xen. *Conv.* 5. 10, τὸ δὲ σὺν (ἀργύριον) ὥσπερ τὸ πλείστον, διαφθείρειν ἱκανὸν ἐστὶ καὶ δικαστὰς καὶ κριτὰς." — In Jas. iv. 12, εἷς ἐστὶν νομοθέτης καὶ κριτής, we should accordingly have expected δικαστής conformably with general usage, but there is a fineness and delicacy in the expression; syllogistically recognised truth is one with right and justice; *vid. ἀλήθεια, ἀδικία, κριτής.*

Ἄδικος, ον, not in conformity with δίκη, the opposite of ἔνδικος; not as it should and ought to be; in classical Greek it is transferred (as also δίκαιος, which see) from the sphere of morals to that of nature, e.g. ἄδικοι οἰκέται, Xen. *Cyr.* ii. 2. 26, "qui suo munere non funguntur" (Sturz), and likewise οὔτε γὰρ ἄρμα γένοιτ' ἂν δίκαιον ἵππων ἀδίκων συνεzeugμένων. It is otherwise used by Aristotle, *Eth. Nicom.* v. 2, δοκεῖ δὲ ὁ παράνομος ἄδικος εἶναι καὶ ὁ πλεονέκτης καὶ ὁ ἄνιστος, ὥστε δῆλον ὅτι καὶ ὁ δίκαιος ἔσται ὁ τε νόμιμος καὶ ὁ ἴσος. Comp. with this Luke xviii. 11, ἄρπαγες, ἄδικοι, μοιχοί, where ἄδικος obviously has the social narrowness attaching to the δικαιοσύνη in the profane sphere. See ἀδικεῖν and δίκαιος. The use of the word corresponds with the usage of the LXX., see below. It approaches its primary sense in Luke xvi. 10, 11. There (ver. 10) we read, ὁ πιστὸς ἐν ἐλαχίστῳ καὶ ἐν πολλῷ πιστὸς ἐστίν, ὁ ἐν ἐλαχίστῳ ἄδικος καὶ ἐν πολλῷ ἀδίκος ἐστίν, and πιστὸς denotes the person who does not disappoint expectations nor neglect claims, but who fulfils the relations which he ought to fulfil. When, therefore (ver. 11), it is said, εἰ οὖν ἐν τῷ ἀδίκῳ μαμμωνᾷ πιστοὶ οὐκ ἐγένεσθε, Mammon denotes something whose nature it is to disappoint and deceive—a state of things which must be rectified by the faithfulness of him who has to do with it; cf. what follows, τὸ ἀληθινὸν τίς ὑμῶν πιστεύσει;

Conformably with the scriptural view of the moral requirement of man, ἄδικος (2 Pet. ii. 9) may stand in contrast with εὐσεβής; and hence we see how in Rom. iv. 5 we read, θεὸς δικαίων, not τὸν ἄδικον, but (for the very purpose of more closely describing the ἄδικος) τὸν ἀσεβή. In 1 Cor. vi. 9, on the other hand, we read, ἄδικοι θεοῦ βασιλείαν οὐ

κληρονομήσουσιν. The same sense is indicated in 1 Pet. iii. 18, Χριστὸς ἅπαξ περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν ἔπαθεν, δίκαιος ὑπὲρ ἀδίκων, and when Paul, 1 Cor. vi. 1, contrasts ἄδικος with ἅγιος, and in ver. 6 identifies it with ἄπιστος. — Rom. iii. 8, μὴ ἄδικος ὁ θεός; Heb. vi. 10, οὐ γὰρ ἄδικος ὁ θ. Ἄδικος is really, as Aristotle says, what is *παράνομος*, only not in a social, but in a religious sense; cf. ἀδικεῖν and ἀδικία. Plato, *adv. Colot.* c. 32, Σωκράτης ἀδίκως ἀποθανεῖν εἴλετο μᾶλλον ἢ σωθῆναι παρανόμως. It occurs in antithesis with δίκαιος in Matt. v. 45, δίκαιοι καὶ ἄδικοι, so also in Acts xxiv. 15. See under δίκαιος. — LXX. — נֶפֶשׁ, which, when it occurs, usually answers to ἀδ., though the LXX. render it by ἀδ. in only a few texts, Ex. xxiii. 1; Prov. xvii. 15; Isa. lvii. 20; ver. 21, ἀσεβής. Elsewhere they use it only in a social sense — נֶפֶשׁ, נֶפֶשׁ, נֶפֶשׁ, and other words; they therefore give prominence to only one aspect of the word, for they were still fettered by the language, which had not yet become the organ of divine revelation. Elsewhere they render נֶפֶשׁ by ἁμαρτωλός, ἄνομος, παράνομος, ἀσεβής, πονηρός. Cf. 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10.

Ἀδικία, ἡ, what is not conformable with δίκη, what ought not to be = *wrong*. 2 Cor. xii. 13b, χάρισασθέ μοι τὴν ἀδικίαν ταύτην, cf. 13a. Opposed to δικαιοσύνη, Rom. iii. 5, vi. 13; Aristotle, δικαιοσύνη ἀδικία ἐναντίον. Contrasted with ἀλήθεια, Rom. i. 18, τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐν ἀδικίᾳ κατέχειν; Rom. ii. 8, ἀπειθοῦσιν μὲν τῇ ἀλ., πειθομένοις δὲ τῇ ἀδικ.; 1 Cor. xiii. 6, οὐ χαίρει ἐπὶ τῇ ἀδικίᾳ, συγχαίρει δὲ τῇ ἀλ.; 2 Thess. ii. 10, ἀπάτη τῆς ἀδικίας, over against ἡ ἀγάπη τῆς ἀληθείας. Cf. ver. 12, οἱ μὴ πιστεύσαντες τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, ἀλλ' εὐδοκῆσαντες ἐν τῇ ἀδικίᾳ. There is an ἀδικία only because there is an ἀλήθεια, which occupies the place of δίκη (*vid.* ἀλήθεια). Ἀδικία, therefore, must be defined according to this. Cf. John vii. 18, οὗτος ἀληθής ἐστιν καὶ ἀδικία ἐν αὐτῷ οὐκ ἔστιν. With ἀσέβεια (see ἄδικος), Rom. i. 18, ἀποκαλύπτεται ὀργὴ θεοῦ ἐπὶ πᾶσαν ἀσέβειαν καὶ ἀδικίαν ἀνθρώπων. But while ἀσέβεια and ἀδικία, like εὐσέβεια and δικαιοσύνη, refer in classical Greek to different spheres, to the religious and social spheres respectively (see ἀδικεῖν, cf. Xen. *Cyrop.* viii. 8. 4, περὶ θεοῦ ἀσέβειαν, περὶ δὲ ἀνθρώπους ἀδικίαν), it is clear that this distinction cannot be made here, but that ἀδικία rather denotes the action or bearing of an ἀσεβής as that which ought not to be, because of divine truth. Hence 2 Tim. ii. 19, ἀποστήτω ἀπὸ ἀδικίας πᾶς ὁ ὀνομάζων τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου; 1 John v. 17, πᾶσα ἀδικία ἁμαρτία ἐστίν; but we may not say (with Düsterdieck on 1 John iii. 4) that is ἀδικία which contradicts divine righteousness, though it may be this if the connection sanction it (Rom. ix. 14; cf. iii. 4, 5), and in the issue it is. Thus we may understand the phrases ἐργάται τῆς ἀδικίας, Luke xiii. 27; οἰκόννομος τῆς ἀδ., Luke xvi. 8; μαμμωνᾶς τῆς ἀδ., xvi. 9; κριτὴς τῆς ἀδ., xviii. 6. (In these texts we have the *gen. qualitatis*, if in Luke xvi. 9 ὁ μαμμ. τῆς ἀδ. be not perhaps mammon abused by the ἀδικ., mammon generally claimed by the ἀδικ. But see ἄδικος.) Also, ὁ κόσμος τῆς ἀδ., Jas. iii. 6; μισθὸς (τῆς) ἀδ., Acts i. 28, 2 Pet. ii. 13, 15; σύνδεσμος ἀδικίας, Acts viii. 23. — In Matt. xxiii. 25, Received text, Lachm. and Tisch. read ἀκρασία.

Ἀδικέω, ὦ, fut. ἥσω, to do wrong, see ἄδικος, ἀδικία; literally, to be an ἄδικος, and

to act as one. Used in its most comprehensive sense, Rev. xxii. 11, ὁ ἀδικῶν ἀδικησάτω ἔτι. In the narrowest sense, in other parts of the Revelation, ii. 11, vi. 6, vii. 2, 3, ix. 4, 10, 19, xi. 5 = to hurt, to injure; cf. Xen. *Cyrop.* v. 5. 9, where it is synonymous with χαλεπὸν τι τινὶ ποιεῖν, Thuc. ii. 71, γῆν ἀδικεῖν, to lay waste the country. Xen. *Anab.* iv. 4. 6, ὅτι σπείσασθαι βούλοιο ἐφ' ᾧ μήτε αὐτὸς τοὺς Ἕλληνας ἀδικεῖν μήτ' ἐκείνους καίειν τὰς οἰκίας, v. 8. 3. (Concerning this signification, see under δίκαιος.) Thus, too, it occurs in Luke x. 19, οὐδὲν ὑμᾶς ἀδικήσει. It is used in a sense between the general and the narrow meaning elsewhere in the N. T., Matt. xx. 13; Acts vii. 24, 26, 27, xxv. 10, 11; 1 Cor. vi. 7, 8; 2 Cor. vii. 2, 12; Gal. iv. 12; Col. iii. 25. Philem. 18 = to act unjustly in a sense defined in the context, with the accus.; without case, Acts xxv. 11; 1 Cor. vi. 8; 2 Cor. vii. 12; Col. iii. 25; Rev. xxii. 11. Passive, Acts vii. 24; 1 Cor. vii. 7; 2 Cor. vii. 12; Rev. ii. 11. The fundamental thought, without special application, as it occurs in Rev. xxii. 11, is to be explained according to the N. T. view of δίκαιος or ἄδικος in its strongest, i.e. its religious, sense. We find this even originally in classical Greek, Hom. *Hymn. in Cer.* 367 = to refuse the honour due to the gods, syn. with ἀσεβεῖν, from which, however, it is always distinguished in later Greek. We see how the habits of social life influence the meaning of the word in classical Greek, e.g. in Xen. *Mem.* i. 1. 1, ἀδικεῖ Σωκράτης, οὗς μὲν ἡ πόλις νομίζει θεοὺς οὐ νομίζων. Cf. Acts xxv. 10. "Ἀδικεῖν quid sit Socrates (Xen. *Mem.* iv. 4) disputat in hanc sententiam, ut appareat, idem esse quod ἄνομα ποιεῖν" (Sturz). Cf. Xen. *Mem.* iv. 4. 13, where Socrates shows that he acts justly who obeys, ἀ οἱ πολῖται συνθέμενοι ἃ τε δεῖ ποιεῖν καὶ ὧν ἀπέχεσθαι ἐγράψαντο. He, on the contrary, does wrong who does not obey, οὐκοῦν ὁ μὲν τὰ δίκαια πράττων δίκαιος, ὁ δὲ τὰ ἄδικα ἄδικος. — ὁ μὲν ἄρα νόμιμος δίκαιός ἐστιν, ὁ δὲ ἄνομος ἄδικος. Cf. Aristot. *Rhet.* i. 9, ἐστὶ δὲ δικαιοσύνη μὲν ἀρετὴ δι' ἣν τὰ αὐτῶν ἕκαστοι ἔχουσι, καὶ ὡς ὁ νόμος, ἀδικία δὲ δι' ἣν τὰ ἀλλότρια, οὐχ ὡς ὁ νόμος; *ibid.* 10, ἀδικεῖν . . . τὸ βλάπτειν ἕκοντα παρὰ τὸν νόμον. "Αδικεῖν omnino de qualibet injuria quam homines sibi invicem inferunt adhibetur" (Steph. *Thes.*). Synonymous with βλάπτειν, βιάζεσθαι, opposed to δικαιοπραγεῖν, Plut. *de tuenda sanūt.* 22. In the biblical use of the word ἄνομα ποιεῖν is only a species of ἀδικεῖν.

Καταδίκη, ἡ, the δίκη, so far as it is against any one = judgment, punishment; Lachm. Acts xxv. 15 for δίκη. Rarely in profane Greek, because the simple δίκη sufficed.

Καταδικάζειν, to give judgment against a person, to recognise the right against him = to pass sentence, to condemn, opposed to ἀπολύειν, Luke vi. 37; to δικαιόειν, Matt. xii. 37, ἐκ τῶν λόγων σου δικαιωθήσῃ καὶ ἐκ τῶν λόγων σου καταδικασθήσῃ. Also in Matt. xii. 7; Jas. v. 6.

Ἐκδικος, ὁ, ἡ, (I.) in the Tragedians as synonymous with ἔκνομος = ὁ ἔξω τοῦ δικαίου, lawless, mischievous, exlex; opposed to ὅσιος, Eurip. *Hell.* 1638, ὅσια δρᾶν, τὰ δ' ἔκδικ' οὐ. So in the Tragedians the adverb ἐκδίκως. In later Greek, on the contrary, (II.) = he who carries out right to its issue (ἐκ), avenger. This also is the only meaning in ἐκδικία,

ἐκδικέω, ἐκδίκησις, ἐκδικάζω; also ἐκδικαστής, which occurs in Eurip. *Suppl.* 1153, τοῦ φθιμένου πατρὸς ἐκδικαστάν, has this meaning; Eustathius, *Il.* p. 29, 34, ἐλέγετο τὸ ἐξαίσιον καὶ ἐκδικον τὸ ἔξω τοῦ αἰσίου καὶ δικαίου· νῦν δὲ ἀγαθολογούνται. Zonaras, ἐκδικον ἐπὶ δικαίου καὶ ἀδίκου λέγεται. In the LXX. it does not occur. On the contrary, we find ἐκδικητής in a bad sense, *revengeful*, synonymous with ἐχθρός, Ps. viii. 3, καταλύσαι ἐχθρὸν καὶ ἐκδικητήν, and this may perhaps indicate a link between the two seemingly opposite meanings. In the Apocrypha, Ecclus. xxx. 6, ἐναντίον ἐχθρῶν κατέλιπεν ἐκδικον, καὶ τοῖς φίλοις ἀνταποδίδοντα χάριν; Wisd. xii. 12, ἐκδικος κατὰ ἀδίκων ἀνθρώπων. In the N. T. Rom. xiii. 4, of the magistracy, ἐκδικος εἰς ὀργὴν τῷ τὸ κακὸν πράσσοντι. Herodianus, vii. 4. 10, ἐκδικοὶ τοῦ γενησομένου ἔργου. In Suidas, of the cranes of Ibycus, αἱ Ἰβύκου ἐκδικοί.

Ἐκδικέω, to revenge, only in later Greek, Apollodorus, Diodorus, and others; e.g. ἐκδ. φόνον, τὸν θάνατον, τὴν ὕβριν. Often in the LXX. = *drj*, *trp*, *drp*, *wpw*, and indeed (I.) both with the accusative of the deed for which, and of the person upon whom, the revenge is taken, 2 Kings ix. 7, ἐκδικήσεις τὰ αἵματα τῶν δούλων. Cf. Rev. vi. 10, xix. 2. — Ecclus. v. 3, ἐκδικῶν ἐκδικήσει σε; xxiii. 21, οὗτος ἐν πλατείαις πόλεως ἐκδικηθήσεται; Zech. v. 3, ὁ κλέπτῃς, ὁ ἐπίορκος ἕως θανάτου ἐκδικηθήσεται. In the N. T. only with the accusative of the thing for which the revenge is taken, 2 Cor. x. 6, ἐκδικῆσαι πᾶσαν παρακοήν. On the other hand, (II.) the person on whom the revenge is taken, from whom retribution is required, is added with a preposition, Rev. vi. 10, ἐκδικεῖς τὸ αἷμα ἡμῶν ἐκ τῶν κ.τ.λ. (Received text, ἀπό); xix. 2, ἐξεδίκησε τὸ αἷμα τῶν δούλων αὐτοῦ ἐκ χειρὸς αὐτῆς. Cf. Jer. i. 18, ἐκδικῶ ἐπὶ τὸν βασιλέα Βαβυλῶνος κ.τ.λ. — Hos. ii. 15, ἐκδικήσω ἐπ' αὐτὴν τὰς ἡμέρας τῶν Βααλεῖμ; iv. 9; Amos iii. 2, ἐκδικήσω ἐφ' ὑμᾶς πάσας τὰς ἀμαρτίας ὑμῶν; ver. 14, ἐκδικήσω ἀσέβειαν τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ ἐπ' αὐτόν (so by ἐπί with the genitive in profane Greek also); 1 Sam. xviii. 25, ἐκδικῆσαι εἰς ἐχθρούς. Hence (III.) its combination with the accusative of the person for whom the revenge is taken becomes possible, Luke xviii. 3, ἐκδικήσόν με ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀντιδίκου; ver. 5, ἐκδικήσω αὐτήν; Rom. xii. 19, μὴ ἑαυτοὺς ἐκδικοῦντες. Cf. 1 Macc. vi. 22, ἕως πότε οὐ ποιήσῃ κρίσιν καὶ ἐκδικήσεις τοὺς ἀδελφούς ἡμῶν; 1 Macc. ii. 67, ἐκδικήσατε ἐκδίκησιν τοῦ λαοῦ ὑμῶν.

Ἐκδίκησις, ἡ, revenge; Hesychius = ἀνταπόδοσις. Cf. Deut. xxxii. 35, ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐκδικήσεως ἀνταποδώσω, parallel with ἡμέρα ἀπωλείας αὐτῶν. Once in Polybius iii. 8. 10. More frequently in the LXX. = *drj*, *wpj*, *trp*, *drp*, *wpw*, *trp*, and other words. Luke xxi. 22, ἡμέραι ἐκδικήσεως; comp. Ecclus. v. 7; Deut. xxxii. 35. — Rom. xii. 19, ἐμοὶ ἐκδίκησις, as in Heb. x. 30; 2 Cor. vii. 11. — (I.) With the genitive of the person upon whom the revenge is taken, 1 Pet. ii. 14, εἰς ἐκδίκησιν κακοποιῶν, ἔπαινον δὲ ἀγαθοποιῶν. Cf. Judith viii. 35, ix. 2. With the dative of the person in whose behalf the revenge is taken, ποιεῖν ἐκδίκησίν τινι, to take revenge for some one, to procure retribution in behalf of some one, Acts vii. 24, ἐποίησεν ἐκδίκησιν τῷ καταπονουμένῳ;

Judg. xi. 36, ἐν τῷ ποιῆσαι σοι ἐκδίκησιν τῶν ἐχθρῶν σου; 2 Sam. xxii. 48, ὁ διδοὺς ἐκδικήσεις ἐμοί, παιδεύων λαοὺς ὑποκάτω μου.—(II.) With the genitive of the person in whose behalf the revenge is taken, Luke xviii. 7, 8; while, on the other hand, the object against which the revenge is directed is added in the dative, 2 Thess. i. 8, διδόναι ἐκδίκησιν τοῖς μὴ εἰδόσιν θεὸν κ.τ.λ. Comp. Ezek. xxv. 24; Ecclus. xii. 6, τοῖς ἀσεβέσιν ἀποδώσει ἐκδίκησιν. Or added with ἐν, Mic. v. 15; 1 Macc. iii. 15, vii. 9, 24, 38.

Ἐν δίκῳς, *ον*, fair, just, syn. δίκαιος, yet differing therefrom, for δίκαιος characterizes the subject so far as he or it is (so to speak) one with δίκη, ἔνδικος so far as he occupies the due relation to δίκη; Heb. ii. 2, ἔνδικος μισθαποδοσία, just or fair recompense. Ἐνδिका δρᾶν in Sophocles and Euripides is not = δίκαια δρᾶν, but = δικάως δρᾶν. Rom. iii. 8, ὡν τὸ κρίμα ἔνδικόν ἐστιν; cf. ii. 5, ἡμέρα ἀποκαλύψεως δικαιοκρισίας τοῦ θεοῦ. Ἐνδικον there presupposes that that has been decided δικάως, which leads to the just sentence. The Tragedians sometimes, for clearness' sake, designate the δίκαιος as ἔνδικος, as opposed first to ὑπόδικος and then to ἄδικος.

Ἐπὶ δίκῳς, *ον*, one who comes under δίκη, guilty. The word is one rather of Attic usage, for the Attics use δίκη of what is according to legally established right. Opposed to ἔνδικος, cf. Plato, *Legg.* xii. 954 A, Ἐγγυητὴς μὲν καὶ ὁ προπωλὼν ὅτι οὖν τοῦ μὴ ἔνδικος πωλοῦντος ἢ καὶ μηδαμῶς ἀξιόχρεω ὑπόδικος δ' ἔστω καὶ ὁ προπωλὼν, καθάπερ ὁ ἀποδόμενος. It denotes one who is bound to do or suffer what is imposed for the sake of justice, because he has neglected to do what was right. Cf. *ibid.* ix. 869 A, ἐὰν δέ τις ἀπειθῇ, τῷ τῆς περὶ ταῦτα ἀσεβείας νόμῳ ὑπόδικος ὀρθῶς ἂν γίγνοιτο μετὰ δίκης. Synon. *ibid.* B, πολλοῖς ἔνοχος ἔστω νόμοις ὁ δράσας τι τοιοῦτον, therefore = *under obligation to make compensation*; cf. Dem. 518. 3, ἐὰν δέ τις τούτων τι παραβαίῃ, ὑπόδικος ἔστω τῷ παθόντι. Plato, *Legg.* ix. 871 B, ὑπόδικος τῷ ἐθελόντι τιμωρεῖν. In the N. T. Rom. iii. 19, ἵνα ὑπόδικος γένηται πᾶς ὁ κόσμος τῷ θεῷ.

Δοκέω, δόξω, ἔδοξα (akin to δέχομαι), (I.) intransitive, to appear, to have the appearance, Luke x. 36; Acts xvii. 18; 1 Cor. xii. 22; 2 Cor. x. 9; Heb. iv. 1, xii. 11. Generally used impersonally, δοκεῖ μοι εἶναι, Matt. xvii. 25, xviii. 12, and frequently. In this construction it is applied to decrees, settlements, decisions, e.g. Acts xv. 22, 25, 28, ἔδοξε τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι καὶ ἡμῖν, μηδὲν πλέον ἐπιθέσθαι ὑμῖν βάρος, an urbane expression only approximately rendered by the German "für gut befinden, gut achten" (to find good, to deem good), because it means more than a mere "find, deem good;" e.g. τὰ τῷ πλήθει δόξαντα = the decisions of the majority. Hence δόγμα = appointment, ordinance, Luke ii. 1, etc. The same urbanity lies in the οἱ δοκοῦντες εἶναι τι, Gal. ii. 6; οἱ δοκοῦντες, ii. 2, 6; οἱ δοκοῦντες στύλοι εἶναι, ii. 9; people who stand for something, who have weight, and are esteemed; it expressed not doubt, but the general opinion, Plat. *Euthyd.* 303 C, τῶν σεμνῶν καὶ δοκούντων τι εἶναι οὐδὲν ὑμῖν μέλει; Eurip. *Troad.* 608, τὰ δοκούντα, opposed to τὰ μηδὲν ὄντα.—(II.) Transitive, to hold for, be of opinion, believe, completely εἰναυτῷ δοκεῖν, *sibi videri*, Acts xxvi. 9, ἔδοξα ἑμαυτῷ . . . δεῖν πολλὰ ἐναντία

πρᾶξαι. Then, without the addition of the personal pronoun, Matt. vi. 7, 24, 44, Gal. vi. 3, etc., to intend, to purpose, Matt. iii. 9, μὴ δόξητε λέγειν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς.

Δόγμα, τό, *conclusion, ordinance, opinion, proposition, dogma*. The word occurs first in Xenophon and Plato, then in Plutarch and later authors. Usage primarily associates it with the use of δοκεῖ μοι, ἔδοξε ταῦτα, of conclusions of the popular assembly, of the senate, etc. Therefore (I.) = **conclusion**, synonymous with ψήφισμα, cf. Plato, *de Legg.* 314 B, τί οὖν ἂν τούτων ὑπολάβοιμεν μάλιστα τὸν νόμον εἶναι; τὰ δόγματα ταῦτα καὶ ψηφίσματα, ἐμοίγε δοκεῖ . . . Δόξαν, ὡς ἔοικε, λέγεις πολιτικὴν τὸν νόμον; Aesch. *Suppl.* 596, δήμου δέδοκται ψηφίσματα; 2 Macc. x. 8, ἐδογμάτισαν μετὰ κοινοῦ προστάγματος καὶ ψηφίσματος; xv. 36, ἐδογμάτισαν πάντες μετὰ κοινοῦ ψηφίσματος. In Xenophon the word occurs only in this sense, *Anab.* vi. 2. 11, δόγμα ἐποιήσαντο . . . θανάτῳ αὐτὸν ζημιοῦσθαι; iii. 3. 5, ἐκ τούτου ἔδοκε τοῖς στρατηγοῖς βέλτιον εἶναι δόγμα ποιήσασθαι τὸν πόλεμον ἀκήρυκτον εἶναι; vi. 4. 8, 27, ἦν γὰρ τῶν στρατιωτῶν δόγμα . . . δημόσια εἶναι τὰ ληφθέντα; *Hell.* v. 2. 27, iv. 37, and often; Polyb. xx. 4. 6, μετὰ κοινοῦ δόγματος; iv. 26. 4, χωρὶς κοινοῦ δόγματος. So also in Herodotian, Diodorus, and others, e.g. δόγμα κυροῦν, συνθεῖναι; Demosth. δόγματα Ἀμφικτυόνων; Plut. *Mor.* 79, *f. praec. Ger. Reip.* 19. Cf. Plat. *Legg.* i. 644 D, ἐπὶ δὲ πᾶσιν τούτοις λογισμός, ὃ τί ποτ' αὐτῶν ἄμεινον ἢ χεῖρον ὅς γενόμενος δόγμα πόλεως κοινὸν νόμος ἐπωνόμασται. So in the N. T. Acts xvi. 4, φυλάσσειν τὰ δόγματα τὰ κεκριμένα ὑπὸ τῶν κ.τ.λ. Akin to this is the transition to the signification, (II.) **will, ordainment, decree, prescription, command**, in which, however, it occurs but seldom in classical Greek, e.g. Plat. *Rep.* iv. 414 B, τοὺς δὲ νέους οὕς νῦν δὴ φύλακες ἐκαλοῦμεν ἐπικούρους τε καὶ βοηθοὺς τοῖς τῶν ἀρχόντων δόγμασιν; Plut. *Mor.* 742 D, ἔν τε δόγμασιν καὶ νόμοις, ἔν τε συνθήκαις καὶ ὁμολογίαις κυριώτερα καὶ ὕστερα νομίζεται καὶ βεβαιώτερα τῶν πρώτων. Oftener, on the contrary, in biblical Greek, where, excepting the place quoted under I., Acts xvi. 4, it appears in this meaning alone, and except in 3 Macc. i. 3, in the Book of Daniel only, answering to נְדָרִים, Dan. vi. 9, ἐπέταξε γραφῆναι τὸ δόγμα; = נְהִי, vi. 8, στήσον τὸν ὀρισμὸν καὶ ἔκθες γραφήν, ὅπως μὴ ἀλλοιωθῇ τὸ δόγμα Περσῶν καὶ Μήδων; ver. 15, ii. 13; = מִצְוָה, vi. 13, 26, ἐκ προσώπου μου ἐτέθη δόγμα τοῦτο, iii. 10, 12, 29; = נְהִי, vi. 10. Cf. 3 Macc. i. 3, μεταβαλὼν τὰ νόμιμα καὶ τῶν πατριῶν δογμάτων ἀπηλλοτριωμένος; Phil. *Alleg.* i. p. 50, ἡ δὲ μνήμη φυλακὴ καὶ διατήρησις τῶν ἁγίων δογμάτων. So in the N. T. Luke ii. 1, ἐξῆλθεν δόγμα παρὰ Καίσαρος; Acts xvii. 7, τὰ δόγματα Καίσαρος; Eph. ii. 15, τὸν νόμον τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασιν καταργήσας; Col. ii. 14, ἐξαλείψας τὸ καθ' ἡμῶν χειρόγραφον τοῖς δόγμασιν, ὃ ἦν ὑπεναντίον ἡμῖν. To be δόγματα, i.e. ordinances, commands which he simply has to promulgate who stands before a higher will, this is the character of the law which Christ has abrogated (concerning the combination of ἐν δογμ. with καταργήσας in Eph. ii. 15, cf. Theile, Harless, Hofmann *in loc.*). That the apostle uses δόγμα in this sense, and not of the teaching or doctrines of Christ, is clear from the use of δογματίζεσθαι in Col. ii. 20. Cf. Ign. *ad Magn.* 13, βεβαιωθῆναι ἐν τοῖς δόγμασιν τοῦ κυρίου καὶ τῶν ἀποσ-

τολων. The signification to which the use of the word to denote the dogmas of Christianity attached itself—to carry this out for completeness' sake—was borrowed from the use of δόγμα in the sense of—

(III.) Opinion, view, doctrinal statement, specially of the dogmas of philosophers; yet also, especially in Plato, in the more general sense, *view, opinion, e.g.* Plato, *Soph.* 265 C, τῶ τῶν πολλῶν δόγματι καὶ ῥήματι χρώμενοι; *Legg.* vii. 797 C, and often. Of fixed philosophical propositions, less frequently in Plato, but all the oftener in Plutarch, *e.g.* *Mor.* 14 E, τὰ περὶ τῶν ψυχῶν δόγματα; *Mor.* 797 B, καὶ μὴν οἱ λόγοι τῶν φιλοσόφων, ἂν ψυχαῖς ἡγεμονικῶν καὶ πολιτικῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐγγραφῶσι βεβαίως καὶ κρατήσωσι, νόμων δύναμιν λαμβάνουσιν· ἢ καὶ Πλάτων εἰς Σικελίαν ἔπλευσεν, ἐλπίζων τὰ δόγματα νόμους καὶ ἔργα ποιήσῃ ἐν τοῖς Διουνσίου πράγμασιν; 1000 D, καὶ λόγοι ῥητόρων καὶ δόγματα σοφιστῶν; 1062 E, ὅταν μὲν οὖν μηδενὸς ἐκστήναι τῶν μαχομένων, ἀλλὰ πάντα ὁμολογεῖν καὶ τιθέναι θέλωσι . . . ἢ πού σοι δοκοῦσι θαυμασίως ἐν τοῖς δόγμασι τὴν ὁμολογίαν βεβαιοῦν; *de tyrugn. Stoic.* 1033 A, ἀξιῶ τὴν τῶν δογμάτων ὁμολογίαν ἐν τοῖς βίοις θεωρεῖσθαι; 1034 B, ὁμολογεῖ τοὺς λόγους αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀνεξόδους εἶναι καὶ ἀπολιτεύτους, καὶ τὰ δόγματα ταῖς χρεαῖς ἀνάρμοστα καὶ ταῖς πράξεσιν; *ibid.* Ἔτι δόγμα Ζήνωνός ἐστιν, ἱερὰ θεῶν μὴ οἰκοδομεῖν· ἱερὸν γὰρ μὴ πολλοῦ ἄξιον καὶ ἄγιον οὐκ ἔστιν· οἰκοδόμων δὲ ἔργον καὶ βαναύσων οὐδὲν ἐστὶ πολλοῦ ἄξιον; *adv. Colot.* 1, περὶ τοῦ ὅτι κατὰ τὰ τῶν ἄλλων φιλοσόφων δόγματα οὐδὲ ζῆν ἐστίν; *Clem. Alex. Strom.* viii. 330. 11, ed. Sylb., τὸ μὲν δόγμα ἐστὶ κατὰληψίς τις λογική· κατὰληψις δὲ ἕξις καὶ συγκατάθεσις τῆς διανοίας. One sees how closely the significations, so different in themselves, *assumption, opinion, and doctrine, principle*, approximate, so that according to circumstances in patristic Greek, *e.g.*, θεῖος λόγος and δόγμα πατέρων might be placed over against each other; while, on the other hand, τὸ δόγμα τὸ θεῖον might in turn designate the evangelical truth, as the Stoics designated the fundamental truths universally to be recognised as δόγματα; cf. M. Aurelius, εἰς ἑαυτόν; ii. 3, ταῦτά σοι ἀρκέιτο, ἀεὶ δόγματα ἔστω; Justin Martyr, *Apol.* i. 58, δόγματος ὄντος παρ' αὐτῶν, κατ' ἀξίαν τῶν πράξεων ἕκαστον ἀμείψεσθαι μέλλοντα τῶν ἀνθρώπων κ.τ.λ. Further, see Suic. *Thes. s.v.* δόγμα; Nitzsch, *System der Christl. Lehre*, § 17, 3.

Δογματίζω, *to conclude, to ordain, to establish*, 2 Macc. x. 8, xv. 36, see under δόγμα; Col. ii. 20, τί . . . δογματίζεσθε; Μὴ ἄψῃ, μηδὲ γεύσῃ κ.τ.λ. (the middle = *to let oneself order*).—Of the philosophers = *to teach, e.g.* Justin, *Apol.* i. 4, οἱ τὰ ἐνάντια δοξάσαντες καὶ δογματίσαντες; 7, οἱ ἐν Ἑλλήσι τὰ αὐτοῖς ἀρεστὰ δογματίσαντες ἐκ παντὸς τῷ ἐνὶ ὀνόματι φιλοσοφίας προσαγορεύονται, καίπερ τῶν δογμάτων ἐναντίων ὄντων; i. 27, οἱ λεγόμενοι Στωϊκοὶ φιλόσοφοι καὶ αὐτὸν θεὸν εἰς πῦρ ἀναλύεσθαι δογματίζουσι, καὶ αὐτὸν κατὰ μεταβολὴν τὸν κόσμον γενέσθαι λέγουσιν.

Δόξα, ἡ. The significations of this word divide themselves conformably with the usage of the verb δοκέω. We cannot regard as the fundamental meaning, *opinion, representation*, as against ἐπιστήμη, the actual knowledge of a thing,—a meaning which is connected with the transitively used δοκεῖν, and, like this, is yet also intransitive at bottom,—but rather

the signification *appearance, repute, glory*, which the lexicographers clumsily distinguish as the secondary meaning of the word thus—"the opinion in which one stands to others" (in this Passow, Pape, Schenkl agree), whereby the usage and the relation of the word to *δοκέω* are mystified. Its meanings are rather to be arranged thus—(I.) from the intransitive *δοκεῖν*: (a.) *seeming*, as against *ἀλήθεια*; e.g. Xen. *Cyrop.* vi. 3. 30, *πλήθους δόξαν παρέξει*; *Hell.* vii. 5. 21, *δόξαν παρέιχέ μὴ ποιήσεσθαι μάχην*, made it appear, etc. (b.) *Reputation, renown*, always in an honourable sense, unless an epithet alters the force; from *δοκεῖν εἶναι τι* or *δοκεῖν*, the expression of general recognition. Hesych. *δόξα· φήμη, τιμή*; Eurip. *Herc.* f. 157, *ἔσχε δόξαν, οὐδὲν ὦν, εὐψυχίας*; Plat. *Menex.* 241 B, *δόξαν εἶχον ἄμαχοι εἶναι*. So Herod. Xen. Thuc. Plat. Plut. Hence Plut. *probl. Rom.* XIII. (266 F), *τὸν δὲ 'Ουνώρεμ' δόξαν ἂν τις ἢ τιμὴν μεθερμηνεύσειε*.—(II.) From the transitively used *δοκεῖν*, *opinion, notion*, opposed to *ἐπιστήμη*. From the signification I. b, the biblical usage, which is an expansion of it, starts.

(I.) It denotes, as in profane Greek, the *recognition*, which any one finds or which belongs to him; *honour, renown*, connected with *ἔπαινος*, Phil. i. 11; 1 Pet. i. 7; with *τιμή*, 1 Tim. i. 17; Heb. ii. 7, 9; 2 Pet. i. 17; Rev. iv. 11, v. 13; 1 Pet. i. 7, etc.; with *τιμή* and *εὐλογία*, Rev. v. 12, opposed to *ἀτιμία*, 2 Cor. vi. 8, *διὰ δόξης καὶ ἀτιμίας, διὰ δυσφημίας καὶ εὐφημίας*; 1 Cor. xi. 14, 15. It differs from *τιμή* as recognition does from estimation; Rom. iii. 23, *ὕστεροῦνται τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ, they lack recognition on the part of God*; for so must we render the Greek, and not "the glory of God" or "His image;" otherwise we lose the true relation between vv. 23 and 24, where *δικαιούμενοι* is contrasted with *ἡμαρτον*, and *δωρεάν* takes up the element lying in *ὕστ.* τῆς δ. τοῦ θεοῦ. Cf. also John xii. 43, *ἡγάπησαν γὰρ τὴν δόξαν τῶν ἀνθρώπων μᾶλλον ἢ περὶ τὴν δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ*; John viii. 54, *ἡ δόξα μου*. Noticeable are the combinations, *ζητεῖν δόξαν*, 1 Thess. ii. 6; John vii. 18, viii. 50; *δόξαν λαμβάνειν παρά τινος* (cf. *ἐξ ἀνθρώπων*, 1 Thess. ii. 6), John v. 41, 44, 2 Pet. i. 17, Rev. iv. 11; *δόξαν διδόναι τινι*, Luke xvii. 18; John ix. 24; Acts xii. 23; Rom. iv. 20; Rev. iv. 9, xi. 13, xiv. 7, xix. 7; *δόξα τινι, sc. ἐστίν*, Luke ii. 14, xix. 38; Rom. xi. 36, xvi. 27; Gal. i. 5, Eph. iii. 21; Phil. iv. 20; 1 Tim. i. 17; 2 Tim. iv. 18; Heb. xiii. 21; 1 Pet. iv. 11 (v. 11, Received text); 2 Pet. iii. 18; Jude 25; Rev. i. 6, vii. 12, xix. 1. Cf. Luke xiv. 10, *τότε ἔσται σοι δόξα ἐνώπιον κ.τ.λ.* Further, *εἰς, πρὸς δόξαν τινός*, Rom. iii. 7, xv. 7; 1 Cor. x. 31; 2 Cor. i. 20, iv. 15, viii. 19; Phil. ii. 11; 1 Pet. i. 7.—Heb. iii. 3.

(II.) As *δόξα*, in opposition to *ἀλήθεια*, denotes *seeming, appearance*, from *δοκεῖν*, in opposition to *εἶναι*, cf. Xen. *Hell.* ii. 3. 39, *ἀνδρὸς καὶ ὄντος καὶ δοκούντος ἱκανοῦ εἶναι*, so also, if traced back to *δοκεῖ εἶναι τι* or *δοκεῖν*, it may denote *appearance, form, aspect*; and, indeed, that appearance of a person or thing which catches the eye or attracts attention, commanding recognition, "*looking like something*;" equivalent therefore to *splendour, brilliance, glory*. Cf. Isa. liii. 2, *οὐκ ἔστιν εἶδος αὐτῷ οὐδὲ δόξα*. How closely these meanings border on each other may be seen, Isa. xi. 3, *οὐ κατὰ τὴν δόξαν κρίνει, כְּדֹכָא לֹא יִשְׁפָּט, comp. Ecclus. viii. 14, μὴ δικάζου μετὰ κριτοῦ· κατὰ γὰρ τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ κρινούσιν*

αὐτῷ. In this sense δόξα denotes (a.) the appearance of glory attracting the gaze; so, e.g., as a strong synonym of εἰκὼν, cf. Rom. i. 23, ἤλλαξαν τὴν δόξαν τοῦ ἀφθάρτου θεοῦ ἐν ὁμοιωματι εἰκόνος φθάρτου ἀνθρώπου, which explains why קִדְּשׁוּהוּ, which elsewhere = μορφή, ὁμοίωμα, in Ps. xvii. 15 and Num. xii. 8 = δόξα; in the latter passage, τὴν δόξαν κυρίου εἶδεν, parallel with εἶδος = נִשְׁכַּח, cf. 1 Cor. xi. 7, ἀνὴρ . . . εἰκὼν καὶ δόξα θεοῦ ὑπάρχων. The expression ἡ δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ, τοῦ κυρίου, must be explained accordingly; indeed, it corresponds to the Hebrew הִנֵּה יְהוָה, which signifies "the august contents of God's own entire nature, embracing the aggregate of all His attributes according to their undivided yet revealed fulness" (Umbreit, *die Sünde*, p. 99), or which embraces all that is excellent in the divine nature. (In a similar manner, Philo explains the δόξα of God as the "unfolded fulness of the divine δυνάμεις;" cf. Rev. xv. 8, where δόξα and δύναμις τοῦ θεοῦ are conjoined.) The δόξα of God coincides with His self-revelation, Ex. xxxiii. 22, בָּרַךְ בְּעֵינַי הִנֵּיקָא ד' אֵן פָּרַעְלָתְהּ הִי דִּדְּכָא מוֹן, cf. the following עָוֶס אֵן פָּרַעְלָתְהּ, ver. 21; τὸ πρόσωπόν μου, i.e., in it as the form of His manifestation, God sets Himself forth, since it comprises all that He is for us, for our good, cf. Ex. xxxiii. 19, בָּרַךְ בְּעֵינַי הִנֵּיקָא ד' אֵן פָּרַעְלָתְהּ, ἐγὼ παρελεύσομαι πρότερόν σου τῇ δόξῃ μου; ver. 18, קִדְּשׁוּהוּ כִּי יִשְׁכַּח הִי, ἐμφάνισόν μοι σεαυτόν. (According to this, Delitzsch's remark in Ps. xxv. 7 is to be completed, "טוֹב is not God's goodness as an attribute, but, as in Ps. xxxi. 20, Hos. iii. 5, the fulness of good promised and in store for those who turn to Him.") Cf. Isa. xlv. 13, xxvi. 10. It occupies accordingly a prominent place in the final revelation of redemption, Isa. lx. 3, ἐπὶ δὲ σὲ φανήσεται ὁ κύριος καὶ ἡ δόξα αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ σὲ ὀφθήσεται; Isa. vi. 3, xlii. 8, xlviii. 11; cf. Luke ii. 9; Rev. xxi. 23; Rom. vi. 4, v. 2. This redemptive character is an essential element of the idea of δόξα, so that one might perhaps say—the δόξα of God, as it is the fulness of all that is good in Him (בָּרַךְ בְּעֵינַי, Ex. xxxiii. 19), all His redeeming attributes (cf. πλήρωμα, John i. 14, 16), so also is it the form in which He reveals Himself in the economy of salvation,—which, however, is not to be taken in the coarse and outward sense taught by Jewish theology in its doctrine of the קִדְּשׁוּהוּ, "splendor quidam creatus, quem Deus quasi prodigii vel miraculi loco ad magnificentiam suam ostendendam alicubi habitare fecit," Maimon. *Mor. neboch.* i. 64. Cf. Bengel on Acts vii. 2, "gloria, divinitas conspicua."—Cf. Rom. ix. 23, ἵνα γνωρίσῃ τὸν πλοῦτον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ σκεύη ἐλέους; Eph. i. 12, εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἡμᾶς εἰς ἔπαινον δόξης αὐτοῦ; ver. 14; 1 Tim. i. 11, κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς δόξης τοῦ μακαρίου θεοῦ; Rev. xxi. 11, 23; John xi. 40, εἰς πίστεύσης, ὅψῃ τὴν δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ; Acts vii. 55; John xi. 44; Jude 25. Hence the δόξα of God, along with His ἀρετή (which see), is both the means (2 Pet. i. 3) and the goal (1 Pet. v. 10; 1 Thess. ii. 12) of our vocation. By means of it all the redemptive work of God is carried on. Rom. vi. 4, ἡγέρθη Χριστὸς ἐκ νεκρῶν διὰ τῆς δόξης τοῦ πατρὸς; 2 Thess. i. 9; it manifests itself in every redemptive influence experienced by individuals, Col. i. 11, δυναμούμενοι κατὰ τὸ κράτος τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ εἰς κ.τ.λ.; Eph. iii. 16, ἵνα δῶῃ ὑμῖν κατὰ τὸν πλοῦτον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ, δυνάμει κραταιωθῆναι κ.τ.λ. It made itself specially known in Christ and in His working, 2 Cor. iv. 6, πρὸς φωτισμὸν τῆς γνώσεως τῆς δόξης

τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν προσώπῳ Χριστοῦ, cf. Heb. i. 3 under ἀπαύγασμα, Luke ix. 43, ἐξεπλήσσοντο ἐπὶ τῇ μεγαλειότητι τοῦ θεοῦ, Tit. ii. 13, and forms the final goal of Christian hope, Rom. v. 2, καυχώμεθα ἐπ' ἐλπίδι τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ, cf. Acts vii. 55, 1 Thess. ii. 12, 1 Pet. v. 10, 2 Thess. ii. 14, so far as its disclosure belongs to the future, and, indeed, to the close of the history of redemption, Tit. ii. 13, προσδεχόμενοι τὴν μακαρίαν ἐλπίδα καὶ ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Cf. Matt. xvi. 27, Mark viii. 38, Luke ix. 26, where Christ speaks of His second coming ἐν τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ πατρὸς. The δόξα of the Son of man in Matt. xix. 28, xxv. 31, Mark x. 37, comp. Luke ix. 32, xxiv. 26, is to be understood in contrast with His earthly manifestation, John xvii. 22, 24, Phil. iii. 21, cf. 1 Tim. iii. 16, and is brought by Christ Himself into connection with the δόξα which He had before His humiliation, John xvii. 5; cf. xii. 41 and Phil. ii. 6, μορφή θεοῦ; and this His δόξα, John ii. 11, the manifestation of that which He properly is (δόξα ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός, John i. 14, ii. 11), becomes perceptible whenever His then present manifestation is broken through by His past and future glory. So in the writings of John; whereas elsewhere this relation does not come into consideration, and the δόξα of Christ, as it appertains to Him now, is alone spoken of, 2 Cor. iii. 18, iv. 4; 2 Thess. ii. 14; Jas. ii. 1; 1 Pet. i. 21.—With Rom. ix. 4, ὃν ἡ νιοθεσία καὶ ἡ δόξα, καὶ αἱ διαθήκαι κ.τ.λ.,—where ἡ δόξα must be taken absolutely in as definite and independent a sense as the other predicates,—we can scarcely compare 1 Sam. iv. 21, 22, ἀπώκισται δόξα ἀπὸ Ἰσραὴλ ἐν τῷ ληφθῆναι τὴν κιβωτὸν κυρίου; for this passage relates not to that which δόξα is absolutely, but to that which is the δόξα τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ, and what this is, the context shows. (See under b.) On the other hand, however, we may take as parallels, Ecclus. xlix. 8, Ἰεζεκιὴλ ὃς εἶδεν ὄρασιν δόξης ἣν ὑπέδειξεν αὐτῷ ἐπὶ ἄρματος Χερουβίμ, and Heb. ix. 5, Χερουβίμ δόξης; 2 Pet. i. 17, φωνή . . . ἀπὸ τῆς μεγαλοπρεποῦς δόξης, cf. Heb. i. 3, δεξιὰ τῆς μεγαλωσύνης, according to which ἡ δόξα is equivalent to ὁ θεὸς ἐν τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ, the self-revelation of God in the economy of redemption.

Δόξα without more precise definition by a genitive = *manifestation of glory*, opposed to ἀτιμία, 1 Cor. xv. 43, σπείρεται ἐν ἀτιμίᾳ, ἐγείρεται ἐν δόξῃ (synonymous with τιμή, Isa. xxxv. 2; Rev. xxi. 26; Rom. ii. 7, 10). Cf. 1 Pet. i. 21, πιστεύειν εἰς θεὸν τὸν ἐγείραντα Χριστὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ δόξαν αὐτῷ δόντα, as also in all the passages in which δόξα stands in antithesis to παθήματα, Rom. viii. 18; 1 Pet. i. 11, v. 1; Heb. ii. 10; 1 Pet. iv. 13, 14; 2 Cor. iv. 17. In this sense future δόξα is the hope of Christians, Rom. viii. 18, 21, Col. i. 27, iii. 4, a constituent of σωτηρία, 2 Tim. ii. 10, ἵνα . . . σωτηρίας τύχωσιν τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ μετὰ δόξης αἰωνίου, above all peculiar to God, for which reason we read ὁ θεός, πατὴρ τῆς δόξης, Acts vii. 2; Eph. i. 17. Cf. Jas. ii. 1, ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς τῆς δ.; 1 Cor. ii. 8.—1 Pet. iv. 14, τὸ τῆς δόξης . . . πνεῦμα.—Besides also in 2 Cor. iii. 7–11, 18; Matt. vi. 13, xxiv. 30; Mark xiii. 26; Luke ix. 31, xxi. 27; Phil. iv. 19.—The plural δόξαι, analogously to the use of ἡ δόξα of the self-revelation of God, in 2 Pet. ii. 10, Jude 8, δόξας βλασφημεῖν, denotes, according to the

context, *angelic powers*, so far as there belongs to them an appearance demanding recognition.

(b.) More specially δόξα means not the glorious appearance, attracting attention, of the person or thing itself, but that in the appearance which attracts attention, *e.g. splendour, glory, brightness, adornment*, in which sense the LXX. use it for דָּבָר, Isa. liii. 2, ii. 10; Dan. xi. 20. דָּבָר, Isa. xl. 7, πᾶσα δόξα ἀνθρώπου ὡς ἄνθος χόρτον. דָּבָר, Ex. xxviii. 2, 36; 1 Chron. xxii. 5; Isa. iii. 18; cf. Esth. v. 1, especially, however = דָּבָר, which is rendered only in Ex. xxviii. 2, 36, Isa. xi. 10, by τιμή, in Isa. xxii. 18 by καλός, elsewhere always by δόξα, Isa. xxxv. 2, lx. 13, דָּבָר דָּבָר = ἡ δόξα τοῦ Λιβάνου. Matt. iv. 8; Luke iv. 6, ἡ δ. τῶν βασιλειῶν τοῦ κόσμου. Matt. vi. 29; Luke xii. 27, ἡ δ. Σολομῶνος. Acts xxii. 11; 1 Cor. xv. 40, 41; 2 Cor. iii. 7; 1 Pet. i. 24; Rev. xviii. 1, xxi. 24; Phil. iii. 19; Eph. i. 6, δ. τῆς χάριτος. Ver. 18, τῆς κληρονομίας. Col. i. 27, τοῦ μυστηρίου; 1 Cor. ii. 7. In this sense God is designated דָּבָר, Jer. ii. 11; Isa. iii. 8; Ps. cvi. 20; cf. 2 Cor. viii. 23, δόξα Χριστοῦ. Eph. iii. 13, ἥτις (*sc. αἱ θλίψεις μου ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν*) ἐστὶν δόξα ὑμῶν. 1 Thess. ii. 20, ὑμεῖς γὰρ ἐστε ἡ δόξα ἡμῶν καὶ ἡ χαρά. Luke ii. 32, δόξα λαοῦ σου Ἰσραήλ.

Δοξάζω, *to think, to be of opinion, to suppose*; *e.g. ὀρθῶς, οὕτως δοξ.*, opposed to εἰδέναι, γινώσκειν; *to hold any one for anything, e.g. δοξάζομαι ἄδικος*, Plat. Rep. ii. 363 E; Plut. de Superst. 6, δοξάζουσι φοβερὸν τὸ εὐμενές, καὶ τυραννικὸν τὸ πατρικόν. The meaning connected therewith, *to recognize, to honour, to praise*, is found only in later Greek, *e.g. Polyb. vi. 53. 10, ἐπ' ἀρετῇ δεδοξασμένοι ἄνδρες*. LXX. = דָּבָר, Lev. x. 3, ἐν τοῖς ἐγγίζουσίν μοι ἁγιασθήσομαι καὶ ἐν πάσῃ τῇ συναγωγῇ δοξασθήσομαι; Judg. ix. 9, etc. It is further employed by the LXX., in accordance with their peculiar use of δόξα, to denote *to invest with dignity, to give any one esteem, to cause him honour by putting him into an honourable position*; Esth. iii. 1, ἐδόξασεν ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἀρταξέρξης Ἀμὸν καὶ ὕψωσεν αὐτὸν καὶ ἐπρωτοβάθρει πάντων τῶν φίλων αὐτοῦ = דָּבָר; cf. Ps. xxxvii. 20, ἅμα τῷ δοξασθῆναι αὐτοὺς καὶ ὑψωθῆναι = דָּבָר. Esth. vi. 6–11; Ex. xv. 6, ἡ δεξιὰ σου δεδοξασται ἐν ἰσχύϊ = דָּבָר. Vv. 1, 21 = דָּבָר. Isa. xlv. 23, ἐλυτρώσατο ὁ θεὸς τὸν Ἰακώβ, καὶ Ἰσραὴλ δοξασθήσεται = דָּבָר. Cf. especially, however, Ex. xxxiv. 29, 30, 35, δεδοξασται ἡ ὄψις τοῦ χρώματος τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ = דָּבָר, *to ray forth, to shine*. Accordingly we may distinguish even in the N. T. the meanings—

(I.) *To recognise, honour, praise*, Matt. vi. 2; Luke iv. 15; Rom. xi. 13. τὸν θεόν, Matt. v. 16, ix. 8, xv. 31; Mark ii. 12; Luke v. 25, 26, vii. 16, xiii. 13, xvii. 15, xviii. 43, xxiii. 47; Acts xi. 18, xiii. 48, xxi. 20; Rom. i. 21, xv. 9; 1 Cor. vi. 20; 2 Cor. ix. 13; Gal. i. 24; 1 Pet. iv. 11, 14 (over against βλασφημεῖν), 16; Rev. xv. 4. The occasion is indicated by ἐπί with the dative, Luke ii. 20; Acts iv. 21; by ἐν, Gal. i. 24.

(II.) (a.) *To bring to honour, make glorious, glorify* (strictly, *to give any one importance*). So in 1 Cor. xii. 26, εἴτε δοξάζεται ἐν μέλος, opposed to πάσχειν; cf. δόξα opposed to

πάθημα. Heb. v. 5, οὐχ ἑαυτὸν ἐδόξασε γεννηθῆναι ἀρχιερέα. 1 Pet. i. 8, χαρὰ δεδοξασμένη; cf. δοξάζεσθαι and χαίρειν conjoined, 1 Cor. xii. 26, Rev. xviii. 7, ὅσα ἐδόξασε αὐτήν, τοσοῦτον δότε αὐτῇ βασανισμὸν καὶ πένθος; 2 Cor. iii. 10. The expression in Rom. viii. 30, οὗς ἐδικαίωσεν, τούτους καὶ ἐδόξασεν, rests upon the connection existing between calling, justification, and the object of Christian hope, the future δόξα, Rom. viii. 18, 21; 2 Cor. iii. 18; cf. Rom. v. 1, 2; 1 Thess. ii. 12; 1 Pet. v. 10. Συνδοξάζειν, Rom. viii. 17

(b.) Specially, however, is the Johannine use of δοξάζειν connected with this meaning. As the δόξα of God is the revelation and manifestation of all that He has and is of good (*vid.* δόξα), it is said of a self-revelation in which God manifests all the goodness that He is, δοξάζει τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, John xii. 28. So far as it is Christ through whom this is made manifest, He is said to glorify the Father, John xvii. 1, 4; or the Father is glorified in Him, xiii. 31, xiv. 13; and Christ's meaning is analogous when He says to His disciples, ἐν τούτῳ ἐδοξάσθη ὁ πατήρ μου, ἵνα καρπὸν πολὺν φέρητε καὶ γενήσεσθε ἐμοὶ μαθηταί. When δοξάζεσθαι is predicated of Christ, the υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (*vid.* δόξα), it means simply that His innate glory is brought to light, is made manifest; cf. John xi. 4, ἵνα δοξάσθῃ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ διὰ τῆς ἀσθενείας. So John vii. 39, xii. 16, 23, xiii. 31, xvii. 1, 5. It is an act of God His Father in Him; cf. the more O. T. expression in Acts iii. 13, ὁ θεὸς ἐδόξασεν τὸν παῖδα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν, for which ii. 33, ὑψοῦν; compare above, δοξάζειν and ὑψοῦν frequently combined. The glorious nature of Christ is revealed by God in Himself (John xiii. 32, ὁ θ. δοξάσει αὐτὸν ἐν ἑαυτῷ), inasmuch as it is God Himself again who is revealed in Christ as that which He is. So also is Christ glorified in His disciples, xvii. 10; cf. xiv. 13; and finally, as the revelation of the Holy Spirit is connected with the glorification of Christ, Christ says regarding Him, ἐκεῖνος ἐμὲ δοξάσει, xvi. 14.—As this use of δοξάζειν is so constant, it would seem right to assume that it has the force of "*to glorify, make honourable,*" in viii. 54, xxi. 19 also.

Ἐνδοξος, *ον*, recognised, honoured, honourable, distinguished, e.g. ἔνδοξα καὶ λαμπρὰ πράγματα, Aesch. iii. 231. So in Luke xiii. 17, τὰ ἔνδοξα τὰ γινόμενα ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, of the miracles of Christ (Luke v. 26, εἶδομεν παράδοξα σήμερον). Cf. Ex. xxxiv. 10; Job v. 9 = תִּשְׁבָּח, xxxiv. 24. Distinguished, aristocratic, e.g. πλούσιοι καὶ ἔνδοξοι, Plat. *Sophist.* 223 B; Isa. xxvi. 15, οἱ ἔνδοξοι τῆς γῆς; 1 Sam. ix. 6, etc. = נִפְחָל, Niphal. So opposed to ἄτιμος, 1 Cor. iv. 19; Luke vii. 25.—In Eph. v. 27, ἵνα παραστήσῃ αὐτὸς ἐαυτῷ ἔνδοξον τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, also, the meaning *distinguished* will have to be taken as lying at the basis; for neither classical Greek nor the LXX. supply an example of the meaning *glorious*. In this case ἔνδοξος would pretty nearly correspond to εὐπρόσδεκτος in Rom. xv. 16, 1 Pet. ii. 5; to εὐάρεστος in Rom. xii. 1. The meaning *glorious* is only defensible if we compare ἐνδοξάζειν.

Ἐνδοξάζω, only in biblical Greek, Ex. xiv. 4, ἐνδοξασθήσομαι ἐν Φαραώ = נִפְחָל, as in Ezek. xxviii. 22, ἐνδοξασθήσομαι ἐν σοί, καὶ γνώσῃ ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ κύριος; 2 Kings

xiv. 10. — Ex. xxxiii. 16, ἐνδοξασθήσομαι . . . παρὰ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη = $\text{עֲנִי־לְכָל־עַמִּים}$; Isa. xlix. 3, δοῦλός μου εἰ σὺ Ἰσραήλ, καὶ ἐν σοὶ ἐνδοξασθήσομαι = אֶפְרַיִם , Hithpael; Isa. xlv. 25, ἀπὸ κυρίου δικαιοθήσονται καὶ ἐν τῷ θεῷ ἐνδοξασθήσεται πᾶν τὸ σπέρμα τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ (cf. Rom. viii. 30) = אֶפְרַיִם ; Ps. lxxxix. 8; Ecclus. xxxviii. 6. According to this, ἐνδοξάζω is equivalent to actually to glorify; aorist passive, to appear glorious; 2 Thess. i. 10, ὅταν ἔλθῃ ὁ κύριος ἐνδοξασθῆναι ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις αὐτοῦ. Cf. Ezek. xxviii. 22; Ps. lxxxix. 8. — 2 Thess. i. 12, ὅπως ἐνδοξάσθῃ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν.

Δόκιμος, ον (from δοκέω), *acceptable*, of good and tried coin, hence *genuine, approved*, 2 Cor. x. 18, οὐ γὰρ ὁ ἑαυτὸν συνιστάμενος, ἐκείνός ἐστιν δόκιμος, ἀλλὰ ὃν ὁ κύριος συνίστησιν, Jas. i. 12. Of those who prove or have approved themselves as Christians, 1 Cor. xi. 19, ἵνα οἱ δόκιμοι φανεροὶ γένωνται ἐν ὑμῖν, Rom. xvi. 10, Rom. xiv. 18, εὐάρεστος τῷ θεῷ, δόκιμος τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, *acceptable to God and recognised, approved, of men*. Bengel, “*Id agit, unde Deo placeat, et hominibus sese probet probarique ab hominibus debeat*,” cf. Prov. xvi. 7; Herod. i. 65. 2, Δυκούργου τῶν Σπαρτιητέων δοκίμου ἀνδρός; iii. 85. Often in Plutarch.

Ἄδόκιμος, literally, *unapproved*; *unworthy*, e.g. νόμισμα, *spurious, that will not stand proof*, 2 Cor. xiii. 5, ἑαυτοὺς δοκιμάζετε . . . εἰ μή τι ἀδόκιμοί ἐστε. Vv. 6, 7. We find the same play of words in Rom. i. 28, καθὼς οὐκ ἐδοκίμασαν τὸν θεὸν ἔχειν ἐν ἐπιγνώσει, παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς εἰς ἀδόκιμον νοῦν. Ἀδόκιμος νοῦς is a νοῦς that turns out false, cf. 1 Tim. vi. 5, διεφθαρμένος τὸν νοῦν, like 2 Tim. iii. 8; Luther aptly renders it, “with disordered mind.” From this necessarily follows the ποιεῖν τὰ μὴ καθήκοντα, Rom. i. 28. Wetstein, “*Sicut ipsi improbarunt habere cognitionem Dei, ita Deus tradidit eos in mentem improbam, plumbeam, inidoneam quae id quod mentis est ageret*,” 1 Cor. ix. 27; 2 Tim. iii. 8; Tit. i. 16; Heb. vi. 8.

Δοκιμή, ἡ, *proof* (of genuineness, trustworthiness). We must distinguish between a present and past, an active and a passive signification, for δοκιμή has a reflexive sense; hence either the having proved oneself true or the proving oneself true. Georg. Sync. p. 27 D, πρὸς δοκιμὴν τῆς ἐκάστου πρὸς τὸν θεὸν προαιρέσεως. Accordingly the texts in which the word occurs may be arranged as follows: (1) 2 Cor. xiii. 3, δοκιμὴν ζητεῖτε τοῦ ἐν ἐμοὶ λαλοῦντος Χριστοῦ, ὃς εἰς κ.τ.λ., i.e. *ye desire that Christ's speaking in me shall prove itself true*; 2 Cor. ii. 9, ἵνα γινῶ κ.τ.λ., whether ye prove yourselves true. So also Rom. v. 4. (2) Phil. ii. 22, τὴν δὲ δοκιμὴν αὐτοῦ γινώσκετε, *how he has proved himself true*; 2 Cor. ix. 13, viii. 2.

Δοκίμιον, τό, in Dion. Hal., Plut., and others = τὸ δοκιμεῖον, *means of proving*. Dion. Hal. *Rhet.* 11, δοκ. . . πρὸς ὃ τις ἀποβλέπων δυνήσεται τὴν κρίσιν ποιεῖσθαι. Still the means of proof are not only, e.g., the touchstone itself, but also the trace of the metal left thereon. Hence τὸ δοκίμιον τῆς πίστεως, Jas. i. 3, 1 Pet. i. 7, the result of the contact of πίστις with πειρασμοῖς, that in virtue of which faith is recognised as genuine,

= the verification of faith. Cf. the frequently cited passage in Herodian, ii. 10. 12, δοκίμιον δὲ στρατιωτῶν κάματος ἄλλ' οὐ τρυφή.

Εὐδοκέω, belonging only to later Greek, Polyb., Dion. Hal., Diod. Sic., and previously employed several times by the LXX. to translate רָצָה and רָצָה. Fut. εὐδοκήσω, aor. εὐδόκησα, forms which in δοκέω occur only rarely, and in poetry. *Ἡεὐδόκησα* occurs interchangeably with εὐδόκησα, the same mss. reading in one passage the former, in another the latter; e.g. codex C, Heb. x. 6, ηὐδ., in ver. 8 εὐδ. — Strictly speaking, it is merely a *stronger form* of the transitive δοκεῖν, to deem good; cf. Polyb. i. 77, ὡς οὐ μόνον εὐδοκῆσαι κοινωνὸν αὐτὸν προσλαβέσθαι τῶν πράξεων, with Xen. *Cyrop.* viii. 7. 4, ἔδοξεν ἀναπαύσεσθαι; 1 Macc. vi. 23, ἡμεῖς εὐδοκοῦμεν δουλεύειν τῷ πατρὶ σου, with Acts xxvi. 9 under δοκεῖν, where a resolve is referred to, the infinitive following, and it lays stress on the willingness or freedom thereof; at the same time marking its design as something good, whether as intended by the resolver or in reality. Where it expresses the relation of the subject to an object, it implies *recognition, approval thereof*; Polyb. iii. 8, εὐδοκεῖν τοῖς ὑπ' Ἀννίβου πραχθείσιν, opposed to *δυσαρεστεῖσθαι*, *ibid.* *δυσηρεστοῦντο τοῖς ὑπ' Ἀννίβου πραττομένοις*. For both cases at once, see Ps. lxxviii. 17, τὸ ὅρος δ' εὐδόκησεν ὁ θεὸς κατοικεῖν ἐν αὐτῷ. — (I.) It relates to a determination, when it is followed by an infinitive; in the LXX. only in Ps. lxxviii. 17. In the N. T. Luke xii. 32, εὐδόκησεν ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν δοῦναι ὑμῖν τὴν βασιλείαν; 1 Cor. i. 21, εὐδόκησεν ὁ θεὸς διὰ τῆς μωρίας τοῦ κηρύγματος σῶσαι κ.τ.λ.; Gal. i. 15, εὐδόκησεν ὁ ἀφορίσας με . . . ἀποκαλύψαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐμοί; Col. i. 19; Rom. xv. 26, 27; 1 Thess. ii. 8, iii. 1; 2 Cor. v. 8, εὐδοκοῦμεν μᾶλλον ἐκδημῆσαι κ.τ.λ.; cf. Ecclus. xxv. 16. — (II.) Where the matter under consideration is the relation of the subject to an object, the latter is expressed in profane Greek by the dative (*vid. supra*), rarely by the addition of ἐπὶ τινι;—in the LXX., on the contrary, we find the accusative, as in Ps. lxxviii. 17, li. 18, 21; Lev. xxvi. 34, 41; 1 Esdr. i. 55 (Ecclus. xv. 17); once ἐπὶ with the dative in Judith xv. 10; mostly, however, ἐν with dative, 2 Sam. xxii. 20; Isa. lxii. 4; Mal. ii. 17; Hab. ii. 4; Ps. xlv. 5,—varieties of usage which arose probably from the circumstance that when the word first began to be employed by writers its construction was not quite settled, and that fixed rules were formed on the basis of the example of the authors above quoted. In the N. T. the accusative occurs only in Heb. x. 6, 8 (from Ps. xl. 7). Elsewhere ἐν, Matt. iii. 17, xvii. 5; Mark i. 11; Luke iii. 22; 1 Cor. x. 5; Heb. x. 38; 2 Cor. xii. 10; 2 Thess. ii. 12; εἰς, 2 Pet. i. 17, Matt. xii. 18, where Lachm. reads simply the accusative. This mode of indicating the object is justified by the circumstance that εὐδοκεῖν may be classed among the verbs which denote an emotion, a mood, a sentiment cherished towards any one = to take pleasure in something, to have an inclination towards it, as θέλειν also is used by the LXX., and ἀγαπᾶν is sometimes combined with the dative in classical Greek. — In general the LXX. employ θέλειν far more frequently to express that which they elsewhere express by εὐδοκεῖν = רָצָה and רָצָה. So e.g. = רָצָה, θέλειν with the accusative, Deut. xxi. 14; Ps. xviii. 22, ῥύσεται

με, ὅτι ἠθέλησέ με. (Cf. Matt. xxvii. 43, ῥυσάσθω ἑὺν αὐτόν, εἰ θέλει αὐτόν.) Ps. xxxiv. 12, θέλειν ζωὴν, cf. 1 Pet. iii. 10, ζωὴν ἀγαπᾶν, and γὰρ = ἀγαπᾶν, Ps. li. 8; Hos. vi. 6, ἔλεος θέλω καὶ οὐ θυσίαν, cf. Heb. x. 6, 8. Herewith cf. εὐδοκεῖν with the accusative in the places quoted. Further, ῥᾷ = θέλειν ἐν, quite in the same sense as εὐδοκεῖν ἐν, 1 Sam. xviii. 22, θέλει ἐν σοὶ ὁ βασιλεύς; 2 Sam. xv. 26, οὐκ ἠθέληκα ἐν σοί, correlative with ver. 25, εἰ ἐν εὐρῷ χάριν; 1 Kings x. 8, ἠθέλησεν ἐν σοὶ δοῦναί σε ἐπὶ θρόνου Ἰσραὴλ, as in 2 Chron. ix. 8. Further = ῥᾷ, 1 Chron. xxviii. 4, ἐν ἐμοὶ ἠθέλησε τοῦ γενέσθαι με εἰς βασιλέα, parallel previously with ἐκλέγεσθαι and αἰρετίζειν, cf. Matt. xii. 18. Like θέλειν in these combinations, εὐδοκεῖν also denotes what is elsewhere rendered ἐκλέγεσθαι and αἰρετίζειν, or προσδέχεσθαι, as ῥᾷ is rendered in Isa. xlii. 1; Amos v. 22; Mal. i. 10; cf. Prov. iii. 12, παραδέχεσθαι, and accordingly εὐδοκεῖν is fitted to express *the same bearing on God's part to men* (Matt. iii. 17, xvii. 5; Mark i. 11; Luke iii. 22; 1 Cor. x. 5; Heb. x. 38; 2 Pet. i. 17; Matt. xii. 18), for which elsewhere *these latter expressions are employed* (hence also the aor. ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα, Matt. iii. 17, etc.). Cf. Isa. xlii. 1, ὁ ἐκλεκτός μου, προσεδέξατο αὐτόν ἢ ψυχὴ μου, for which Matt. xii. 18, ὁ ἀγαπητός μου, εἰς ὃν εὐδόκησεν ἡ ψυχὴ μου. Cf. also ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα, Matt. xvii. 5, with the parallel passage Luke ix. 35, ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἐκλελεγμένος. It corresponds also to ἀγαπᾶν; cf. 2 Thess. ii. 12, εὐδοκεῖν ἐν ἀδικίᾳ, with 2 Pet. ii. 15; Heb. i. 9; see ἀγαπᾶν (a) and (b). What is special here is that εὐδοκεῖν is at the same time an expression of **emotion**; hence the combination with ἀγαπητός, as προσδέχεσθαι with ἐκλεκτός, Isa. xlii. 1; cf. 2 Cor. xii. 10, εὐδοκῶ ἐν ἀσθενείαις.

Εὐδοκία, ἡ, in the LXX. and N. T., for which Dion. Hal., Diod. Sic., etc., have εὐδόκησις, *the deeming good, contentment, approval*. Diod. Sic. xv. 6, τηρήσειν ἅμα καὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν καὶ τὴν εὐδόκησιν τοῦ Διονυσίου. In this sense εὐδοκία = ῥᾷ, Ps. xix. 15, ἔσονται εἰς εὐδοκίαν τὰ λόγια τοῦ στόματός μου; Ecclus. xxxi. 20, cf. ῥᾷ, Lev. i. 3, xxii. 20, 21, Jer. vi. 20, Prov. xii. 22, where it is = δεκτὸς τῷ θεῷ. This corresponds to the use of εὐδοκεῖν τινί, ἐν τινί, No. II., where an object actually present is referred to, = *joy, good pleasure*, Ecclus. i. 27, xxxii. 5, xxxix. 8. But as εὐδοκεῖν, where allusion is made to a resolve, lays stress on the willingness or freedom of it (Ecclus. xxxii. 20, θεραπεύων ἐν εὐδοκίᾳ δεχθήσεται καὶ ἡ δέησις αὐτοῦ ἕως νεφελῶν συνάψει), at the same time marking it as good, so also does εὐδοκία denote a *free will* (willingness, pleasure), *whose intent is something good*,—benevolence, gracious purpose. It corresponds thus to ῥᾷ, Ps. lxxxix. 18, cvi. 4, li. 20, ἀγάθυνον, κύριε, ἐν τῇ εὐδοκίᾳ σου τὴν Σιών (cf. θέλημα = ῥᾷ, Ps. xxx. 6, 8), and in this sense is parallel to εὐλογία, *blessing*, Ps. v. 15, εὐλογήσεις δίκαιον, κύριε, ὡς ὄπλῳ εὐδοκίας ἐστεφάνωσας ἡμᾶς, cf. Deut. xxxiii. 23; Ps. cv. 16, ἐμπιπλᾷς πᾶν ζῶον εὐδοκίας. Cf. ῥᾷ = ἔλεος, Isa. lx. 10 = χάρις, Prov. xi. 27. Hence Theodoret, ἡ ἐπ' εὐεργεσίᾳ βούλησις. — Of God's purpose of grace, Matt. xi. 26; Luke x. 21, οὕτως ἐγένετο εὐδοκία ἐμπροσθέν σου; Eph. i. 9, κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν αὐτοῦ; Phil. ii. 13 (cf. ὑπέρ, Rom. xv. 8). In Eph. i. 5 it serves more exactly to characterize the θέλημα, κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν

τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ. Luke ii. 14, ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκία, corresponds to εὐδοκεῖν ἐν. Even if, with Lachm. and Tisch., we read ἐν ἀ. εὐδοκίας, we should have to take εὐδοκία in the same sense, and to explain the genitive like τέκνα ὀργῆς, υἱοὶ τῆς βασιλείας. For εὐδοκία never denotes "good will" in the moral sense; not even in 2 Thess. i. 11. As πᾶσα εὐδοκία ἀγαθωσύνης is there mentioned along with ἔργον πίστεως, it is impossible that εὐδοκία ἀγαθωσύνης should mean "pleasure in the good" (de Wette), for the symmetry of expression would thus be destroyed; but εὐδοκία must be an outcome of ἀγαθωσύνη, as ἔργον is a product of πίστις; εὐδοκία ἀγαθωσύνης is an expression like εὐδοκία ἐπιθυμίας, Ecclus. xviii. 31; εὐδ. ἀσεβῶν, Ecclus. ix. 12, denoting accordingly that which pleases ἀγαθωσύνη, goodness, the tendency to the good. Nor does εὐδ. in Phil. i. 15 mean *a purpose morally good*; but in opposition to διὰ φθόνον καὶ ἔριν, δι' εὐδοκίαν τὸν Χριστὸν κηρύσσειν is = *benevolently*, cf. vv. 16, 17. The question is more difficult, how we are to understand ἡ μὲν εὐδοκία τῆς ἐμῆς καρδίας καὶ ἡ δέησις πρὸς τὸν θεὸν κ.τ.λ. in Rom. x. 1. Some urge that it cannot denote *wish*, because εὐδοκεῖν does not occur in the sense of ἐπιθυμεῖν, and that the meaning "good pleasure" is inconsistent both with δέησις and with πρὸς τὸν θεόν, which, owing to the absence of the article, must be referred to both expressions. Apart, however, from the circumstance that some MSS. repeat the article, the words ἡ δέησις πρὸς τὸν θεόν can quite as easily stand alone, like e.g. ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, Col. i. 4, cf. δέησις, 2 Cor. ix. 14, Phil. i. 4, and the meaning "*what is pleasing to my heart* (Ecclus. ix. 12), and *what I ask from God for Israel*," would not be at all unsuitable. At the same time, it is possible that the apostle used εὐδοκία to express his *benevolent intentions* or wishes relatively to the salvation of Israel, analogously to its use for the gracious will of God. Still this explanation of εὐδ. in the present connection is undeniably somewhat forced, especially as the meaning "benevolent purpose," alongside of δέησις, strikes one as much stranger than "good pleasure." The meaning "wish" is totally indefensible, even if we take into consideration the use of εὐδοκεῖν in 2 Cor. v. 8, 1 Thess. ii. 8, where it denotes "willingness," as in Rom. xv. 26, 27; cf. 1 Macc. vi. 23, xiv. 46, 47.

Δοῦλος, ου, ὁ, servant, the opposite of ἐλεύθερος, 1 Cor. xii. 13; Gal. iii. 28; Col. iii. 11; Rev. vi. 15, xiii. 16, xix. 18. Correlative usually to δεσπότης, as in Tit. ii. 9; in the N. T., however, more frequently to κύριος, Luke xii. 46, John xv. 20, and often. He is a δοῦλος whose will and capacity are totally at the disposal of another, Xen. *Cyrop.* viii. 1. 4, οἱ μὲν δοῦλοι ἄκουτες τοῖς δεσπόταις ὑπηρετοῦσι; cf. Luke xvii. 7-10; Gal. iv. 1-3; John xv. 15; 1 Tim. vi. 1. Synonymous with διάκονος (which see), οἰκέτης, θεράπων, which latter expressions are often used interchangeably in the LXX. The transference to moral relationships was natural enough; e.g. δ. τῆς ἀμαρτίας, John viii. 34, Rom. vi. 17, 20, cf. δουλοῦσθαι τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ, Rom. vi. 18, to designate one who has given his will and thus also his activity into bondage to sin, and is completely ruled thereby. Cf. 2 Pet. ii. 19, ἐλευθερίαν αὐτοῖς ἐπαγγελλόμενοι, αὐτοὶ δοῦλοι ὑπάρχοντες τῆς φθορᾶς

subject to corruption; ὃ γάρ τις ἡττηται, τούτῳ καὶ δεδούλωται; Rom. vi. 16, δούλοι ἐστε ὃ ὑπακούετε. Cf. Ammon., p. 45, δούλοι μὲν γάρ εἰσι οἱ τῶν ἡδονῶν καὶ πάντες οἱ ὑποταγμένοι ὑπὸ βασιλέα.

The normal moral relation of man to God is that of a δούλος τοῦ θεοῦ, whose own will, though perfectly free, is bound to God; 1 Pet. ii. 16, ὡς ἐλεύθεροι, καὶ μὴ ὡς ἐπικάλυμμα ἔχοντες τῆς κακίας τὴν ἐλευθερίαν, ἀλλ' ὡς θεοῦ δούλοι. The expression δούλος θεοῦ (κυρίου, Χριστοῦ), however, bears a twofold meaning. It denotes—

(I.) That relation of subservience and subjection of will which befits all who confess God and Christ, and are devoted to Him; and indeed with the distinction, that whilst (a.) some are designated His servants by God Himself, and are separate from others as belonging to Him and well-pleasing on account of their conduct towards Him (for this latter see Rev. xxii. 3), so e.g. Ps. cv. 6, 26, and Isa. lxxv. 9, where δούλος is conjoined with ἐκλεκτός; Ps. cv. 26, ἐξαπέστειλε Μωϋσῆν τὸν δούλον αὐτοῦ, Ἀαρὼν δὲ ἐξελέξατο ἑαυτῷ; Job i. 8, ii. 3, xlii. 8; Joel iii. 2; Acts ii. 18; Deut. xxxii. 36; Lev. xxv. 42; Rev. i. 1, ii. 20, vii. 3, xi. 18, xix. 2, 5, xxii. 3, 6; in other cases (b.) men thus designate themselves; and accordingly merely their relation to God, i.e. their devotion, submission, is expressed, as e.g. Ex. iv. 10; 1 Sam. iii. 9, xxiii. 10; 1 Cor. vii. 22 (cf. ver. 23, μὴ γίνεσθε δούλοι ἀνθρώπων); Eph. vi. 6; Col. iv. 12; Luke ii. 29. Cf. ἰδοὺ ἡ δούλη κυρίου· γένοιτό μοι κατὰ τὸ ῥῆμά σου, Luke i. 38, 48; σύνδουλος, Rev. ii. 9. It is the same idea which gives weight and significance to Phil. ii. 7—one of the most daring expressions,—μορφὴν δούλου λαβών, over against ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων, ver. 6.

(II.) A peculiar relation of devotedness, in which a man is at God's disposal, and is employed by Him,—a special form of the general relation referred to above; cf. the passages in the second part of Isaiah, where the servant of Jehovah (ὁ παῖς μου) is at the same time His Elect One; cf. also Rev. xxii. 9. Thus the prophets are designated δούλοι τοῦ θεοῦ, Rev. x. 7, ἐτελέσθη τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ θεοῦ, ὡς εὐηγγέλισεν τοὺς ἑαυτοῦ δούλους τοὺς προφῆτας; cf. Jer. vii. 25, xxv. 4; Amos iii. 7.—Moses, Rev. xv. 3, and Neh. x. 30, cf. Josh. i. 2, Ex. xiv. 31, Num. xii. 7 = θεράπων; Deut. xxxiv. 5, οἰκέτης; Ps. cxxiii. 10, cxliv. 10; Acts xvi. 17; cf. Eurip. Ion. 309, τοῦ θεοῦ καλοῦμαι δούλος εἰμί τε. In the O. T., after Moses and Joshua, David is the first who is called the servant of Jehovah in a prominent sense, Ps. xviii. 1, xix. 12, 14, cxliv. 10; 2 Sam. vii. 20. (See Delitzsch on Ps. xviii.)—So also the apostles, Acts iv. 29; cf. Tit. i. 1. In the same manner Paul describes himself as a δούλος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, Rom. i. 1, which obviously has relation to his office; cf. Gal. i. 10, εἰ ἔτι ἀνθρώποις ἡρεσκον Χριστοῦ δούλος οὐκ ἂν ἤμην. Cf. also Phil. i. 1, where Paul designates himself and Timothy without further addition δούλοι Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ; and 2 Tim. ii. 24, where there is undoubtedly a reference to the special relation of service (and the correspondent behaviour, see I. b); δούλον δὲ κυρίου οὐ δεῖ μάχεσθαι, ἀλλὰ ἡπιον εἶναι πρὸς πάντας, διδακτικὸν κ.τ.λ.; Jas. i. 1; 2 Pet. i. 1; Jude 1; Rev. i. 1.—Only once does Paul use the word to designate his relation to the church, 2 Cor. iv. 5, κηρίσσομεν Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν κύριον, ἑαυτοὺς δὲ δούλους ὑμῶν διὰ

Ἰησοῦν; cf. i. 24, οὐχ ὅτι κυριεύομεν ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως, ἀλλὰ συνεργοί ἐσμεν τῆς χαρᾶς ὑμῶν; 1 Cor. ix. 19, ἐλεύθερος γὰρ ὢν ἐκ πάντων, πᾶσιν ἑμαυτὸν ἰδούλωσα; cf. διάκονος.

Σύνδουλος, ὁ, fellow-servant, Matt. xviii. 28, 29, 31, 33, xxiv. 49; ὁ τοῦ αὐτοῦ δεσπότου, Pollux, *Onom.* iii. 82. In Attic Greek ὁμόδουλος is often substituted for it. — Used (I.) of companions in the same relationship of devotion and subjection to God, Rev. xxii. 9, as also of subservience (*vid.* δούλος), Rev. vi. 14. And (II.) to denote participation in the same work, in the same divine commission, Rev. xix. 10, xxii. 9, connected with διάκονος, Col. i. 7, iv. 7.

Δουλόω, to make a servant, to subject, to subjugate, Acts vii. 6; 1 Cor. ix. 19; passive, to be subjugated, subdued; perfect, to be dependent; Gal. iv. 3, ὑπὸ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου ἡμεν δεδουλωμένοι. It denotes not so much a relation of service, as rather, primarily, the relation of dependence upon, bondage to any one; *e.g.* in the case of subjugated nations, etc.; so in 2 Pet. ii. 19; Tit. ii. 3. To this the use of the word in Rom. vi. 18, 22, owes its significance, ἐλευθερωθέντες δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἐδουλώθητε τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ; ver. 22, δουλωθέντες δὲ τῷ θεῷ; cf. the adjective, τὰ μέλη δοῦλα, ver. 19. — In 1 Cor. vii. 15 the words οὐ δεδούλωται ὁ ἀδελφὸς ἢ ἡ ἀδελφή are hardly to be explained as standing in antithesis with χωρίζεσθαι, or ver. 13, μὴ ἀφίετώ, but, as Meyer (*in loc.*) justly remarks, relate to the legal necessity, to which attention is directed in the ἐν τοιούτοις, "in such cases;" cf. ver. 39.

Δουλεύω, to be in the position of a servant, and to act accordingly; that is, both to be subject and to serve in subjection, in bondage,—used of actions which are directed by others. Cf. δουλοῦσθαι as opposed to αὐτονόμος, Xen. *Hell.* iv. 8. 1, 2.

(I.) To be subjugated, reduced to bondage, τινί, John viii. 33; Acts vii. 7; Rom. ix. 12. Absolutely, Gal. iv. 25, δουλεύει μετὰ τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς, opposed to ἐλευθέρα ἐστίν, ver. 26, synonymous with ὑπὸ νόμον εἶναι, ver. 21. The similar expression in Rom. vii. 6, ὥστε δουλεύειν ἡμᾶς ἐν καινότητι πνεύματος καὶ οὐ παλαιότητι γράμματος, is occasioned by the relation to the νόμος hitherto considered, and by the antithesis between γράμμα and πνεῦμα intended to be set up by the apostle. Γράμμα, namely (which see), denotes the law as a fixed and therefore outwardly abiding norm, and the words ἐλευθέρα ἐστὶν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου, ver. 4, readily suggested the expression δουλεύειν. At the same time the apostle had in view, not merely the dissolution of the relation to the law, but also the establishment of a new relation, in which Christ takes the place of the law, just as a husband represents the law relatively to his wife until another can rightly take his place, vv. 1–4. Finally, however, in order to express the change effected in the δουλεύειν itself, the apostle in ver. 6 contrasts, not as hitherto νόμος and Χριστός, but πνεῦμα and γράμμα; for in the πνεῦμα the relation of Christ to man manifests itself analogously to that of the law to man in the γράμμα, hence also we read δουλεύειν ἐν τινί and not δουλεύειν τινί.

(II.) To serve in bondage, to put one's dependence into effect, *e.g.* to obey, Luke xv. 29,

δουλεύω σοι καὶ οὐδέποτε ἐντολήν σου παρήλθον; Matt. vi. 24; Luke xvi. 13, δυσὶ κυρίοις, θεῷ καὶ μαμωνᾷ; Gal. v. 13, δουλεύετε ἀλλήλοις; cf. Eph. v. 21, ὑποτασσόμενοι ἀλλήλοις; Eph. vi. 7; 1 Tim. vi. 2. Metaphorically, e.g. ταῖς ἡδοναῖς, Plat., Xen., Herodian; τοῖς νόμοις, Plato. In the N. T. Tit. iii. 3, δουλεύοντες ἐπιθυμίαις καὶ ἡδοναῖς ποικιλαῖς; Rom. vii. 25, δ. νόμῳ θεοῦ; vi. 6, τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ; Gal. iv. 8, δ. τοῖς φύσει μὴ οὖσιν θεοῖς; 1 Thess. i. 4, θεῷ ζῶντι; Col. iii. 24; Rom. xiv. 18, xvi. 18, Χριστῷ. The expression ἐαυτῷ, Χριστῷ ζῇν, 2 Cor. v. 15, may be compared. Eurip. *Ion*. 182, Φοῖβῳ δουλεύσω.—If we read Rom. xii. 11, with Griesbach and others, τῷ καιρῷ δουλεύοντες, instead of the Received τῷ κυρίῳ, which is favoured by the context with its special exhortations, we shall have to understand the apostle as requiring an exact and careful consideration of the circumstances of the time. Τῷ καιρῷ δουλεύειν denotes, namely, like the Latin *tempori servire*, to take the circumstances into consideration, to regulate oneself by them. For examples, see Tholuck and Fritzsche *in loc*. In such a connection the otherwise ambiguous expression can have no less force than the general exhortation in Eph. v. 16, Col. iv. 5, namely, a force agreeable to the Christianity of the writer and the persons addressed; *vid.* ἐξαγοράζειν.

Δουλεία, ας, ἡ, *servitude, dependence*; the state of a δούλος, who is not his own master; opposed to ἐλευθερία, Gal. v. 1. In this place, as well as in iv. 24, διαθήκη . . . εἰς δουλείαν γεννώσα, cf. ver. 26 and Rom. viii. 15, πνεῦμα δουλείας, opposed to υἰοθεσίας (cf. John viii. 35), we must understand by δουλεία the state of involuntary dependence into which man is put by the law. From it we are freed by Christ (Gal. v. 1, ii. 4), in that He brings about a δουλεύειν ἐν πνεύματι—a figurative expression, cf. Rom. viii. 4.—On Heb. ii. 15, ὅσοι φόβῳ θανάτου διὰ παντὸς τοῦ ζῆν ἔνοχοι ἦσαν δουλείας, comp. Lev. xxvi. 36, ἐπάξω δουλείαν εἰς τὴν καρδίαν αὐτῶν . . . καὶ διώξεται αὐτοὺς φωνὴ φύλλου φερομένου, καὶ φεύξονται ὡς φεύγοντες ἀπὸ πολέμου. That state of man is described in which he is prevented from freely possessing and enjoying his life.—With the genitive added, in Rom. viii. 21, ἡ δουλεία τῆς φθορᾶς, *subjection to corruption*.

Δύναμις, to be able, to be capable of. Hence

Δύναμις, εως, ἡ, *capability, power*.—(I.) Relatively, *capability of anything, ability to perform anything*, Matt. xxv. 15; Acts iii. 12, iv. 7; Heb. xi. 11; cf. εἰς, κατὰ δύναμιν, according to ability, as far as able (2 Cor. viii. 3), opposed to παρὰ, ὑπὲρ δύναμιν, 2 Cor. i. 8, viii. 3, *beyond ability*. Plato, *Phileb.* 58 D, εἴ τις πέφυκε τῆς ψυχῆς ἡμῶν δύναμις ἐρᾶν τε τοῦ ἀληθοῦς καὶ πάνθ' ἕνεκα τούτου πράττειν.—(II.) Absolutely, *power, strength, might*, both (1) the ability to make oneself felt vigorously, to work, to act powerfully,—as, e.g., of physical and intellectual power,—and (2) power in operation, in action; not merely *power capable of action*, but *power in action*. The former in Luke xxiv. 49, ἕως οὗ ἐνδύσησθε ἐξ ὑψους δύναμιν; Acts i. 8, vi. 8; Luke i. 17; Rev. iii. 8. Opposed to ἀσθένεια, 1 Cor. xv. 43.—1 Cor. xv. 56, ἡ δὲ δύναμις τῆς ἁμαρτίας ὁ νόμος, it is the law which gives sin its power to assert itself and bring forth death (it is used for this purpose by

sin), because it itself ἡσθένει διὰ τῆς σαρκός, Rom. viii. 3, cf. vii. 8, 10. Of moral vigour and efficiency, Eph. iii. 16, δυνάμει κραταιωθῆναι εἰς τὸν ἔσω ἄνθρωπον; Col. i. 11, ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει δυναμούμενοι . . . εἰς πᾶσαν ὑπομονήν (Isa. xl. 31). Cf. Plato, *Phileb.* 64 E, ἡ τάγαθου δύναμις. Mostly, however, it is power showing itself as power (not passive), *power in action—might*. So in Rom. i. 20, ἡ ἀέδριος τοῦ θεοῦ δύναμις καὶ θεϊότης. In this sense Paul describes the gospel as δύναμις θεοῦ εἰς σωτηρίαν παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι, Rom. i. 16, as he says similarly in 1 Cor. i. 18, ὁ λόγος τοῦ σταυροῦ . . . τοῖς σωζομένοις ἡμῖν δύναμις θεοῦ ἐστίν. Ver. 24 of Christ crucified, θεοῦ δύναμις καὶ σοφία for those who are called. Cf. 2 Pet. i. 3, ἡ θεία δύναμις τοῦ Χριστοῦ; Phil. iii. 10, ἡ δύν. τῆς ἀναστάσεως τοῦ Χριστοῦ, where we must take into consideration everything by which it is made evident in us that Christ has risen from the dead, 1 Cor. xv. 14–22; Rom. viii. 33, 34. —2 Tim. iii. 5, δύν. τῆς εὐσεβείας, opposed to μόρφωσις. In the same sense in the doxologies as in Matt. vi. 13; Rev. vii. 12, xii. 10, xix. 1; in the combination ἐν δυνάμει, e.g. Mark ix. 1, ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἐληλυθὺν ἐν δυνάμει; Luke iv. 36; Rom. i. 4; 1 Cor. xv. 43; Col. i. 29; 1 Cor. iv. 19, 20, οὐ γὰρ ἐν λόγῳ ἡ βασ. τ. θ. ἀλλ' ἐν δυνάμει. God Himself, as the power who is exalted above and prevails over all things, is designated absolutely ἡ δύν., Matt. xxvi. 64; Mark xiv. 62 (in the parallel passage, Luke xxii. 69, ἡ δύν. τοῦ θεοῦ), like מְלִיכָהּ with the Rabbins, δόξα, 2 Pet. i. 17, etc.; μεγαλοσύνη, Heb. i. 3; ὁ μόνος δυνάστης, 1 Tim. vi. 15; ὁ τῆς ἀπάσης δυνάμεως δυνάστης, 3 Macc. v. 51. Analogous is the use of δύναμις (ἐξουσία) in profane Greek to denote the *ruling power, the authorities*, Xen., Dem., Diod. Sic. Comp. δυνάμεις as a designation of persons, 1 Cor. xii. 29 (Acts viii. 10). With this may be compared *the designation of supramundane, angelic powers* in the N. T. and Hellenistic Greek in general by δύναμις or δυνάμεις, conjoined with ἀρχή, ἐξουσία, κυριότης, corresponding to the rabbinical הַיְּהוּדִים, Eph. i. 21, Rom. viii. 38, 1 Cor. xv. 24, 1 Pet. iii. 22, ὑποταγέντων αὐτῷ ἀγγέλων καὶ ἐξουσιῶν καὶ δυνάμεων, perhaps describing principally their relation to humanity (but see under ἄγγελος). Cf. the Philonic doctrine of the divine δυνάμεις. For further details, *vid.* ἐξουσία; 2 Thess. i. 7, ἄγγελοι δυνάμεως κυρίου. Where the appearance of Christ, μετὰ δόξης καὶ δυνάμεως, is spoken of, Matt. xxiv. 30, Mark xiii. 26, Luke xxi. 27, we may conceive the δύναμις as represented by the accompanying hosts of angels who, like an army in prof. Greek, Plutarch, *Mar.* 13, are designated δύν. τοῦ κυρίου, Ps. ciii. 21, cxlviii. 2 = מַלְאָכָיו מְלִיכָהּ. Not to be confounded therewith is the expression in Matt. xxiv. 29, αἱ δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν σαλευθήσονται; Luke xxi. 26 (Mark xiii. 25, αἱ δυν. αἱ ἐν τοῖς οὐρ.). Ἡ δύν. τῶν οὐρ. denotes, indeed, in Ps. xxxii. 6, Dan. viii. 10, plural in Isa. xxxiv. 4, *the starry host*; but in the places cited this meaning does not harmonize with the words ὁ ἥλιος . . . καὶ ἡ σελήνη . . . καὶ οἱ ἀστέρες which precede; so that it must be assumed to add a new feature. I prefer, therefore, to take it to denote *the powers which are connected with the stars or the heavens* (cf. Gen. i. 14–19), to whose influence the earth is subject. It thus corresponds to Job xxxviii. 33, מְלִיכָהּ מְלִיכָהּ לְקִיץ לְקִיץ. Cf. Cremer on Matt. xxiv. 25, p. 104 sqq.

As a special peculiarity of the N. T. use of δύναμις, may be further adduced its application to signs and wonders. Not merely are we told that δύναμις κυρίου ἦν εἰς τὸ ἰᾶσθαι αὐτούς, Luke v. 17; δύναμις παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐξήρχετο καὶ ἰᾶτο πάντας, vi. 19; cf. viii. 46; Mark v. 30, but the miraculous activity of Christ, is traced to the δυνάμεις working in Him. Mark vi. 14, ἐνεργούσιν αἱ δυν. ἐν αὐτῷ; Matt. xiv. 2, xiii. 54, πόθεν τούτῳ ἡ σοφία αὐτῆ καὶ αἱ δυν.; cf. 1 Cor. xii. 10, ἐνεργήματα δυνάμεων; xii. 28, 29, μὴ πάντες δυν.,—a mode of expression which is most readily traceable to the employment of δυνάμεις by Philo to designate the *divine attributes*, which were represented in the form of intermediate beings, who were the *media* of God's external activity. Cf. John i. 52. (To a similar notion may perhaps be traced the words in Acts viii. 10, οὗτός ἐστιν ἡ δύναμις τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ καλουμένη μεγάλη, cf. de Wette *in loc.*)—Further, miracles themselves are also passively termed δυνάμεις, Matt. xi. 20, 21, 23; Mark vi. 2, 5; Luke x. 13, xix. 37; Acts ii. 22, viii. 13, xix. 11; 2 Cor. xii. 12; Gal. iii. 5; Heb. ii. 4; ποιεῖν δυνάμεις, Matt. vii. 22, xiii. 58, Mark ix. 39, as effects wherein *power* is in a special sense *unfolded* and *manifested*, cf. ποιεῖν δυνάμιν, Ps. cviii. 14, lx. 14 = לָקַח כֹּחַ; Job xxxvii. 13, νοουθετεῖσθαι δυνάμιν κυρίου = נִסִּים. Further analogies for this usage, which we find also in patristic Greek, do not exist. We can scarcely take the term in this sense in Heb. vi. 5, δυνάμεις μέλλοντος αἰῶνος γεύσασθαι, for the writer is treating of an inward personal experience of the δυν., such as we may have of the word of God (καλὸν γευσάμενους θεοῦ ῥῆμα δυνάμεις τε μ. αἰῶν.), which we could not be expected to have of miracles (Heb. ii. 4). They are influences which are connected with or arise from another order of things, but have no causal connection with the present, and as such confer a special worth on the state and position, whose loss is referred to. Cf. Eph. ii. 2; Tit. ii. 12; Heb. vii. 16; Eph. i. 19; 1 Pet. i. 3.

Apart from these peculiarities of usage, δύναμις in other respects also has a distinctive place in the treasury of N. T. words. It denotes the *power* which manifests itself in all the modes of the activity of God, especially in His redeeming work. We read, accordingly, not only of the αἰδώς τοῦ θεοῦ δύναμις, Rom. i. 20, Heb. i. 3, which is set forth in the works of creation; but, for example, when speaking of the possibility of the resurrection of the dead, and therewith of the promised redemption, Christ says, πλανᾶσθε μὴ εἰδότες τὰς γραφὰς μηδὲ τὴν δυνάμιν τοῦ θεοῦ, Matt. xxii. 29; Mark xii. 24. Especially at the beginning and concluding realization of salvation is the power of God active and discernible, Luke i. 35; 1 Cor. vi. 14; 2 Cor. xiii. 4 (the birth and resurrection of Christ); and where Paul speaks of the δύναμις τοῦ θεοῦ, as in Eph. i. 19, 2 Cor. vi. 7, Eph. iii. 7, 20, 2 Tim. i. 8, cf. 1 Pet. i. 5, 2 Cor. xii. 9, reference is made to the power which manifested itself in the resurrection of Christ, which works *σωτηρία* (2 Tim. i. 8; 1 Pet. i. 5), and displays itself savingly in and on man,—to God's redeeming and renewing power, cf. 1 Cor. ii. 5, ἵνα ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν μὴ ᾖ ἐν σοφίᾳ ἀνθρώπων ἀλλ' ἐν δυνάμει θεοῦ. In this sense Paul terms the gospel the word of the cross, Christ the crucified, the *power of God* (see above). Power operates and appears everywhere where God is at

work revealing and carrying out the plan of salvation (cf. 2 Pet. i. 16), or where the results of His redeeming work are found either in the whole or in the individual; cf. 2 Cor. iv. 7, xii. 9; Eph. iii. 16, 20; Col. i. 11; 2 Thess. i. 11, ii. 9; Heb. vii. 16; 1 Pet. i. 5; 1 Cor. xv. 43. In accordance therewith, the work of those who are engaged in the service of the divine economy of salvation is done *in power*, Acts vi. 8; 1 Thess. i. 5; Col. i. 29; 1 Cor. ii. 5. It is connected with the Holy Spirit, by whose agency the personal possession of salvation is brought about, Acts i. 8, x. 38, Luke xxiv. 49, Rom. xv. 13, 19, and who for this reason is termed πνεῦμα δυνάμεως, 2 Tim. i. 7; 1 Pet. iv. 14. Thus, always according to the contexts, these very determinate ideas are connected with the word δύναμις (synonyms, ἰσχύς, κράτος, ἐξουσία),—ideas which ought not especially to be excluded from the doxologies; cf. Rev. vii. 12, xi. 17, xii. 10, xv. 8, xix. 1. The example was set by the O. T. with the stress it laid on the power of God, cf. Deut. iii. 24; Ps. xxi. 14, lxxxvi. 8, lxxxix. 7, cxlvii. 5; Isa. xl. 26, 29, l. 2, etc. Cf. אֱלֹהִים שְׂרֵי אֱלֹהִים. "God and Power are one and the same," says Fronmüller in Zeller's *bibl. Wörterbuch*, ii. 87. Cf. δυνάστης as used of God, especially in the Apocrypha.

Δυνάστης, ὁ, possessor of power; in general, of such as are in possession of authority, who occupy any high position; e.g. Herod. ii. 32. 2, γενέσθαι ἀνδρῶν δυναστέων παῖδας ὑβριστάς. So in Job vi. 23, ix. 22, xv. 20 = יָרַץ; Lev. xix. 15 = לָרֶץ; Ecclus. viii. 1. Then in the LXX. Gen. l. 4, Jer. xxxiv. 19, of the chief officers; in the latter passage = מִסִּיפִי. So in Acts viii. 27, δυνάστης Κανδάκης. Cf. *Constit. apost.* p. 425, οἱ πρεσβύτεροι καὶ οἱ διάκονοι . . . δυνάσται ὑπάρχουσι τῆς ἐκκλησίας. Specially, however, of the independent rulers of larger or smaller territories (*rex* and *regulus*); Phavor. δυνάστης ὁ τύραννος καὶ ὁ βασιλεύς; Luke i. 52 (cf. Ecclus. xii. 5).—Δυνάστης is used of God in the Apocrypha with the same predilection and emphasis as that with which God's power is made prominent in the O. T., e.g. in Ecclus. xlv. 5, 6, ὁ ὑψιστος δυνάστης, parallel with ὁ μέγας κύριος; 2 Macc. iii. 24, ὁ τῶν πατέρων κύριος καὶ πάσης ἐξουσίας δυνάστης; xii. 15, ὁ μέγας τοῦ κόσμου δυν.; xv. 23, δυν. τῶν οὐρανῶν; xii. 28, xv. 3, 29. To the Pauline ὁ μακάριος καὶ μόνος δυνάστης, ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν βασιλευόντων καὶ κύριος τῶν κυριευόντων, 1 Tim. vi. 15, corresponds 3 Macc. ii. 3, ὁ κτίσας τὰ πάντα καὶ τῶν ὅλων ἐπικρατῶν δυνάστης; v. 51, ὁ τῆς ἀπάσης δυνάμεως δυνάστης; vi. 39.

Δυναμόω, to strengthen; very rare in profane Greek. LXX. Ecclus. x. 10; Dan. ix. 27 = נָבַר; Ps. lxxviii. 29 = נָגַץ. In the N. T. the passive, *to be strengthened*, *to grow strong*, Col. i. 11, ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει δυναμούμενοι . . . εἰς ὑπομονήν, of moral strengthening; cf. Eph. iii. 16; Isa. xl. 29–31. Cf. κραταιοῦσθαι.

Ἐνδυναμόω, only in biblical and ecclesiastical Greek = *to make strong*, *vigorous*; passive, *to be strengthened*, *to become strong*. Macar. *Hom.* 27, ἐνδυναμωθῆναι ὅλα τὰ μέλη; Heb. xi. 34, ἐνδυναμώθησαν ἀπὸ ἀσθενείας. Cf. Xen. *Hell.* vi. 4. 18, ἐκ τῆς ἀσθενείας οὕτω ἴσχυεν. In connection with Heb. xi. 34, reference is appropriately made to Samson and Hezekiah.—Elsewhere only metaphorically, of the spiritual and moral sphere, 2 Tim.

iv. 17, ὁ δὲ κύριός μοι παρέστη καὶ ἐνεδυνάμωσέν με, ἵνα δι' ἐμοῦ τὸ κήρυγμα πληροφορηθῇ, as in 1 Tim. i. 12 of equipment with the power necessary to the office of an apostle, see δύναμις. Cf. Acts ix. 22.—Phil. iv. 13, πάντα ἰσχύω ἐν τῷ ἐνδυναμοῦντί με; cf. Eph. vi. 10, ἐνδυναμοῦσθε ἐν κυρίῳ κ.τ.λ., 2 Tim. ii. 1, ἐνδυναμοῦ ἐν τῇ χάριτι, with Isa. xlv. 24, 2 Sam. xxii. 30.—Rom. iv. 20, ἐνεδυναμώθη τῇ πίστει.

E

Ἐγγυος, ὁ, bail, usually derived from γυῖον, in the sense, *hand*; ἐγγύη, *security* by delivery of a pledge; ἔγγυος, *ον*, giving bail; γυῖον, however, neither originally nor usually signifies *hand*, it is "the place in arms and feet where a bending can take place," and then signifies in linguistic usage *the limbs*, arms and feet, in contrast with the head and body, as also in German the term *Glieder* (*limbs*) is used specially of arms and legs; ἐγγυῖω, 2 Kings iv. 35 = to take in the arms; Hesych. ἐγγυῖώσεται· ἐναγκαλισθήσεται, συμπλακῆσεται. Against this derivation tells also the omission of the *ι* in the compounds, though this is not altogether without example. It seems more correct to trace the word back to the same stem as ἐγγύς, which see. Ἐγγυος is rare both as an adj. and a noun in profane Greek. Xen. *Vect.* iv. 20, λαμβάνειν ἐγγύους παρὰ τῶν μισθουμένων. Sometimes in Plutarch, ἔγγυον ἐπάγεσθαι; Plut. *Mor.* 753 D, to find bail for oneself. Also in Aristotle, Polybius. Usually in the Attic and later writers, ἐγγυητής; Xen. *Cyrop.* vi. 2. 39, εἰ δέ τις χρημάτων προσδεῖσθαι νομίζει εἰς ἐμπολὴν, γνωστῆρες ἐμοὶ προσαγαγὼν καὶ ἐγγυητάς. Often in Plato, e.g. *Alcib.* i. 134 E, ἀσφαλὴς γὰρ εἰ ἐγγυητής.—Ἐγγυος, ἐγγυητής, signifies the bail who personally answers for any one, either *in causa capitis* with his life, or otherwise with his property. Not to be confounded, as may easily be done, with μεσέγγυος, which signifies the mediator between contending parties, e.g. μεσέγγυον τὴν μείρακα καταθέσθαι, *Poll.* viii. 28; μεσεγγυάω, to bail by a pledge with a third or middle person. Μεσέγγυος is synonymous with μεσίτης; ἔγγυος is only so far also μεσίτης as in a secondary sense it signifies the security who appears for anything. (It is worthy of observation that ἔγγυος occurs also in a passive sense = *bailed*, synonymous with ἀσφαλής, therefore actively of him who holds something to be true, somewhat like the German *Eideshelfer*, one associated with another as surety.)

In the N. T. only in Heb. vii. 22, κρείττονος διαθήκης γέγονεν ἔγγυος, which is not to be referred to the death of Christ, by which He has answered *for us* (to which ἔγγυος might also be applied, cf. *Ecclus.* xxix. 15, 14, *Prov.* vi. 1; but then it could not have been κρείττ. διαθ. ἔγγ., but ἔγγ. ἡμῶν), but to His eternal life through which (not with which) He is surety for the better covenant (κρείττων διαθήκη), cf. vv. 21, 24, 25.—Ἐγγυος often occurs in the Apocrypha, e.g. 2 *Macc.* x. 28, οἱ μὲν ἔγγυον ἔχοντες εὐημερίας καὶ νίκης μετ' ἀρετῆς τὴν ἐπὶ τὸν κύριον καταφυγὴν; *Ecclus.* xxix. 15, χάριτας ἐγγύου μὴ ἐπιλάθῃ, ἔδωκε γὰρ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ὑπὲρ σοῦ; *Ecclus.* xxix. 16, ἀγαθὰ ἐγγύου ἀνατρέψει ἀμαρτωλός. Comp. ἐγγυάομαι τινα, to go security for one; *Ecclus.* xxix. 18; *Prov.* vi. 1.

Ἑγγύς, according to Curtius, akin to ἄγχι, ἀγχού, ἄγχυμαι, narrow, anguish, egere = close, near; cf. Ruth iii. 12, ὁ ἀληθῶς ἀγχιστεὺς ἐγὼ εἰμι· καὶ γέ ἐστιν ἀγχιστεὺς ἐγγίων ὑπὲρ ἐμέ. According to Schenkl, on the contrary, akin to the Sanscrit *angu*, hand, “ἐγγυ would correspond as the theme in Greek, and thus ἐγγύθι, at hand, near; ἐγγύθεν, from at hand, from close by; ἐγγύς instead of ἐγγύσι, loc. plur., in the hands, near,” in which case ἐγγυος, bail, might be connected with it; ἐγγύη, security, by handing in a pledge (*Faustpfand*, hand-pledge); by Schenkl, however, as by other lexicographers, associated with γυῖον.—(I.) Near, as to time and space, as well absolutely—Matt. xxiv. 32, 33, xxvi. 18, and often; Phil. iv. 5, ὁ κύριος ἐγγύς, with reference to time, of the Parousia, while the same combination more accurately defined in Ps. xxxiv. 19, cxlv. 18, in a local sense—as with the genitive, ἐγγὺς τοῦ τόπου, πλοίου, etc., Job vi. 19, 23, and often; or with the dative, Acts ix. 38, xxvii. 8; Ps. xxxiv. 19, cxlv. 18. In the LXX. = ^{לְקָרְבָן} Jer. xxxv. 4; ^{לְקָרְבָן} Gen. xix. 20, xlv. 10; Ex. xiii. 10.—(II.) Figuratively, of spiritual relations, e.g. Plato, *Rep.* vi. 508 C, ἐγγὺς φαίνονται τυφλῶν = similar. Wisd. vi. 20, ἀφθαρσία δὲ ἐγγὺς εἶναι ποιεῖ θεοῦ. With and without γένους, γένει, of kinship, e.g. Aeschylus in Plato, *Rep.* iii. 391 E, οἱ Ζηνὸς ἐγγύς; Eurip. *Heracl.* 37, τοῖσδ’ ἐγγὺς ὄντας. Further, ὁ ἐγγυτάτω γένους, γένει, the nearest of kin, Plato, Demosthenes. Comp. above, Ruth iii. 12; Ex. xxxii. 27; Lev. xxi. 2; Judith xvi. 4, ὁ, οἱ ἐγγιστα; Job vi. 15, οἱ ἐγγύτατοί μου = ^{קָרְבָּנִי}.—Esth. i. 14, οἱ ἐγγὺς τοῦ βασιλέως, οἱ πρῶτοι παρακαθήμενοι τῷ βασιλεῖ = ^{הַקְּרִיבִּים} יְהִי. It is used in a special sense in Eph. ii. 13, ὑμεῖς οἱ ποτὲ ὄντες μακρὰν ἐγγὺς ἐγενήθητε ἐν τῷ αἵματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ver. 17, ἐλθὼν εὐηγγελίστατο εἰρήνην ὑμῖν τοῖς μακρὰν καὶ εἰρήνην τοῖς ἐγγύς, to distinguish between Jews and Gentiles according to their contrasted relations to God and to the blessings of salvation; comp. προσαγωγή, ver. 18, and ἄθεοι ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, ver. 12. The Pauline expression (not perhaps to be compared with οἱ εἰς μακρὰν, Acts ii. 39, which, like Isa. xlix. 1, ^{רִיחֵהֶם} ^{מִמְּסָכִים}, LXX. = ἔθνη, denotes locally the heathen world) needs for its explanation no further conjecture as to usage, and finds none such in biblical usage in particular. For in Isa. xlix. 1 the peoples are named according to their local relation to Israel, the peoples and Israel are not distinguished according to some supposed twofold relationship to some third thing. But Isa. lvii. 19, κτίζων καρπὸν χειλέων εἰρήνην ἐπ’ εἰρήνην τοῖς μακρὰν καὶ τοῖς ἐγγύς οὖσιν, denotes ^{רִיחֵהֶם} ^{מִמְּסָכִים}, the members of God’s people scattered far and near; cf. Esth. ix. 20, ἐξαπέστειλε τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ὅσοι ἦσαν ἐν τῇ Ἀρταξέρξου βασιλείᾳ τοῖς ἐγγύς καὶ τοῖς μακρὰν, synonymous with οἱ διεσπαρμένοι ἐν πάσῃ χώρᾳ τῇ ἔξω, ver. 19. The apostle’s expression rather points to, or rests on, a usage of post-biblical Hebrew with reference to the ἔθνη; cf. Bereschith Rabba 39, “Quicunque gentilem appropinquare facit et proselytum facit, idem est acsi ipsum creasset.” Mid. Sam. 28, “Tunc dixit David, An propter proselytos Deus haec facit populo suo? Dixit ei Deus, Si removes remotos, removebis etiam propinquos.” Literally and originally at the basis of this designation of the heathen and of proselytes, there lies simply a reference to their relation to Israel as a national community, not to Israel as in fellowship with God, since heathen and proselytes, not heathen and Jews, are

distinguished as far and near, so that we must recur to קרוב in the sense of kinship; see Levy, *Chald. Wb.* under קרוב. Probably not till later was there introduced a reference to the ritual of sacrifice, cf. Beresch. xxxix. 18, "*Et tu appropinquans remotos et purificans eos patri suo coelesti*;" cf. Eph. ii. 13, ἐν τῷ αἵμ. At any rate, however, St. Paul's expression differs from the Rabbinical as the juxtaposition of heathen and Jews differs from that of heathen and proselytes.

The comparative occurs in Xen. and in biblical Greek, Rom. xiii. 11, ἐγγύτερον ἡμῶν ἢ σωτηρία ἢ ὅτε ἐπιστεύσαμεν. The form ἐγγίω is found only in later Greek and in the LXX. For the superlative both later Greek and the LXX. have the two forms ἐγγύτατος and ἑγγιστος.

Ἑγγίζω, future ἐγγίω, for which Cod. B in Jas. iv. 8 has ἐγγίσει. Only in later Greek = to bring near and to come near, in a transitive and intransitive sense, as is often the case with verbs of motion; see under ἄγω. In biblical Greek, (I.) transitive only in the LXX., and there but seldom. Isa. v. 8, ἄγρον πρὸς ἄγρον ἐγγιζόντες; Gen. xlviii. 10; Ezek. xlii. 13, οἱ ἐγγιζόντες πρὸς κύριον τὰ ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων; Ecclus. xxxvi. 12, ἐξ αὐτῶν ἤγλασε καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἤγγισε, answering to קרבה, of the officiating priests. Usually in the N. T. only (II.) intransitively = to come near, to approach; local ἐγγ. τινί, Luke vii. 12, xv. 1, 25, xxii. 47; Acts x. 9, xxii. 6; εἰς, Matt. xxi. 1; Mark xi. 1; Luke xviii. 35, xix. 21, xxiv. 28; πρὸς τινα, Luke xix. 37; ὅπου, Luke xii. 33. Cf. Phil. ii. 30, μέχρι θανάτου ἤγγισε, comp. Job xxxiii. 22. Without closer limitation, Matt. xxvi. 46, and often.—Temporal, ὁ καιρὸς, Matt. xxi. 34; ὁ χρόνος, Acts vii. 17; ἡ ὥρα, Matt. xxvi. 45; πάντων τὸ τέλος, 1 Pet. iv. 7; ἡ ἡμέρα, Rom. xiii. 12, here in contrast with νύξ; on the other hand, in Heb. x. 25, of the Parousia. In the combination ἤγγικεν ἡ βασ. τ. θ., τῶν οὐρ., Matt. iii. 2, iv. 17, x. 7; Mark iv. 15; Luke x. 11 (in ver. 9, ἤγγικεν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἡ βασ. τ. θ., comp. Ps. xxvii. 2, ἐν τῷ ἐγγίξειν ἐπ' ἐμὲ κακούντας κ.τ.λ., ἐγγ. has reference to space). Jas. v. 8, ἡ παρουσία τοῦ κυρίου; Luke xxi. 28, ἡ ἀπολύτρωσις; xxi. 20, ἡ ἐρήμωσις αὐτῆς.—In the LXX. = קרב, Kal, Piel, and Hiphil.—Ἑγγίζειν τῷ θεῷ, Heb. vii. 19, Jas. iv. 8 (Matt. xv. 8, Received text), of intercourse with God in prayer, and in desired and cherished fellowship with Him; cf. προσέρχεσθαι, προσαγαγωγή. On the other hand, in Lev. x. 3, ἐν τοῖς ἐγγιζουσίν μοι ἁγιασθήσομαι, of priestly service.—Προσεγγίζειν, Mark ii. 4.

Ἑγείρω, future ἐγερῶ, aorist ἤγειρα, to awaken, to wake up. The passive ἐγείρομαι, awakened, to awake; perf. ἐγήγερμαι (in the classics also second perf. ἐγήγερκα); aorist, ἠγέρθη. The imperative ἔγειρε in an intransitive sense, as in Eur. *Iph. A.* 624, Aristoph. *Ran.* 340, everywhere restored by Tischendorf instead of ἔγειραι, which would (cf. Fritzsche on Mark ii. 9) be equivalent to *excita mihi aliquem*; Matt. ix. 5; Mark ii. 9, 11, iii. 3, x. 49; Luke v. 23, 24, vi. 8; John v. 8; Acts iii. 6; Eph. v. 14; Rev. xi. 1. Elsewhere ἐγείρου, Luke viii. 54; ἐγείρεσθε, Matt. xxvi. 46; Mark xiv. 42.—(I.) It is primarily used of sleepers; to wake them up; passive, to wake up. Hence ἐξ

ὑπνοῦ, Rom. xiii. 11; ἀπὸ τοῦ ὑπνοῦ, Matt. i. 24; and without this addition, in Matt. viii. 25; Acts xii. 7; Eph. v. 14. In the last-mentioned passage, as in Rom. xiii. 11, figuratively = *to become attentive to one's own dangerous position* (Prov. xxiii. 34), and to the salvation of God delivering therefrom. *Vid. γρηγορέω*. Similarly in classical Greek the passive, *to be awake, lively, attentive*, Xen. *Cyrop.* i. 4. 20, vii. 5. 20, οὗς ἡμεῖς καὶ συμμάχους πρὸς ἑαυτοῖς ἔχοντας καὶ ἐγρηγορότας ἅπαντας καὶ νήφοντας καὶ ἐξωπλισμένους καὶ συντεταγμένους ἐνικῶμεν.—Then (II.) of those who are sick, and needing help, *to raise them up*, Mark i. 31, ix. 27, cf. Matt. xii. 11. Passive, *to recover, to rise from bed*, Matt. viii. 15, ix. 5–7, etc. Especially, however, (III.) of the *dead*, who are recalled to life, or who rise to new life. Conjoined with *ζωοποιεῖν*, John v. 21; Rom. viii. 11, cf. Eph. ii. 5, 6. The active, Matt. x. 8 (Rec. text); Acts iii. 15, iv. 10, v. 30, x. 40, xiii. 30, 37, xxvi. 8; Rom. iv. 24, viii. 11, x. 9; 1 Cor. vi. 14; 2 Cor. i. 9, iv. 14; Eph. i. 20; Col. ii. 12; 1 Thess. i. 10; Heb. xi. 19; 1 Pet. i. 21. The passive, *to rise again*, with or without *ἐκ νεκρῶν*, always refers to the resurrection of the body, Matt. xi. 5, xiv. 2, xvi. 21, xvii. 9, 23, xxvi. 32, xxvii. 52, 63, 64, xxviii. 6, 7; Mark vi. 14, 16, xii. 26, xiv. 28, xvi. 6, 14; Luke vii. 14, 22, ix. 7, 22, xx. 37, xxiv. 6, 34; John ii. 22, xii. 1, 9, 17, xxi. 14; Rom. iv. 25, vi. 8, 9, vii. 4; 1 Cor. xv. 4, 12–17, 20, 29, 32, 35, 42–44, 52; 2 Cor. v. 15; 2 Tim. ii. 8.—The usage noted under II. and III. is not found in profane Greek. Parallels, however, may be found answering to the use (IV.) in John ii. 19, τὸν ναὸν ἐγείρειν = *to erect, to build up*, e.g. τεῖχος, Herodian, viii. 1. 12; πύργους, viii. 2. 12; but, as a general rule, ἀνιστάναι is used, which is a synonym, especially in following cases. Thus (V.) = עָרָא, LXX. = ἀνιστάναι, ἐγείρειν; in the classics = *to bring to pass, to originate, to arouse*; passive, *to arise*, synonymous with γίγνεσθαι, cf. Herod. vii. 49, ἐγείρεται χειμών; Xen. *Hipp.* i. 19, ἡ πόλεμος ἐγείρεται, corresponding to the foregoing ἡ πόλεμος γίγνηται. In biblical Greek, with a personal object, *to call forth, to cause to appear*; passive = *to appear, to come forth*. So in Acts xiii. 22, ἤγειρεν αὐτοῖς τὸν Δαβὶδ εἰς βασιλείαν, cf. 2 Sam. xviii. 1; Judg. ii. 18, ἤγειρε κύριος αὐτοῖς κριτὰς; 1 Sam. ii. 35, ἀναστήσω ἐμὰντῷ ἱερέα πιστόν, Jer. xxix. 15; Deut. xviii. 18.—Matt. xxiv. 7, 11, 24; Mark xiii. 8, 22; Matt. xi. 11; Luke vii. 16, xi. 31, xxi. 10; John vii. 52 (Acts xiii. 23, Rec. text); Luke i. 69. On Luke iii. 8, Matt. iii. 9, δύναται ἐκ τῶν λίθων τούτων ἐγείρει τέκνα τῷ Ἀβραάμ, cf. Gen. xxxviii. 8, ἀνάστησον σπέρμα τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου.—On Luke vii. 11, comp. Stier, “In עָרָא, human birth and divine ordainment and bestowment are included.”—Matt. xxiv. 11, 24, of false prophets, etc., the middle passive = *to make their appearance*.—Cf. ἐξεγείρω, Rom. ix. 17. Lastly, (VI.) the passive denotes in general, *to quit one's previous position, to rise, to get up*, Rev. xi. 1; John xiv. 31, and often.

Ἐγερσις, ἡ, *the resuscitation of the dead*, Matt. xxvii. 53.—In the classics it corresponds with ἐγείρω; τοῦ θύμου, τῶν τευχῶν, etc.

Συνεγείρω, *to awaken together*, both with co-operation and common activity, therefore the combination of several subjects, Ex. xxiii. 5, συνεγερεῖς αὐτὸ μετ' αὐτοῦ (al.

συναρείς), and, as in the N. T. always, when several *objects* are connected, Plut. *consol. ad Apollon.* 117 C, πᾶσα πρόφασις ἱκανὴ πρὸς τὸ τὰς λύπας καὶ τοὺς θρήνους συνεγείρειν; Isa. xiv. 9, συνεγέρθησάν σοι πάντες οἱ γίγαντες οἱ ἄρξαντες τῆς γῆς.—In the N. T. Eph. ii. 6, ὁ θεὸς ὄντας ἡμᾶς νεκροὺς τοῖς παραπτώμασιν συνεζωοποίησεν τῷ Χριστῷ, χάριτι ἔστε σεσωσμένοι, καὶ συνήγειρεν καὶ συνεκάθισεν ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. The revivification of Christ, His resuscitation to a new life (Rom. vi. 10), involves at the same time the vivifying anew of those that are His, to wit, delivery from the state into which they have been brought by sin, which, considered in its entire compass, may be designated *death*. Cf. Rom. vi. 4–10. And as in the state produced by sin there is an anticipation of final destruction, so in that of deliverance there is an anticipation of the end, to wit, resurrection; cf. Rom. vi. 4–11 with viii. 11, 24. The *συν* in *συνεγείρειν* expresses not merely the similarity of the deliverance, of the divine work of salvation, but it affirms that it is an effect not specially and newly appearing, but connected with Christ's resurrection, taking place and included in it, and also proceeding from it, cf. Rom. vi. 6, iv. 25,—an effect brought about on God's part through the medium of baptism, Rom. vi. 4; on man's part, by the faith which avails itself of the facts of redemption, i.e. of Christ's resurrection; Col. ii. 12, ἐν Χριστῷ καὶ συνεγέρθητε διὰ τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἐγείραντος αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν; Col. iii. 1, εἰ οὖν συνεγέρθητε τῷ Χριστῷ, τὰ ἄνω ζητεῖτε. Considered from another side, *συνεγεσθῆναι* coincides with *δικαιωθῆναι*; cf. Col. ii. 12, 13, with Rom. iv. 25, v. 1.

Γρηγορέω, belonging to biblical Greek, from ἐγρήγορα, *to be awakened, to be awake* → *to watch, to refrain from sleep*, Neh. vii. 3; transferred from the physical to the moral-religious sphere, cf. Matt. xxvi. 38, 40, 41, it denotes *attention* (cf. Jer. i. 12, v. 6; Mark xiii. 34) to God's revelation, cf. Prov. viii. 34; Isa. xxix. 10; or to the knowledge of salvation, 1 Thess. v. 6; a mindfulness of threatening dangers (cf. Prov. xxiii. 34), which, with conscious earnestness and mind on the alert, keeps from it all drowsiness and all slackening in the energy of faith and conduct; Matt. xxvi. 40, γρηγορεῖτε καὶ προσεύχεσθε, ἵνα μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς πειρασμόν; Mark xiv. 38; 1 Pet. v. 8, νήψατε, γρηγορήσατε. ὁ ἀντίδικος ὑμῶν διάβολος, ὡς λέων ὠρυόμενος, περιπατεῖ, ζητῶν τίνα καταπίῃ (conjoined with νήφειν, further, in 1 Thess. v. 6, cf. Joel i. 6); the anxiety resulting therefrom to retain possession of salvation, 1 Cor. xvi. 13; Col. iv. 2; Rev. xvi. 15, μακάριος ὁ γρηγορῶν καὶ τηρῶν τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ, ἵνα μὴ γυμνὸς περιπατῇ κ.τ.λ.; care for the salvation and preservation of others, Acts xx. 31; Rev. iii. 2, 3. In His eschatological discourses the Lord with this word demands constant watching and preparation for the decisive day of His παρουσία, Matt. xxiv. 42, 43, xxv. 13; Mark xiii. 34, 35, 37; Luke xii. 37, 39; cf. ver. 40, γίνεσθε ἑτοιμοὶ κ.τ.λ. Once only of *life* as opposed to *καθεύδειν* of *death*, 1 Thess. v. 10.—Synonymous with ἀγρυπνεῖν, Mark xiii. 33; Luke xxi. 36; Eph. vi. 18; Heb. xiii. 17; 2 Cor. vi. 5, xi. 27.

Ἔθνος, τό, *host, multitude, people*; probably from ἔθος = *the multitude bound together*

by like habits, customs, peculiarities, both of animals = herd, swarm; e.g. μελισσῶν, Hom. Il. ii. 87; χοίρων, Od. xiv. 37; and of men, e.g. ἐταίρων, γυναικῶν; Acts xvii. 26, πᾶν ἔθνος ἀνθρώπων; cf. Pindar, ἔθνος βροτόν. Then, however, more definitely (I.) people, tribe, with reference to their natural connection generally with each other, less with regard to the separation arising from descent, language, constitution, Xen. Anab. i. 8. 9, πάντες κατὰ ἔθνη. So in the N. T. Matt. xxi. 43, xxiv. 7; Luke xxi. 25, xxii. 25; Matt. xx. 25; Mark xiii. 8; Luke xxi. 10; Acts ii. 5, iv. 25, 27, vii. 7, viii. 9, x. 35, xiii. 19. Especially in Revelation along with λαός, γλῶσσα, φυλή, v. 9, vii. 9, x. 11, xi. 9, xiii. 7, xiv. 6, xvii. 15; 1 Pet. ii. 9. Also of the Jewish people, Luke vii. 5, xxiii. 2; Acts x. 22, xxiv. 3, 10, 17, xxvi. 4, xxviii. 19; John xi. 48, 51, 52, xviii. 35; cf. John xi. 50, συμφέρει ἡμῖν ἵνα εἰς ἄνθρωπος ἀποθάνῃ ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ μὴ ὅλον τὸ ἔθνος ἀπόληται. Elsewhere the word λαός is used of Israel, see (II.).

(II.) It is a peculiarity of N. T., and indeed of biblical usage generally, to understand by τὰ ἔθνη, πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, the peoples who are not of Israel, in antithesis with υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ, Ἰουδαῖοι, Acts ix. 15, xiv. 2, 5, xxi. 11, 21, xxvi. 20; Rom. ii. 24, iii. 29, ix. 24, 30, 31, xi. 25; 1 Cor. i. 23; Gal. ii. 15; οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς, Acts x. 45; περιτομή, Gal. ii. 9 (cf. Eph. ii. 11); γένος, 2 Cor. xi. 26, parallel with οἱ κατάλοιποι τῶν ἀνθρώπων, Acts xv. 17. In this sense the word corresponds to the Hebrew עַם (LXX. sometimes = λαός, e.g. Josh. iii. 17, iv. 1), and this likewise signifies primarily nothing but a connected host, multitude; e.g. used also of animals in Joel i. 6; Zeph. ii. 14. It is used in a general way of Israel, as of other distinct nations, when no special declaration is to be made, Deut. xxxii. 28; Gen. xii. 2, xxxv. 11; Isa. i. 4; Zeph. ii. 9; cf. John xi. 50; whereas elsewhere, when the peculiar and appointed position of the people is in question, the word עַם, λαός, is employed; compare Ex. xxxiii. 13, הָעָם יְהוָה דָּבַר. Further, cf. ver. 16. Cf. Deut. xxxii. 21, עַם אֲנִי לַיהוָה וְעַם אֲנִי לַיהוָה, where the LXX. in both cases improperly use ἔθνος (cf. Rom. x. 19); 2 Sam. vii. 23, מִיָּהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ מִיָּהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ, τίς ὡς ὁ λαός σου Ἰσραὴλ ἔθνος ἄλλο ἐν τῇ γῇ; Deut. xxxii. 43, εὐφράνθητε ἔθνη μετὰ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ; xxvi. 18, 19; Num. xiv. 15. Cf. Acts xv. 14, ὁ θεὸς ἐπεσκέψατο λαβεῖν ἐξ ἐθνῶν λαὸν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ. We never find יְהוָה עַם used for יְהוָה (vid. Fürst, Wörterb.) except in Zeph. ii. 9. In the later books we first find עַם, עַם יִשְׂרָאֵל, without further addition (cf. Acts vii. 45, xiii. 19; Josh. xxiii. 12, 13), applied to non-Israelitish nations; first in 1 Sam. viii. 5, 20, then in 2 Kings xviii. 33, xix. 17; 1 Chron. xiv. 17, xvi. 35; 2 Chron. xxxii. 23, xxxvi. 14; Neh. v. 17; Ps. lxxix. 10, cvi. 47, and other places; cf. also Esdr. v. 69, viii. 89, συναθροίσαντες γυναῖκας ἀλλογενεῖς ἐκ τῶν ἐθνῶν τῆς γῆς; Esdr. vii. 13, τὰ βδελύγματα τῶν ἐθνῶν τῆς γῆς; viii. 84, ἡ ἀκαθαρσία τῶν ἐ. τ. γ; Wisd. xiv. 11, xv. 15, εἶδωλα τῶν ἐθνῶν; Matt. iv. 15.

So also ἔθνη in the N. T. Τὰ ἔθνη are the peoples outside of Israel,—the totality of the nations, which, being left to themselves (Acts xiv. 16), stand outside the connection with the God of salvation, who is Israel's God; Acts xxviii. 28, τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἀπεστάλη τοῦτο τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτοὶ καὶ ἀκούσονται; Eph. ii. 11, 12, ἀπηλλοτριωμένοι τῆς

πολιτείας τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ, καὶ ξένοι τῶν διαθηκῶν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας; Rom. xi. 11, 12; Gal. iii. 8, 14; 1 Thess. iv. 5; Eph. iii. 6; Matt. xii. 21. Outside the sphere of divine revelation, and not, or not yet embraced by the divine ἐκλογή, but rather left to themselves and to their own will, they stand in moral antagonism to the divine order of life; Eph. iv. 17; 1 Pet. iv. 3, 4; 1 Cor. x. 20, xii. 2; Matt. vi. 32; Luke xii. 30; cf. Matt. xviii. 17, ἄθροι ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, in the double sense of this expression, Eph. iv. 12, they are not in possession of the revealed law, Rom. ii. 14, cf. ix. 30; nor are they bound to the rules and laws of Israelitish life, Gal. ii. 12, 14, 15. It is this moral-religious lack that renders so significant the emphasis laid on the ὑπακοή πίστεως on the part of the ἔθνη, Rom. i. 5, xv. 18, xvi. 26.

With the designation of the non-Israelitish nations as ἔθνη is thus connected the idea of their moral-religious position in relation to the plan of salvation; cf. Matt. xx. 19; Mark x. 33; Luke xviii. 32, xxi. 24, Acts xxi. 11. Inasmuch as they are out of connection with the people in whose midst the saving plans of God are executed, the circumstance that they are taken into consideration in the N. T. revelation of redemption is an important feature of the N. T.; cf. Matt. x. 5, εἰς ὁδὸν ἐθνῶν μὴ εἰσέλθῃτε, with ver. 18, xii. 18, 21, xxiv. 14, xxviii. 19; Mark xi. 17, xiii. 10; Luke xxiv. 47; Acts xiii. 46, xviii. 6, xxii. 21, xxviii. 28; 1 Tim. iii. 16; 2 Tim. iv. 17; 1 Thess. ii. 16. With reference to this Paul calls himself διδάσκαλος ἐθνῶν, 1 Tim. ii. 7; 2 Tim. i. 11; cf. Rom. xi. 13, ἐθνῶν ἀπόστολος; Eph. iii. 8; Gal. i. 16, ii. 2, 8. As their relation and conduct with reference to the N. T. redemption is opposed to the former state of things,—Acts x. 45, xi. 18, xiii. 47, 48; Luke ii. 32; Acts xiv. 27, xv. 12, xxi. 19,—xi. 1, xv. 3, 7, xxi. 25, Rom. i. 5,—the difference hitherto existing comes to an end, Acts xv. 9, Eph. iii. 6, τὰ ἔθνη συγκληρονόμα καὶ σύσσωμα κ.τ.λ., ii. 11, 12, and the expression has at last only an *historical* value as a designation of the non-Israelitish nations, which, as such, were formerly without God and without salvation, Acts xv. 23, ἀδελφοὶ οἱ ἐξ ἐθνῶν; Rom. xvi. 4, αἱ ἐκκλησίαι τῶν ἐ.; Rom. xi. 13, ὑμῖν γὰρ λέγω τοῖς ἔθνεσιν; xv. 16, 26; Gal. ii. 12, 14; Eph. iii. 1, ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν τῶν ἐθνῶν, cf. with ii. 11, ὑμεῖς πότε τὰ ἔθνη κ.τ.λ.—Elsewhere in Rom. i. 13, iv. 17, 18, xv. 9–12, 16. The change in the idea connected with the word, or rather the force of this representation, according to which ἔθνη denotes those who are not within the range of the divine ἐκλογή, goes so far that at last, on the ground indeed of the contrast with the N. T. church,

(III.) Stress is laid on the religious-moral aspect of the word alone, and ἔθνη denotes the heathen, in opposition to the N. T. or Christian church; 1 Cor. v. 1, ἀκούεται ἐν ὑμῖν πορνεία . . . ἥτις οὐδὲ ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν; x. 20, xii. 2, ἔθνη ἦτε; 1 Thess. iv. 5; 1 Pet. ii. 12; 3 John 7.—Whether in Revelation ἔθνη is opposed to Israel, or, as it appears to me, to the N. T. redeemed church, must be left to commentators to decide; Rev. ii. 26, xi. 2, 18, xii. 5, xiv. 8, xv. 3, 4, xvi. 19, xviii. 3, 23, xix. 5, xx. 3, 8, xxi. 24, 26, xxii. 2.

Ἐθνικός, peculiar to later Greek = *popular*. In the N. T. it answers to the biblical

idea of ἔθνη = heathenish, that which appertains to those who are unconnected with the people and God of salvation; Matt. xviii. 17, ἐὰν δὲ καὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας παρακούσῃ, ἔστω σοι ὥσπερ ὁ ἐθνικός καὶ ὁ τελώνης; Matt. v. 47, vi. 7 (cf. 1 Kings xviii. 26–29); 3 John 7 derived from ἔθνος, No. III. The adv. ἐθνικῶς ζῆν to live in a non-Israelitish manner, not bound to the Israelitish mode of life, Gal. ii. 14, *vid.* ἔθνος, No. II.—Not in the LXX.

ΕΙΔΩ, obsolete root (Lat. *video*; German, *wissen*; Low German, *witen, weten*) of εἶδον and οἶδα = *to perceive, to become aware of*; εἶδομαι, *to appear*; with the dative, *to be like*.

(I.) Εἶδον forms the 2d aor. of ὁράω, *to see*. Noteworthy in biblical Greek are the combinations ἰδεῖν θάνατον, Luke ii. 26; Heb. xi. 5, cf. Ps. lxxxix. 49; διαφθοράν, Acts ii. 27, 31, xiii. 35–37; cf. Ps. xvi. 10; πένθος, Rev. xviii. 7, cf. Eccles. vi. 6, ἀγαθωσύνην; 1 Pet. iii. 10, ἡμέρας ἀγαθὰς, cf. Ps. xxxiv. 13; Luke xvii. 22, ἡμέρας τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, cf. John viii. 56; John iii. 3, τὴν βασ. τ. θ. These are not indeed entirely foreign to classical Greek, cf. Soph. *Oed. R.* 831, μὴ δῆτα . . . ἴδοιμι ταύτην ἡμέραν = *to see the day*, but still are more closely allied to the Hebrew נָסָא with similar objects, *e.g.* Jer. v. 11, μάχαιραν καὶ λιμὸν οὐκ ὀφόμεθα, Ps. lxxxix. 49, Eccles. vi. 6, Isa. xxx. 30, and are not to be explained otherwise than, *e.g.*, in John xi. 40, ἐὰν πιστεύσῃς ὄψῃ τὴν δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ; Isa. xl. 5, ὀφθήσεται ἡ δόξα κυρίου, καὶ ὄψεται πᾶσα σὰρξ τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ, ὅτι κύριος ἐλάλησε; Jer. xxxiii. 24; Isa. xlv. 16; Deut. xxxii. 29; Eccles. viii. 16. All these expressions have the *general* meaning—to be specified by the context—to *become aware of, to perceive* (cf. נָסָא along with נָסָא, 1 Sam. xxiv. 12); the object presents itself *to and for the subject*; cf. Prov. xxvii. 12, נָסָא נָסָא נָסָא נָסָא, “the prudent man perceiveth the misfortune and hideth himself.” Accordingly, *e.g.*, θάνατον ἰδεῖν as the general differs from the more intensive γεύεσθαι θανάτου, John viii. 52; Heb. iii. 9 (cf. both conjoined in Ps. xxxiv. 9). 1 Pet. iii. 10, ἡμέρας ἀγαθὰς ἰδεῖν (cf. Ps. xxxiv. 13), would then be, “to perceive good days,” equivalent to “experience good days;” whilst John viii. 56, Ἀβραὰμ ἠγαλλιάσατο ἵνα ἴδῃ τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ἐμὴν καὶ εἶδεν καὶ ἐχάρη, cf. vv. 57, 58, must be taken in the more general sense, inasmuch as the words καὶ εἶδεν can scarcely refer to anything but prophetic, or perhaps better, *proleptic* vision, Matt. xiii. 17; Heb. xi. 13, ἀπέθανον οὗτοι πάντες μὴ λαβόντες τὰς ἐπαγγελίας, ἀλλὰ πόρρωθεν αὐτὰς ἰδόντες καὶ ἀσπασόμενοι κ.τ.λ., cf. ver. 19; *vid.* under παραβολή. Accordingly John iii. 3, ἰδεῖν τὴν βασ. τ. θ., in relation to ver. 5, εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν β., is very suitably the more general expression, corresponding to the like general expression ἄνωθεν γεννηθῆναι; whereas in ver. 5 we have the more special form γεννηθ. ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος. In ver. 3, every, even the remotest, participation in God’s kingdom is excluded, while in ver. 5 full and entire participation is expressed.

(II.) Οἶδα, infinitive εἰδέναι, pluperfect ἥδειν, strictly = *to have perceived*; hence, *to have knowledge of, to know, to be acquainted with*. So far as the word here comes under consideration, the usage of the N. T. presents few peculiarities. Between it and its

synonym *γινώσκειν* there is merely the difference that the latter implies an active relation, to wit, a self-reference of the knower to the object of his knowledge; whereas in the case of *εἰδέναι*, the object has simply come within the sphere of perception, within the knower's circle of vision. Where *εἰδέναι* is employed, therefore, a relation of the object to the subject is in question, and the emphatic *οὐκ οἶδα ὑμᾶς* in Matt. xxv. 12 denotes, *you stand in no relation to me*; whereas the words used in vii. 23, *οὐδέποτε ἔγνω ὑμᾶς*, cf. vv. 21, 22 = *I have never been in connection with you*; cf. Rom. vii. 7, *τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν οὐκ ᾔδειν*, with 2 Cor. v. 21, *τὸν μὴ γνόντα ἁμαρτίαν*. So also cf. *εἰδέναι τὸν θεόν*, 2 Thess. i. 8, 1 Thess. iv. 5, Tit. i. 6, with *γινῶναι τὸν θεόν*, Rom. i. 21. (In the classics, *εἰδέναι* denotes mediate knowledge, e.g. from hearsay.) This distinction, however, is set aside, and *εἰδέναι* is used like *γινώσκειν*; cf. 1 Thess. v. 12, *εἰδέναι τοὺς κοπιῶντας ἐν ὑμῖν*, as also Gen. xxxix. 6, *οὐκ ᾔδει τῶν καθ' αὐτὸν οὐδὲν πλὴν τοῦ ἄρτου οὗ ἤσθιεν αὐτός*, with Heb. xiii. 23, *γινώσκετε τὸν ἀδελφὸν Τιμόθεον*. *Εἰδέναι* perhaps = *not to forget*, *γινώσκειν* = *to notice*.—Both are included in *εἰδέναι*, both *ἑωρακεῖν* and *ἐγνωκεῖν*; cf. 1 John iii. 6 with Tit. i. 6, John vii. 28, 29, viii. 55, xv. 21; Heb. viii. 11, *οὐ μὴ διδάξωσιν ἕκαστος τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ λέγων Γινῶθι τὸν κύριον, ὅτι πάντες εἰδήσουσίν με*.

Εἶδος, τό, derived from *εἶδεσθαι*, to appear = **appearance, form**, usually of the human form, yet also of beasts, etc., and indeed both formally *the form of a thing, externa rei species*, and materially or concretely *an appearance which presents itself*. The latter in classical Greek only in the sense **kind, species**, over against *γένος*. It denotes generally the totality of the appearance as distinguished from its special features, such as *μέγεθος*, etc., e.g. Herod. viii. 113. Synonyms, *μορφή, σχῆμα*. Though it may frequently be interchanged with *μορφή*, it distinguishes itself eventually from it as the appearance which represents itself or something, from the form which something has or assumes, so that it is frequently conjoined with *μορφή* fully to express the conception = *kind* and *form*; cf. Plato, *Rep.* ii. 380, *ἀλλάττειν τὸ αὐτοῦ εἶδος εἰς πολλὰς μορφάς*; *Phaedr.* 246 B, *ἡ ψυχὴ πᾶσα παντὸς ἐπιμελείται τοῦ ἀψύχου, πάντα τε οὐρανὸν περιπολεῖ, ἄλλοτε ἐν ἄλλοις εἶδεσιν γιγνομένη*, where *εἶδος* scarcely could have been exchanged with *μορφή*. Compare also Plutarch, *Mor.* 1013 C, *σωματικῆς οὐσίας καὶ νοητῆς, ὧν ἡ μὲν ὕλην καὶ ὑποκείμενον, ἡ δὲ μορφήν καὶ εἶδος τῷ γενομένῳ παρέσχε*. As *μορφή* denotes the form of the appearance, *εἶδος* is the appearance as a whole. Accordingly *γένος* and *μορφή* seldom stand together; usually it is *γένος* and *εἶδος*, as genus and species. Aristot. *Metaph.* x. 1, *τὰ γένη εἰς εἶδη πλείω καὶ διαφέροντα διαιρεῖται*. Cf. *Physiogn.* 5, *διαιρετέον τὸ τῶν ζώων γένος εἰς δύο μορφάς, εἰς ἄρρεν καὶ θῆλυ, προσάπτοντα τὸ πρέπον ἑκάτερά μορφῇ*, where *μορφή* is manifestly equivalent to *form of appearance*, while *εἶδος* could hardly be applied. *Μορφή* and *εἶδος* in the same sense also stand over against the *ὕλη* and the *ὑποκείμενον*; *μορφή*, however, much more seldom.

(I.) Relatively, **appearance, face**, or form of a thing, *externa rei species*; Luke iii. 22, *σωματικῶς εἶδει*; Luke ix. 21, *ἐγένετο τὸ εἶδος τοῦ προσώπου ἑτερον* (Cod. D, *ἡ ἰδέα*, cf.

Matt. xxviii. 3, ἡ εἰδέα; John v. 37, οὔτε φωνὴν αὐτοῦ ἀκηκόατε πώποτε, οὔτε εἶδος αὐτοῦ ἑώρακατε (cf. Num. xii. 8; Ex. xxiv. 17); Ecclus. xliii. 1, εἶδος οὐρανοῦ; Gen. xli. 2, 3, 4, καλαὶ τῷ εἶδει; Ex. xxiv. 17, τὸ εἶδος τῆς δόξης κυρίου ὥσει πῦρ; Ezek. i. 16; Num. xi. 17 = נִסְיָא; Gen. xxix. 17, xxxix. 6, xli. 18, 19 = נִסְיָא, synonymous with ὄψις.—(II.) Absolutely, *the appearance which presents itself*, that which appears, e.g. of an image or picture, as in Wisd. xv. 4, σκιαγράφων πόνος ἄκαρπος, εἶδος σπιλωθὲν χρώμασι διηλλαγμένος; cf. ver. 5, νεκρᾶς εἰκόνας εἶδος ἄπνουν. So Ex. xxvi. 30, ἀναστήσεις τὴν σκηνὴν κατὰ τὸ εἶδος τὸ δεδειγμένον σοι ἐν τῷ ὄρει = מַעֲשֵׂה. Cf. Xen. Mem. iii. 10. 8, δεῖ τὸν ἀνδριαντοποιὸν τὰ τῆς ψυχῆς ἔργα τῷ εἶδει προσεικάζειν. Hence of the self-manifestation of God before Moses, Num. xii. 8, στόμα κατὰ στόμα λαλήσω αὐτῷ, ἐν εἶδει καὶ οὐ δι' αἰνιγμάτων, καὶ τὴν δόξαν κυρίου εἶδε. It is also a distinct conception, the import of which need not be defined by other references in 2 Cor. v. 7, διὰ πίστεως γὰρ περιπατοῦμεν, οὐ διὰ εἶδους. But the signification *externa rerum species*, the outward form of things, i.e. of the things by which we are surrounded (Tittmann, Lipsius), is an unfortunate extension of the formal signification *externa rei species*, in no way justified by linguistic usage. If διὰ πίστεως περιπατεῖν is = *to walk by faith*, so that faith is the way and manner of the walk (comp. ii. 4; Rom. ii. 27, viii. 25), then διὰ εἶδους is = *to walk in appearance*, in form, so that what appears lends to the walk its distinctiveness. The question now occurs, Does διὰ εἶδους περιπατοῦμεν refer back to ἐνδημοῦντες ἐν τῷ σώματι, or to ἐκδημοῦμεν ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου, ver. 6? In the first case, the apostle would appeal to the fact that our walk is not moulded as to its character by appearance, but by faith,—a thought which, awkward as the expression would be, might nevertheless be appropriate as the basis of the θαρρῆν πάντοτε, and practically expressed might run thus, we walk in faith, and regard not what is in sight; cf. Rom. iv. 19, μὴ ἀσθενήσας τῇ πίστει οὐ κατένόησεν τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σῶμα νεκρωμένον; but it would be inappropriate as the basis of θαρρῶντες οὖν πάντοτε καὶ εἰδότες κ.τ.λ. As the basis of this twofold statement, the apostle appeals to the fact that it is not appearance, but faith, which moulds our walk; and in connection with the preceding statement, ὅτι ἐνδημοῦντες ἐν τῷ σώματι ἐκδημοῦσιν ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου, this has a reference to the *future*, which is the subject treated of in this paragraph, and the expression may be compared with 1 John iii. 2, οὕτω ἐφανερώθη τί ἐσόμεθα; Col. iii. 4, ὅταν ὁ Χριστὸς φανερωθῇ, ἡ ζωὴ ὑμῶν, τότε καὶ ὑμεῖς σὺν αὐτῷ φανερωθήσεσθε ἐν δόξῃ. We might express it by the participles, πιστεύοντες γὰρ περιπατοῦμεν, οὐκ εἰδόμενοι, cf. Hom. Il. v. 462. Akin to this use is εἶδος in Ecclus. xxiii. 16 and xxv. 2;—xxiii. 16, δύο εἶδη πληθύνουσιν ἁμαρτίας, καὶ τὸ τρίτον ἐπάξει ὀργήν; xxv. 2, τρία δὲ εἶδη ἐμίσησεν ἡ ψυχὴ μου = *something which appears, thing*, then = *species*, over against γένος. It is questionable whether in 1 Thess. v. 22, ἀπὸ παντὸς εἶδους πονηροῦ ἀπέχεσθε, we are to take πονηροῦ as an adjective qualifying εἶδους, or as a genitive dependent upon it, as in Plato, Rep. ii. 357 C, τρίτον εἶδος ἀγαθοῦ; Joseph. Antt. x. 3. 1, πᾶν εἶδος πονηρίας. The first would be sufficiently warranted by a comparison of Ecclus. xxiii. 16, xxv. 2, and recommends itself as the simpler.

ΣυνΕΙΔΩ, from which (I.) *συνείδον*, 2d aor. of *συνοράω*, to look at, to see into, to understand, Acts xii. 12, xiv. 6.

(II.) *Σύνοιδα*, to know together with, to know what others know or do, intend to do, or have done. Soph. *Antt.* 266, ἡμεν δ' ἔτοιμοι . . . θεοὺς ὀρκωμοτεῖν τὸ μήτε δράσαι μήτε τῷ *ξυνειδέναι* τὸ πρᾶγμα βουλευσάντι μήτ' εἰργασμένῳ. So in Acts v. 2, *συνειδυίας καὶ τῆς γυναικός*; Xen. *Mem.* ii. 7. 1, ἐρῶ δὲ καὶ ἐν τούτοις ἃ *σύνοιδα* αὐτῷ, "I will say in reference to this what together with him I have experienced, and what I have heard from him." Cf. Vilmar, *Apol. Moral.* i. 67. It is used especially of those who are jointly guilty, and of witnesses; cf. Xen. *Hell.* iii. 3. 6, ἐρωτῶντων δὲ τῶν ἐφόρων πόσους φαίη καὶ τοὺς *ξυνειδότας* τὴν πρᾶξιν εἶναι, λέγειν καὶ περὶ τούτου ἔφη αὐτὸν ὡς σφίσι μὲν τοῖς προσστατέουσιν οὐ πᾶν πολλοί, ἀξιόπιστοι δὲ *συνειδεῖν*. Of partners in guilt, in the same place, § 10, where οἱ *ξυνειδότες* are parallel with οἱ *ξυμπράττοντες*.—Hence *συνειδέναι* is equal to, to be witness, be able to testify, e.g. Plat. *Conv.* 193 E, εἰ μὴ *ξυνήδειν* Σωκράτει τε καὶ Ἀγάθωνι δεινοῖς οὔσι περὶ τὰ ἐρωτικά.—Most common and most distinctly defined is the combination *συνειδέναι ἑαυτῷ*=to be conscious of to oneself, to be one's own witness (*συν . . .*), e.g. Xen. *Hell.* ii. 3. 12, ὅσοι *ξυνήδεσαν* ἑαυτοῖς μὴ ὄντες τοιοῦτοι (*sc. ἀπὸ συκοφαντίας ζῶντες*); *Cyrop.* iii. 1. 11, *σύννοιδεν* ἑαυτῷ ἐλευθερίας μὲν ἐπιθυμήσας; iii. 3. 38, εἰκότως ἂν ἤδη ἑαυτῷ *συνειδείη* τελῶς ἀγαθὸς ἀνὴρ ὢν. Plat. *Phaedr.* 235 C, *ξυνειδῶς* ἑμαυτῷ ἀμαθίαν; *Rep.* i. 331 A, τῷ μηδὲν ἑαυτῷ ἄδικον *ξυνειδότι*. The Pauline οὐδὲν γὰρ ἑμαυτῷ *σύνοιδα*, 1 Cor. iv. 4, where *συνειδέναι ἑαυτῷ* is equal to be compelled to testify against oneself, always requires in profane Greek an addition such as *κακόν*, ἄδικον, *πονηρόν*, ἄτοπον, etc.; cf. Lexica; Job xxvii. 6, οὐ γὰρ *σύνοιδα* ἑμαυτῷ ἄτοπα πράξας. On the other hand, cf. Horace's *nil conscire sibi, nulla pallescere culpa*.

The neuter participle τὸ *συνειδός*—which we notice here because of the *συνειδησις* which succeeds—denotes the subject's own consciousness, in which he bears witness to himself, and appears as his own witness; whilst ὁ *συνειδώς* denotes the witness or the partner in guilt. In the first instance, the subject-matter of the self-testimony was added in the genitive; its nature was indicated by an adjective; e.g. Plut. *Mor.* 84 D, ἅμα τῷ *συνειδότι* τοῦ ἐνδεοῦς δακνόμενος,—“embittered in the consciousness of his own lack,” in that he is compelled to confess his lack to himself. Pausan. vii. 10. 10, ὑπὸ *συνειδότος* ἐπιφρησιάζετο ἀγαθοῦ. Then without additional word, in a good sense=the good testimony of one's own consciousness, Plut. *Mor.* 85 C, ἔχει τινὰ τοῦ *συνειδότος* ἐκβεβαίωσιν. The opposite in 556 A, ἡ ψυχὴ ἀναπολεῖ ἐν αὐτῇ καὶ διαλογίζεται πῶς ἂν ἐκβᾶσα τῆς μνήμῃ; τῶν ἀδικημάτων, καὶ τὸ *συνειδός* ἐξ ἑαυτῆς ἐκβαλοῦσα καὶ καθαρὰ γενομένη βίον ἄλλον ἐξ ἀρχῆς βιώσειεν=consciousness bearing witness to ἀδικήματα, the unfavourable testimony of one's own consciousness. It is not yet an abiding consciousness, whose nature it is to be a self-testimony of the subject, as in the ecclesiastical writers, who use τὸ *συνειδός* and ἡ *συνειδησις* interchangeably, but a consciousness arising out of the behaviour for the time being and qualified thereby, not restricted to that which falls chiefly within the domain of conscience; cf. above, Plut. *Mor.* 84 D. Philo also applies it to the consciousness testi-

fying of guilt, guilt-consciousness; e.g. *de victim.* cccxxvii. 42, αὐτὸς ἑαυτοῦ γένηται κατηγορος, ἔνδον ὑπὸ τοῦ συνειδότος ἐλεγχόμενος; *de Legg. spec.* ii. 336. 27, ἔοικε δὲ πῶς καὶ αὐτὸς ἑαυτοῦ κατηγορεῖν, ὑπὸ τοῦ συνειδότος ἐλεγχόμενος; *ibid.* 342, ὁ δὲ κλέπτης ὑπὸ τοῦ συνειδότος ἐλεγχόμενος ἀρνεῖται καὶ ψεύδεται.

Συνείδησις, εὖ, ἢ, not to be derived from συνειδέναι τινί, but from συνειδέναι ἑαυτῷ, "to be one's own witness," = **one's own consciousness coming forward as witness**; in Dion. Hal., Diod., Lucian, Stobaeus, primarily in the same sense as τὸ συνειδός, denoting a consciousness arising out of and qualified by the conduct, or a consciousness estimating the conduct, e.g. Diod. iv. 65, διὰ τὴν συνείδησιν τοῦ μύσους εἰς μανίαν περιέστη; comp. Plut. *Popl.* 4, ἐλαυνόμενος τῷ συνειδότι τοῦ πράγματος; Lucian, *Amor.* 49, οὐδεμίας ἀπρεποῦς συνειδήσεως παροικούσης. Next, however, it denotes an abiding consciousness, whose nature it is to bear witness to the subject regarding his own conduct, and that, too, in a moral sense, e.g. Dion. Hal. vi. 825. 15, κράτιστον δὲ πάντων τὸ μηδὲν ἐκουσίως ψεύδεσθαι μηδὲ μαινεῖν τὴν αὐτοῦ συνείδησιν; cf. Tit. i. 15. So also in Stobaeus, *Floril.* ὀρθή, ἀγαθὴ συνείδησις = μηδὲν ἑαυτῷ ἄτοπον, ἀδίκημα συνειδέναι (in sayings of Socrates and others). They are the beginnings of our idea of "conscience," though approaching, but not yet embracing, its full force. Not only in Wisd. xvii. 10, πονηρία . . . συνεχομένη τῇ συνειδήσει (where we shall unhesitatingly translate "conscience"), but also in Eccles. x. 20, the Hebrew נָחַד, "thought," is rendered by συνείδησις, καὶ γὰρ ἐν συνειδήσει σου βασιλέα μὴ καταράσῃ (a curse which does not pass into expression, which is known only to the individual himself, and which can only be testified to him by his own consciousness). Cf. Diog. Laert. vii. 8, ἡ αὐτοῦ σύστασις καὶ ἡ ταύτης συνείδησις = self-consciousness. Here the word occurs for the first time, and just contemporary with Eccles. x. 20. See R. Hofmann, *Die Lehre von dem Gewissen.* Comp. Job ix. 21, εἴτε γὰρ ἡσέβησα, οὐκ οἶδα τῇ ψυχῇ; 2 Sam. xviii. 13, καὶ πῶς ποιήσω ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ μου ἄδικον; Josh. xiv. 7, ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ λόγον κατὰ τὸν νοῦν αὐτοῦ, Hebrew, יְהִי עֵצָה לִי כְּשֶׁנֶּאֱמַר. The comparison of another expression, however, shows that there was connected with it the presentiment of an obligation bearing witness to itself in the consciousness. This is the synonym σύνεσις, which, though generally preceding action,—cf. Dem. τῇ συνέσει δοκιμάζεται τί πρακτέον ἐστί; Aristot. *Eth.* vi. 10, 11, according to whom σύνεσις is used περὶ ὧν ἀπορήσειεν ἄν τις καὶ βουλευσάιτο, to be distinguished as κριτική from φρόνησις, which is ἐπιτακτική,—is also the consciousness which follows action, not merely testifying to the fact, but also estimating its worth (discernment). Eur. *Or.* 390, τί χρῆμα πάσχεις; τίς σ' ἀπόλλυσιν νόσος; ἡ ζύνεσις· ὅτι σύννοια δέιν' εἰργασμένος; Polyb. xviii. 26. 13, οὐδεὶς οὕτως οὔτε μάρτυς ἐστὶ φοβερός οὔτε κατηγορος δεινὸς ὥς ἡ σύνεσις ἡ ἐγκατοικοῦσα ταῖς ἐκάστων ψυχαῖς; Herodian, iv. 7. 1, ὑπὸ τῆς τῶν ἔργων συνέσεως ἐλαυνόμενος; cf. *supra*, Plut. *Popl.* 4. Elsewhere we find attributed to μνήμη what is here ascribed to σύνεσις. Thus Plato says, *Legg.* ix. 865 D, the spirit of the murdered pursuing the murderer, has a ξύμμαχος in the murderer's μνήμη. In συνείδησις a suitable word was found to

express the consciousness man has of his behaviour (*μνήμη*), and his insight into its relation to moral obligation (*σύνεσις*), in the form in which it manifests itself,—as it makes him a witness against himself (*μάρτυς, κατήγορος, ξύμμαχος*). Cf. Epict. *Fragm.* 97, ed. Schweigh., *παῖδας μὲν ὄντας ἡμᾶς οἱ γονεῖς παιδαγωγῶ παρέδωσαν ἐπεβλέποντι πανταχοῦ πρὸς τὸ μὴ βλάπτεσθαι· ἄνδρας δὲ γενομένους ὁ θεὸς παραδίδωσι τῇ ἐμφύτῳ συνειδήσει φυλάττειν· ταύτης οὖν τῆς φυλακῆς μηδαμῶς καταφρονητέον· ἐπεὶ καὶ τῷ θεῷ ἀπάρεστοι καὶ τῷ ἰδίῳ συνειδότητι ἐχθροὶ ἐσόμεθα* (R. Hofmann *in loc.*). What the nature of this consciousness is—the fact that it is more than a mere function of the intellect or of the memory—becomes clear where the word is claimed and makes itself felt in its full force, —to wit, as adopted in the N. T.

Συνείδησις there is not merely the testimony to one's own conduct borne by consciousness, Rom. ix. 1, *οὐ ψεύδομαι, συμμαρτυρούσης μοι τῆς συνειδήσεώς μου . . . ὅτι κ.τ.λ.*, 2 Cor. i. 12, *τὸ μαρτύριον τῆς συνειδήσεως ἡμῶν, ὅτι . . . ἀνεστράφημεν κ.τ.λ.*, but at the same time also that concerning duty, Rom. ii. 15, *ἐνδείκνυνται τὸ ἔργον τοῦ νόμου γραπτὸν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν, συμμαρτυρούσης αὐτῶν τῆς συνειδήσεως* (the *συν* in *συμμαρτυρ.* explains itself by the meaning of *συνείδησις*), namely, the obligation to divinely ordered action, even where God is not known; but cf. Rom. i. 19, 21, 32. Where there is knowledge of and acquaintance with God, conscience is specially determined thereby; hence *συνείδησις* θεοῦ, 1 Pet. ii. 19 (the genitive is to be explained simply as in *συνεῖδ. πράγματος, μύσους, ἁμαρτιῶν*—the testimony a man must bear to himself *in regard to*, etc. So also *συνεῖδ. εἰδώλου* in 1 Cor. viii. 7). Rom. xiii. 5 compared with ver. 4. Now, inasmuch as man is compelled to testify to himself concerning his duty towards God and his relation thereto, *συνείδησις* is the bearer of the religious need, Heb. ix. 9, *θυσαίαι . . . μὴ δυνάμεναι κατὰ συνείδησιν τελειῶσαι τὸν λατρεύοντα*; x. 2, *θυσαίαι . . . οὐκ ἂν ἐπαύσαντο προσφερόμεναι, διὰ τὸ μηδεμίαν ἔχειν συνείδησιν ἁμαρτιῶν τοὺς λατρεύοντας*; and accordingly it has the duty of confirming the truth of divine and saving revelation as intended to meet and satisfy the religious need, Heb. ix. 9, 14, *τὸ αἷμα Χριστοῦ καθαριεῖ τὴν συνείδησιν ὑμῶν ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἔργων, εἰς τὸ λατρεῖν τῷ θεῷ ζῶντι*; 2 Cor. iv. 2, v. 11.

Συνείδησις, accordingly, is *the consciousness man has of himself in his relation to God*, manifesting itself in the form of a self-testimony, the result of the action of the spirit in the heart. The character of this relation is reflected therein, hence 2 Tim. i. 3, *ὃ λατρεύω ἐν καθαρᾷ συνειδήσει*, cf. Heb. ix. 9, 14, x. 2; Acts xxiii. 1, xxiv. 16. Hence the obligation, 1 Tim. iii. 9, *ἔχειν τὸ μυστήριον τῆς πίστεως ἐν καθαρᾷ συνειδήσει*; i. 19, *ἔχων πίστιν καὶ ἀγαθὴν συνείδησιν, ἣν τινες ἀπωσάμενοι, περὶ τὴν πίστιν ἐνανάγησαν*; i. 5, *τὸ δὲ τέλος τῆς παραγγελίας ἐστὶν ἀγάπη ἐκ καθαρᾶς καρδίας καὶ συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς, καὶ πίστεως ἀνυποκρίτου*. As *συνεῖδ. ἁμαρτιῶν* purification is needed, Heb. ix. 14, the removal of the *συνεῖδ. πονηρά*, Heb. x. 22, cf. the passage quoted above from Plut. *Mor.* 556 A. So far as conduct is reflected in conscience, conscience may be appealed to as its surest witness, 2 Cor. i. 12; and so far as conscience is the *συνεῖδ. θεοῦ*, it coincides with the Spirit of God in man, Rom. ix. 1. For it is a function of the spirit, of the

divine principle of life in man; cf. Rom. i. 9, τῷ θεῷ λατρεύω ἐν τῷ πν. μου, with 2 Tim. i. 3, ᾧ λατρεύω ἐν καθαρᾷ συνειδήσει. In conjunction with Rom. ix. 1, compare here the remarks under πνεῦμα on the relation of the Holy Spirit to the human πνεῦμα. Conscience is essentially, determining of the self-consciousness by the spirit as the divine principle of life. In conscience, the πνεῦμα still left to man, but no longer ruling with paramount power, kept in the background rather, faces man as something objective, himself and yet not himself; compare its συμμαρτυρεῖν, Rom. ii. 15. So far as it bears witness to no guilt, it is συνείδ. καθάρᾳ, 2 Tim. i. 3, 1 Tim. iii. 9; ἀγαθῇ, Acts xxiii. 1 (see ἀγαθός), 1 Tim. i. 5, 19, 1 Pet. iii. 16, 21; ἀπρόσκοπος, Acts xxiv. 16. In the contrary case it is πονηρά, μεμιασμένη, κεκαυτηριασμένη, Heb. x. 22; Tit. i. 15; 1 Tim. iv. 2; cf. 1 Cor. viii. 7 (cf. 2 Cor. vii. 1). In conscience, man stands face to face with himself. If it is not in a position to give testimony, owing to defective insight into and understanding of the single case, it is συνειδήσις ἀσθενούς ὄντος, 1 Cor. viii. 10, or even a συνείδ. ἀσθενής, 1 Cor. viii. 7, 12. It goes before action, anticipating the moral quality of the mode of action in question, 1 Cor. viii. 10, ἡ συνείδ. αὐτοῦ οἰκοδομηθήσεται εἰς τὸ τὰ εἰδωλόβυτα φαγεῖν.—Conscience as a function of the spirit is a function also of the heart: a function of the spirit working in the heart, cf. Heb. x. 22. *Vid.* καρδιά, πνεῦμα. The word occurs, besides, in 1 Cor. x. 25, 27, 28, 29; not at all in the Synoptics and John's writings, for John viii. 9 is spurious. Both the expression and the fully correspondent idea are foreign to the O. T. There, testimony as to the behaviour is conceived as borne by the heart. In place of man's own consciousness of obligation towards God, there appears the revelation of the law and the consciousness of the ἐκλογή on the basis of the divine work of redemption; and thus the need of a confirmation of the divine revelation in himself receded to the background, while that state of conflict and division of the *ego* (Rom. vii.) establishing itself in conscience must have been all the more keenly felt. The prophets, as the conscience of Israel (as they have been termed), base their warnings on the fundamental facts of redemption experienced by Israel. But Christ, without mentioning the conscience by name, appeals to it in the Sermon on the Mount, speaks of it in Matt. vi. 23, τὸ φῶς τὸ ἐν σοί; Luke xi. 34–36.—Cf. Delitzsch, *bibl. Psychol.* iii. 4; Beck, *bibl. Seelenlehre*, ii. 18, iii. 22; Hahn, *neutest. Theol.* § 169; Auberlen, *die göttliche Offenb.* ii. 25 ff. Especially, however, Kähler, *die schriftgemässe Lehre vom Gewissen* (Halle, 1864). Further, R. Hofmann, *die Lehre vom Gewissen* (Leipzig, 1866); H. A. Koch, *das Gew. u. die öffentl. Meinung im Alterthum u. in der Neuzeit* (Berlin, 1870); Nägelsbach, *Nachhomer. Theol.* vii. 11 sqq.; Jahnke, *Ueb. den Begriff Gew. in der Griech. Philosophie*, (Berlin, 1872); Vilmar, *Theol. Moral.* i. 98.

Εἰκὼν, ὄνος, ἡ, from Εἶκω, εἶκα, to be like, to resemble (Jas. i. 6, 23).—(I.) *That which resembles an object*, which represents it, image, likeness. Matt. xxii. 20; Mark xii. 16; Luke xx. 24; Rev. xiii. 14, 15, xiv. 9, 11, xv. 2, xvi. 2, xix. 20, xx. 4; Rom. i. 23. Noteworthy is the expression εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ, *image, representation of God*. This

applies to man, generally, in relation to the world; especially, in the relation of husband to wife, 1 Cor. xi. 7; cf. Wisd. ii. 23. Specially, however, does it hold good of Christ, whose δόξα is connected with His being εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ, 2 Cor. iv. 4; τοῦ ἀοράτου, Col. i. 15; cf. 2 Cor. iv. 6, πρὸς φωτισμὸν τῆς γνώσεως τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν προσώπῳ Χριστοῦ. This expression involves, on the one hand, the affinity of Christ with man, in that He is what we ought to be; cf. Jas. iii. 9 with Col. iii. 10, 2 Cor. iii. 18, Rom. viii. 29, 1 Cor. xv. 49. On the other hand, the apostle means to give prominence above all to that in which Christ differs from us; to wit, what man is for the world, or the husband for the wife, Gen. i. 26, 1 Cor. xi. 7, that Christ is for man; cf. Eph. vi. 23 ff.; John xiv. 9. Hence special emphasis attaches to the expression as used regarding Christ, and it is to be compared with Heb. i. 3, ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτήρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως τοῦ θεοῦ; cf. Wisd. vii. 25, 26, of wisdom, ἀτμίς τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ δυνάμεως, ἀπόρροια τῆς δόξης, ἀπαύγασμα φωτὸς αἰδίου, ἔσπιντρον τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ ἐνεργείας, εἰκὼν τῆς ἀγαθότητος αὐτοῦ.

(II.) Εἰκὼν denotes not merely the image, but also the pattern, the original, which, for its part, sets forth that likeness or resemblance which is meant to be found in the image; accordingly = pattern, like the Heb. תבנית, Ezek. i. 16. This meaning, which had almost disappeared from profane use, and existed only in the adverbial accusative εἰκόνα, "after the manner of," "as,"—cf. δεσμοτηρίου εἰκόνα, Plat. *Crat.* 400 C,—unquestionably occurs in biblical Greek; cf. Wisd. xiii. 13, ἀπεικάσεν αὐτὸ εἰκόνι ἀνθρώπου, with Lucian, *de sacrif.* 11, εἰκόνας αὐτοῖς ἀπεικάζουσιν. Especially cf. Hos. xiii. 2, ἐποίησαν ἑαυτοῖς χώνευμα ἐκ τοῦ ἀργυρίου ἑαυτῶν κατ' εἰκόνα εἰδώλων. So also cf. Gen. v. 3, where κατ' εἰκόνα αὐτοῦ, along with the synonymous κατὰ τὴν ἰδέαν αὐτοῦ, is used to strengthen the idea; the latter, however = way and manner, nature; and, since Plato's time, archetype, idea. This meaning not only supplies the simplest explanation of the expressions, Col. iii. 10, ἀνακαινοῦσθαι κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος, comp. Eph. iv. 24, ὁ καινὸς ἀνθρ. ὁ κατὰ θεὸν κτισθεὶς, Rom. viii. 29, συμμορφὸς τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, 2 Cor. iii. 18, τὴν αὐτὴν εἰκόνα μεταμορφούμεθα, but especially also Heb. x. 1, σκιὰν γὰρ ἔχων ὁ νόμος τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν, οὐκ αὐτὴν τὴν εἰκόνα τῶν πραγμάτων; σκιά of the shadowy outline, εἰκὼν = πρωτότυπον.—LXX. = עֲלֹךְ, Gen. i. 26, 27, v. 3, ix. 6 = תבנית, Gen. v. 1; cf. Ecclus. xvii. 3.—Cf. נִפְתָּח in the plural = features, in Levy, *chald. Wörterb.*

Εἰ μὴ εἶναι, to be.

Ἐξουσία, ἡ, from ἔξεστι, it is free, it is allowed = permission, right, liberty, power to do anything. Plat. *Defn.* 415 C, ἔξουσία, ἐπιτροπή νόμου. Cf. Acts xxvi. 12, μετ' ἐξουσίας καὶ ἐπιτροπῆς τῆς παρὰ τῶν ἀρχιερέων. As ἔξεστι denies the presence of an hindrance, it may be used either of the capability or the right to do a certain action. The words ἔξεστι, ἐξουσία, accordingly combine the two ideas right and might; cf. the German "bevollmächtigen," to authorize, and the synonyms *Berechtigung* and *Ermächtigung*, entitlement and authorization. In Thucyd., Herodian, and Plutarch, ἐξουσία appears in conjunction with δύναμις; if the latter imply the possession of the ability to make power

felt, the former affirms that free movement is ensured to the ability. Cf. the Stoic *ἐλευθερία ἐστὶν ἐξουσία αὐτοπραγίας*; Cicero, *Libertas est potestas vivendi ut velis*. The usage may be classified as follows:—

(I.) Right, authority, capability; correctly, Sturz, *facultas faciendi vel omittendi sine impedimento*. E.g. *ἐξουσίαν παρέχειν*, to permit; *ἐξ. ἔχειν*, be able, be allowed, etc. So in the N. T. Rom. ix. 21; 1 Cor. vii. 37, viii. 9, ix. 4; Heb. xiii. 10; Rev. vi. 8; Matt. ix. 6, xxi. 23, etc.—(II.) Capability, ability, power, strength (cf. *δύναμις*). Matt. ix. 8, xxviii. 18. Synonymous with *κράτος*, Jude 25; *δύναμις*, Luke iv. 36. Power over anything, *ἐξ. πνευμάτων*, Matt. x. 1; Luke xix. 17, *ἐπάνω δέκα πόλεων*. To this connection belongs also Luke iv. 6, *σοὶ δώσω τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην ἅπασαν καὶ τὴν δόξαν αὐτῶν* (sc. *τῶν βασιλειῶν τῆς οἰκουμένης*). Syn. *ἀρχή*, Luke xx. 20, *παραδοῦναι τῇ ἀρχῇ καὶ τῇ ἐξουσίᾳ τοῦ ἡγεμόνος*. Here it denotes the executive power, as *ἀρχή* the authority. Right and might, e.g. John v. 27, *ἐξουσίαν ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ καὶ κρίσιν ποιεῖν*, xvii. 2, xix. 10, 11.—(III.) Justified, rightly supra-ordinated power, Matt. viii. 9, *ἄνθρωπός εἰμι ὑπὸ ἐξουσίαν*; Rev. xviii. 1. In the passage, 1 Cor. xi. 10, it is clear from the connection, vv. 6, 7, that *ἐξουσία ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς* is the same as *κάλυμμα ἐπὶ τῇ κεφαλῇ*. The power over the head of the wife (cf. *βασιλεύειν ἐπὶ* with the genitive, Matt. ii. 22, etc.) requires a veil on her head, and this latter is designated after that which it signifies and represents. Cf. Photius in *Caten. graec. patr.*, Oxon. 1844, *ὀφείλει, φησὶν, ἡ γυνὴ ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς, τοῦτ' ἔστιν τὴν τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἐξουσίαν καὶ κυριότητα ἥπερ ὑπόκειται, ὀφείλει ἔχειν καὶ ἐνδείκνυσθαι ἐπ' αὐτῆς τῆς κεφαλῆς . . . διὸ καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ κατακάλυμμα εἰκότως ἀν ἐξουσία κληθεῖν ὡς τῆς τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἐξουσίας καὶ κυριότητος ἐνδεικτικὸν ὑπάρχον καὶ παραστατικόν*. “That *ἐξουσία* denotes the sign of another's power, is as clear from the context as when Diod. Sic. i. 49 says, *ἔχουσιν τρεῖς βασιλείας ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς*; the context shows unmistakably that *βασιλεία* denotes the symbol of personal rule (diadem),” Meyer. In later Greek *ἐξουσία* denotes specially *the power of the magistracy*, as those who have *κατ' ἐξ.* power in the community, and in conjunction therewith the right to exercise it, thus representing the union—not the identification—of right and might; in like manner synonymous with *ἀρχή*, which see. So in Tit. iii. 1; Rom. xiii. 1–3; and, indeed, *ἐξουσία* denotes not so much *the magistracy* as magistracy in general as represented by any one—magisterial jurisdiction; hence the plural in Tit. iii. 1; Rom. xiii. 1.

With this usage is connected the application of the term to *supramundane powers*, synonymous with *ἀρχή, θρόνος, κυριότης*, 1 Cor. xv. 24; Eph. i. 21, iii. 10, vi. 12; Col. ii. 10, 15; 1 Pet. iii. 22,—and that, too, at all events in the Pauline passages, probably to *evil powers*, who oppose Christ, 1 Cor. xv. 24; Col. ii. 25; Eph. vi. 12, *ἔστιν ἡμῖν ἡ πᾶλη . . . πρὸς τὰς ἀρχάς, πρὸς τὰς ἐξουσίας*, seems especially to favour this view. This designation may have been selected without any further defining clause, because the characteristic feature is, that they come forward as *powers*, and do not, like the angels, serve; they appear not in dependence on the redemptive economy of God, but in attempted independence, i.e. opposition. Such being the case, the error referred to in Col. ii. 18

appears specially dangerous. Cf. ἀρχή.—In like manner, Eph. ii. 2, ἐξουσία τοῦ αἵματος, will denote the entire powers, not earthly, and yet not heavenly, which have put themselves into closest relation to the earth, whose ἄρχων (cf. Eph. vi. 11, 12) is the devil; cf. the detailed examination of the subject and refutation of extravagant views in Harless, *Commentar. in loc.* Luke xxii. 53, ἐξουσία τοῦ σκοτός, as in Col. i. 13.

Παρουσία, as, ἡ, from παρῆναι, *to be there, to be present, to be at hand*, opposed to ἀπουσία, Phil. ii. 12; 2 Cor. x. 10. On Phil. i. 26, διὰ τῆς ἐμῆς παρουσίας πάλιν πρὸς ὑμᾶς, cf. παρῆναι εἰς = *to have betaken oneself somewhere*, e.g. εἰς Ἀσίην, to a goal selected for a longer stay, Col. i. 6. Accordingly, παρουσία denotes (I.) presence, 2 Cor. x. 10; Phil. ii. 12; (II.) arrival, 1 Cor. xvi. 17, χαίρω ἐπὶ τῇ παρουσίᾳ Στεφάνῃ . . . ὅτι τὸ ὑμέτερον ὑστέρημα αὐτοὶ ἀνεπλήρωσαν. So also 2 Cor. vii. 6, 7; 2 Thess. ii. 9; 2 Pet. iii. 12; 2 Macc. viii. 12; Pol. xviii. 31. 4, ἵνα μὴ δοκῇ τοῖς καιροῖς ἐφεδρεύων ἀποκαρδοκεῖν τὴν Ἀντιόχου παρουσίαν. With this meaning is most probably connected the application of the word to the second coming of Christ, cf. Jas. v. 8, ἡ παρουσία τοῦ κυρίου ἤγγικε, 1 John ii. 28, where ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ αὐτοῦ is parallel with ὅταν φανερωθῇ; 2 Pet. iii. 4, ἡ ἐπαγγελία τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ. Further, cf. 1 Thess. iv. 15 with vv. 16, 17. To the expression ἡ παρ. τοῦ υἱοῦ τ. ἀνθρ., Matt. xxiv. 27, 37, 39, τοῦ Χριστοῦ, 1 Cor. xv. 23, τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν, 1 Thess. iii. 13, v. 23, corresponds that other, ἡ ἀποκάλυψις τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ, 2 Thess. i. 7; cf. 1 Pet. i. 7 with 1 Thess. v. 23, ii. 19, iii. 13. Further, ἡ ἡμέρα αὐτοῦ, 1 Cor. i. 8, Phil. ii. 10, with 1 Thess. iii. 13, 2 Cor. i. 14; Phil. ii. 16 with 1 Thess. ii. 19; Phil. i. 6 with 1 Thess. v. 23; 1 Thess. v. 2, 2 Pet. iii. 10, with Matt. xxiv. 37, 39. The two expressions are used interchangeably in 2 Thess. ii. 1, 2. According to the passages in question, the παρουσία of Christ denotes His coming from heaven, which will be an advent and revelation of His glory, for the salvation of His church, for vengeance on its enemies, for the overthrow of the opposition raised against Himself,—of antichristianism,—and finally, to realize the plan of salvation. Cf. (in addition to the passages already named) 2 Thess. ii. 1, 8; Jas. v. 7; 2 Pet. i. 16, iii. 12. It is only by comparison with Christ's earlier presence with His disciples (Luke xvii. 26), and without giving the word its full force, that we can apply the name of παρουσία to the second advent. It is not easy to explain how the term came to be used in this sense. It does not occur in Christ's eschatological discourses, as given by Mark and Luke; we find it in Matthew only. Ewald acutely says (*Die drei ersten Evv.* p. 333), "The παρουσία Χριστοῦ perfectly corresponds with the מְשֻׁבָּת of God in the O. T.,—the permanent dwelling of the King, where His people ever behold Him, and are ever shielded by Him. During the present imperfect state He is not so actually and fully present as His people hope and long for; . . . even when the expression more immediately denotes the advent, it still always includes the idea of a permanent dwelling from that coming onwards." Cf. 2 Thess. ii. 9, οὗ ἐστὶν ἡ παρουσία κατ' ἐνέργειαν τοῦ σατανᾶ ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει κ.τ.λ., with ἔρχεσθαι ἐν, Matt. xvi. 27, xxv. 31; Rom. xv. 29, and other places.

Ἐπιούσιος, *ον*, a word quite unknown in the range of Greek, and occurring only in Matt. vi. 11, τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δὸς ἡμῖν σήμερον, and Luke xi. 3, τὸν ἄ. ἡμ. τ. ἐπιούσιον δίδου ἡμῖν τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν (cod. Sin. omits τὸ), concerning which Origen remarks, πρῶτον δὲ τοῦτ' ἰστέον ὅτι ἡ λέξις ἡ ἐπιούσιος παρ' οὐδενὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων οὔτε τῶν σοφῶν ὠνόμασται, οὔτε ἐν τῇ τῶν ἰδιωτῶν συνηθείᾳ τέτριπται, ἀλλ' ἔοικε πεπλᾶσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν εὐαγγελιστῶν. Its very derivation is doubtful. The simplest certainly seems to be from ἔπειμι, ἐπιέναι = *to be coming on, approaching*, participle ἐπιών, and hence ἐπιούσιος, like ἐθέλων, ἐθελούσιος; ἐκών, ἐκούσιος; γέρων, γερούσιος. The participle is for the most part used with reference to time, ἐπιέναι = *to be near*, e.g. ἐν τῷ ἐπιόντι χρόνῳ, *in time to come*; τοῦπιόν, *the future*; ἡ ἐπιούσα ἡμέρα, *the coming day* (not *the morrow*, cf. Acts vii. 26, xvi. 11, xx. 15, xxi. 18, xxiii. 11; cf. also Pape, *Wörterb.* under ἐπιέναι). So also ἡ ἐπιούσα ἐκκλησία, πράγματα ἐπιόντα. According to this, ἄρτος ἐπιούσιος would not mean "bread needful for the coming day, serviceable for the future," but "bread belonging or pertaining to the future,"—a view already given, according to Jerome, though he does not adopt it, in the apocryphal Gospel of the Hebrews, "*in Evangelio quod appellatur secundum Hebraeos, pro supersubstantiali pane reperi Mahar (= מָהָר)*." Meyer maintains this view notwithstanding its incompatibility with Matt. vi. 34; and he does so professedly in keeping with a strictly critical canon, the application of which in exegesis is false almost as often as it is put to the test by him and others, *proclivi scriptioni praestat ardua*. "*Nihil est ineptius, quam panem crastini diei nobis quotidie postulare*," Salmasius. Against this view, moreover, is Ex. xvi. 14–16, which may be taken as, so to speak, an authentic interpretation of this petition. Comparatively few of the Greek Fathers, in particular not Origen, espouse this derivation; not only is the tenor of the context against it, but the fact also that *there is not a derivative single ending in -ιούσιος to be found as formed from lévai and its compounds*. Far better is it to regard the word as one of that not uncommon class of adjectives which have been formed from εἶναι or οὐσία—ἐνούσιος, ἐξούσιος, ὁμοούσιος, ἑτερούσιος, πολυούσιος, ὑπεξούσιος, αὐτεξούσιος, περιούσιος, Ἐπί, certainly, when prefixed to words beginning with a vowel, usually loses its final ι, and so also in ἐπέιναι; still the retaining of it is not entirely without precedent (apart from those cases where its retention in Homer is justified by the digamma), even in words of the same family, e.g. ἐπιετής, *of this year*, Polyb. iii. 55. 1; elsewhere, on the contrary, ἐπέτειος. So also ἐπιорκεῖν, *to swear falsely*, in ecclesiastical Greek, ἐπιорκίζεω, *to conjure*; ἐπιεικής, ἐπίουρος (in Homer = ἔφορος). The hiatus more frequently occurs in compounds with ἀμφί, and always in those with περί. L. Meyer in the Dissertation (declared to be his by Camphausen, *Das Gebet des Herrn*, Elberfeld 1866) on ἐπιούσιος in A. Kuhn's *Zeitschrift für vgl. Sprachforschung*, vii. [1858], pp. 401–430, with which this exposition in essential points unintentionally agrees, adduces further the following forms, ἐπιέννυμι, ἐπιήρανος, ἐπιόινιος, Theogn. 971; ἐπιόγδοος, Plato, *Tim.*; ἐπίοπτος, Opp. Hal. i. 10; ἐπιουδής, Bekk. *Anecd.* 1310; ἐπιερεῦς, Boekh, *Inscr.* i. 440; ἐπιίζομαι, Luc. *Anth. Pal.* xi. 403. 3, and others,—examples which might be multiplied

if we were to adduce all cases in which *ἐπι* retains the *ι* before the aspirate. Its retention is by no means foreign to the N. T. idiom, see Winer, *Gramm.* § 5, 1. The form is not in the least strange if the word is derived, not from the participle of *ἐπεῖναι*, but from *οὐσία*, like *ἐξουσίος*, *ἐνούσιος*, *πολυ-*, *ὁμο-*, *έτερούσιος*, like *ὑπεξούσιος*, *αὐτεξούσιος*, from *ἐξουσία*. In this case the form *ἐπιούσιος* resembles the *ἐπιέτης* of Polybius. The objection, that from substantives in *ία* adjectives in *σιος* or *ώδης* are usually formed (cf. *οὐσιώδης*, *ἐπουσιώδης*), is obviated by the fact that many like adjectives in *σιος* formed from *οὐσία* occur, and especially by the consideration that in compounds generally the adjectives in *σιος* correspond with substantives in *ία*, e.g. *ἐπιθυμία*, *ἐπιθύμιος*; *ἐπικαρπία*, *ἐπικάρπιος*; *περιουσία*, *περιούσιος*. Still less strange is the formation of a new adjective among those formed from *οὐσία*. Hence the Greek expositors who adopt this derivation trace the origin of the word, not from *ἐπεῖναι*, but from *οὐσία*. The derivation from *ἐπεῖναι* (*ἐπουσία* = *surplus*, so that *ἐπιούσιος* = *ἐπουσιώδης* = *superfluous*, *non-essential*) does not give any admissible meaning. But as the derivation of other compound adjectives from *οὐσία* affords such a precedent, as the later and undoubted derivatives *έτερούσιος*, *ὁμοούσιος*, *ὑπερούσιος*, and the earlier *ἐνούσιος*, etc., show, *ἐπιούσιος* may be explained as meaning, “conformable to the *οὐσία*,” cf. *ἐπίκαιρος* and others (*ἐπί* denoting a leaning to anything). We have now to inquire, therefore, what *οὐσία* means. As signifying power, possession, property,—as in *ἐνούσιος*, *ἐξούσιος*, *πολυούσιος*,—*ἐπιούσιος* will be an epithet denoting what belongs to possession or property = *own*, and the meaning thus given to the petition would not be inadmissible; cf. 2 Thess. iii. 12, *ἵνα μετὰ ἡσυχίας ἐργαζόμενοι τὸν ἑαυτῶν ἄρτον ἐσθίωσιν*; see also Ps. xxxvii. 26, *οὐκ εἶδον δίκαιον ἐγκαταλελειμμένον οὐδὲ τὸ σπέρμα αὐτοῦ ζητοῦν ἄρτους*. Still there is not sufficient reason in the passage before us for laying stress upon the fact of possession, and so far-fetched and artificial an interpretation cannot be justified. But one might go even further, and, on the analogy of *ἐνούσιος*, *ἐξούσιος*, explain the *Ἐπιούσιος*, *what belongs to possession, what must be there* = *necessary*. It would be simpler and less strained if we could directly connect the sense with *οὐσία*. *Οὐσία*, in a philosophic sense, denotes *essence* or *reality* (*τὸ πρῶτως ὄν καὶ ὄντι ὄν ἅπλως ἢ οὐσία ἂν εἴη*, Aristot. *Metaph.* 6); but this is too far removed from ordinary language to have been apprehended by our Lord's hearers in the Sermon on the Mount; and the attempts at an inappropriate profundity, such as that of Jerome, who renders it *supersubstantialis* = *super omnes οὐσίας*, must on this account be dismissed. Compare, moreover, the clear declaration of John vi. 32, *ὁ ἄρτος ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὁ ἀληθινός*. The meaning, “*being*,” “*existence*,” cannot, as Tholuck thinks, be assigned to *οὐσία* in the perhaps spurious passage in Soph. *Trach.* 907, *ἅπαις οὐσία*, where “*household stuff, property, without children*,” is the true rendering, if, indeed, the words be not interpolated (the Scholiast here renders *οὐσία* = *συνουσία, κοίτη*),—a signification here indeed false, yet in itself not so unjustifiable and utterly untenable as L. Meyer thinks; cf. Du Fresne, *Glossar. med. et inf. Graec.*, s.v. *οὐσία*. In Aristotle it occurs clearly in this signification,—a signification certainly approximate, though suppressed prob-

ably by philosophic usage; see *Index Aristot.*, ed. H. Bonitz, Berol. 1870. Aristotle uses οὐσία as = τὸ εἶναι, e.g. *De part. anim.* i. 1, ἡ γὰρ γένεσις ἕνεκα τῆς οὐσίας ἐστίν, ἀλλ' οὐχ ἡ οὐσία ἕνεκα τῆς γενέσεως; *De anim. generat.* v. 1, διὰ τὸ εἶναι τοιαυτὴ γίγνεται τοιαῦτα· τῇ γὰρ οὐσίᾳ ἡ γένεσις ἀκολουθεῖ καὶ τῆς οὐσίας ἕνεκά ἐστιν; *De part. an.* ii. 2, τὰ μὲν πρὸς τὰ ἔργα καὶ τὴν οὐσίαν ἐκάστω τῶν ζώων, τὰ δὲ πρὸς τὸ βέλτιον ἢ χεῖρον; *ibid.* ἐκ τούτων γὰρ συνέστηκεν ἕκαστον τῶν ὀργανικῶν μερῶν, ἐξ ὁσῶν καὶ νέρων καὶ σαρκῶν καὶ ἄλλων τοιούτων συμβαλλομένων τὰ μὲν εἰς τὴν οὐσίαν τὰ δ' εἰς τὴν ἐργασίαν. It occurs as directly synonymous with ζωή, *De respir.* 17, πᾶσι μὲν οὖν ἡ φθορὰ γίνεται διὰ θερμοῦ τινὸς ἐκλείψιν, τοῖς δὲ τελείοις, ἐν ᾧ τῆς οὐσίας ἡ ἀρχή . . . ἡ δ' ἀρχὴ τῆς ζωῆς ἐκλείπει τοῖς ἔχουσιν, ὅταν μὴ καταψύχῃται τὸ θερμὸν τὸ κοινωνοῦν αὐτῆς; *Magn. Mor.* i. 20, κίνδυνος ἀναιρετικοὶ τῆς οὐσίας. Compare also (pseudo-) Plat. *Deff.* 405a, ἀθανασία· οὐσία ἔμφυχος καὶ αἰδὶς μονή, where οὐσία, side by side with μονή, hardly signifies *natura*, but *existence* (in general, οὐσία often occurs here in this sense). These passages may suffice to vindicate for οὐσία the meaning *existence*, and accordingly warrant for ἐπιούσιος the meaning "what belongs to existence," as a short and simple rendering of *ὃ ἐστὶν*, for which the LXX. Prov. xxx. 8 has τὰ δέοντα καὶ τὰ αὐταρκῆ. Hence there is no need to take οὐσία, though this was not unjustifiable, as in the first edition, in the signification, *essence*, *nature*, corresponding with the compounds in patristic Greek, *ομοούσιος*, etc.; cf. Plato, *Rep.* ix. 585 B, πότερα οὖν ἡγεῖ τὰ γένη μᾶλλον καθαρᾶς οὐσίας μετέχειν, and often, so that ἐπιούσιος would be = "conformable to the essence or nature," and ὁ ἄρτος ἡμῶν ὁ ἐπιούσιος, "bread answering to our nature, our essence," taking οὐσία, *essence*, *nature*, either in the freer and wider sense as popularly used, according to which ἄρτος ἡμῶν ἐπιούσιος would signify all that Luther sums up as included in this fourth petition, or, in the stricter sense, which would require a reference to our Lord's comment on Matt. iv. 4, Luke iv. 4, οὐκ ἐπ' ἄρτι μόνω ζήσεται ἄνθρωπος, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ παντὶ ῥήματι θεοῦ. It is therefore, in any case, unnecessary, on account of the meaning of οὐσία, to deny its connection with the substantive, and with L. Meyer (in the place above referred to) to regard the word as compounded with the participial theme -οντ, determining its meaning in a roundabout way by its correspondence with *περιούσιος* (which see). Ἐπιούσιος, both in form and meaning, is said to be a correlative of *περιούσιος*, as already Damm, *Lex. Hom.*, supposed, "*περιούσιος*, *superans* (*surpassing*), et *ἐπιούσιος*, *sufficiens* (*praesens*), *qui praesto est*, *quantum satis est*." Against this it tells at once that the analogous forms ἐξούσιος, ἐνούσιος, are connected with οὐσία, and not with the analogous compounds ἐξείναι and ἐνείναι, and the same holds good of ἐπιούσιος; as the cases are analogous, the inference is that it is not connected with ἐπείναι, so that the simplest way of understanding the word is proved to be to regard it in like manner as a compound of ἐπὶ and οὐσία, and the transference from οὐσία, in the sense *possession* (*what is there*), to οὐσία, in the sense *existence*, *life*, will not seem strange to a just linguistic apprehension. Against the suggested explanation of the formation of the word, must be urged, further, the meaning given to it, which, strictly taken, is, to say the least, very difficult to under-

stand. L. Meyer explains "*what is or pertains to,*" i.e. to life ("*what is conformable or appropriate to*" would be more intelligible); "such elliptical expressions," he says, "are surprisingly common in all prepositional combinations, as in the German 'anwesend, abwesend;' in Greek, *περιμήκης*, *overlong*, *very long*, *περίφρων*, *very sensible*, *περιέχειν*, *to surpass*, *περιεῖναι*, *to be superior*, etc.; Latin, *superstes*, *praesens*, *absens*." He might have referred generally to intransitive verbs compounded with prepositions, but this would have proved too much. We might perhaps be satisfied with this explanation if the verb *ἐπεῖναι* were not actually in use. But as it occurs, and by no means seldom, and the preposition in it has quite a different meaning, and more appropriate to its combination with the general conception *εἶναι*,—namely, purely local (a) relative, *to be thereat, thereon, thereupon*; (b) absolute, *to come thereto*,—*ἐπιούσιος*, in the sense "*what is (sc. necessary) thereto*," "*what is suitable*," painfully clashes with it; and this always, unless *ἐπιούσιος* is related to *ἐπουσία*, *ἐπεῖναι*, as *ἐξούσιος* is to *ἐξουσία*, *ἔξεστι*, that is not at all, for this last word is a compound with *οὐσία*. Thus, even on this side, we are driven to seek a derivation, if at all possibly tenable, from *οὐσία*; and that such a derivation is not only possible, but justifiable and satisfactory, is clear from what we have said above. As to the choice of this new and, however we take it, strange expression, which, like no other, embodies the rich brevity of the Hebrew *נֶחֱלֶה נְהִלָּה*, it must not be forgotten that, like many a newly-formed word, it seems more strange to the linguist and the cultured than to the continually creative language of common life. It seems very doubtful whether any of the Greek expositors take *οὐσία* as sometimes meaning "existence," and not always "essence" or "nature," at least in the quotations from them which Tholuck gives. The words of Suid., *ὁ ἐπὶ τῇ οὐσίᾳ ἡμῶν ἀρμόζων*, certainly do not sanction this. For the history of the exposition, see Tholuck on Matt. vi. 11.

Περιούσιος, *ον*, a word apparently as uncommon in classical Greek as *ἐπιούσιος*, used by the LXX. as a translation of *נֶחֱלֶה*, *possession*, *treasure*, Ex. xix. 5; Deut. vii. 6, xiv. 2, xxvi. 17; cf. Eccles. ii. 8 and Ps. cxxxv. 4=*περιουσιασμός*. In the latter place we read, *τὸν Ἰακώβ ἐξελέξατο ἐαυτῷ ὁ κύριος, Ἰσραὴλ εἰς περιουσιασμόν ἐαυτῷ*. *נֶחֱלֶה*, *what one embraces*, is more than a mere possession, it is rather=*a treasure*, and corresponds to *περιουσιασμός*, *surplus*, *overabundance*, *riches*; Israel is God's riches, God's treasure, the jewel or pearl of His possession; cf. especially Ex. xix. 5, *ἔσεσθέ μοι λαὸς περιούσιος ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἔθνων· ἐμὴ γάρ ἐστι πάντα ἡ γῆ*. So also Deut. xxvi. 17, *τὸν θεὸν εἵλου σήμερον εἶναι σου θεόν . . .*; ver. 18, *καὶ κύριος εἵλετό σε σήμερον γενέσθαι σε αὐτῷ λαὸν περιούσιον*. Accordingly *περιούσιος* is what constitutes *a costly possession*, *a specially chosen good*, *that which is a costly possession* (not what belongs to such, because "*ιο-ς*" is not perhaps a new adjectival suffix, but only the adjectival form of *ία* [*οὐσ-ία*], exactly as in *πολυλήϊο-ς*, *rich in seed*, from *τὸ λήϊον*, *seed*;" L. Meyer in the Dissertation mentioned under *ἐπιούσιος*); and this is in keeping with the derivation of the word from *περιουσία*, according to which it denotes a *surplus rich and valuable*,

costly. With this also corresponds the otherwise erroneously cited explanation given by Chrysostom of Titus ii. 14, *καὶ καθάρισή ἐαυτῷ λαὸν περιούσιον* = *ἐξελεγμένος*. If the above rendering be adopted as preferable to the usual one "possession," the representation given in Titus ii. 14 corresponds with that otherwise expressed in Eph. v. 26, 27, *ἵνα αὐτὴν ἀγιάσῃ καθάρισας . . . , ἵνα παραστήσῃ αὐτὴν ἐαυτῷ ἑνδοξον*. This signification, which the connection of the word in the LXX. already suggests, is not to be called in question, only its reference to *περιουσία* is doubtful. *Περιεῖναι* is the only compound of *εἶναι* to which there is found already in the older Greek an adjective formed simply from the participle, *περιώσιος*, as an adverb, *περιώσιον*, in Hom. *Il.* iv. 359, *οὔτε σε νεικείω περιώσιον οὔτε κελεύω*; *Od.* xvi. 203, *οὔτε τι θαυμάζειν περιώσιον οὔτ' ἀγάσθαι*; Schol. *περίσσω*, *παρὰ τὸ προσήκον*; *Hymn. Hom. Cer.* 363, *περιώσιον ἄλλων*. So also *περιώσια* often in the *Hymn. Hom.*; in Pindar once, *Isthm.* iv. 3, *περιώσιον ἄλλων μεγασθενῇ*; *Orph. Argon.* 61, *περιώσια κυδαίνεσκον*. Still also in Soph. *Fr.* 604. Elsewhere only isolatedly in later poets, e.g. *περιώσιον ἄλγος*, *εὐχος*, Greg. Naz. *Carm.* vii. 24, iv. 197. It is more than probable that the word to be derived from *περιεῖναι* is *περιοντ-ιος*, so that properly it must run *περιούσιος*, for which L. Meyer adduces the long *ω* of the Doric dialect, e.g. *νόμως* instead of *νόμου*, *νόμον*. It has a comparative meaning answering to the Homeric *περὶ πάντων ἔμμεναι ἄλλων*. This would give a sense very suitable to the context in the LXX., especially in Deut. vii. 6, *εἶναι αὐτῷ λαὸν περιούσιον παρὰ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη*, though the Hebrew *הַיְיִשִּׁים* would come short of its force; and yet, as Ps. cxxxv. 4 shows, the LXX. seem to take pains to render by this word the thought which lies in the Hebrew, since *περιουσιασμός* is obviously a word coined by them. Considering now that *περιώσιος* did not wholly disappear, yet became decidedly antiquated, so that it nowhere occurs in prose,—and further, that *περιώσιος* is the same with *περισσός*, just as abstract as is this, which does not occur at all in Homer, seldom in Pindar and Hesiod,—*περισσός* seems in usage to have taken the place of *περιώσιος*. *Περισσός*, indeed, appears for the most part with a bad sense attaching to it, yet not always, especially not in later Greek. Thus there seems to be no just reason why the LXX. should have adopted and reinstated this old word occurring only in its old form, especially when the usage of the language presented to them another word not elsewhere disdained by them. That they should do so, is indeed possible; yet it is more probable that they formed *περιούσιος* anew; and then it seems questionable whether it is a compound with *οὐσία*, like the other corresponding adjectives, excepting the *dicomposita*, which in turn are connected with the compounds (*ἐξουσία*, see *ἐπιούσιος*), or whether it is an adjective belonging to *περιουσία*. For the latter it tells that it does not differ from it in sense, as on their part *ἐξούσιος* and *ἐξουσία*, *ἐνούσιος* and *ἐνεῖναι*, differ. *Περιουσία* signifies *surplus*,—*prosperity*, *wealth*,—*περιούσιος*, *what is wealth*, and how closely it answers to the Hebrew *הַיְיִשִּׁים*, is manifest, e.g., from Plato, *Rep.* viii. 554a, *ἀπὸ παντὸς περιουσίαν ποιούμενος* (*enriching oneself*). But that the LXX. had *περιουσία* in mind, and not *περιώσιος*, nor a new form from the participle of *περιεῖναι*, the *περιουσιασμός* = *הַיְיִשִּׁים*, Ps. cxxxv. 4, Eccles. ii. 8, may be decisive proof,

for this word is from *περιουσιάζω* used in later Greek, and manifestly distinct from *περιουσία* by the active character of the verb, so that it can emphasize the possession as *acquisition* or *gain*. If it be said that *περιούσιος* must be traced back to the participle of *περιεῖναι*, it obviously would attach itself to the meaning *to excel, to be over*, and this would suit neither the Hebrew word nor *περιουσιασμός*. This word is, indeed, the only one in the range of adjectives in *-ούσιος* which directly connects itself with its substantive, while all the other compounds or bicomponents with *οὐσία* are from *εἶναι*. But this has all the less weight in explaining the newly-formed word, because, through *περιουσιασμός*, which answers to the same Hebrew word, we are led back to *περιουσία*. With this the attempt referred to under *ἐπιούσιος* to assume a correspondence between *περιούσιος* and *ἐπιούσιος* fails, because *what is necessary* may perhaps stand over against *what is superfluous*, but not to what is said to be marked out as a costly good, and it is just in this direction, and not in the sense of *superfluous* or *overplus*, that the import of *περιούσιος* leans.

Εἰρήνη, ἡ, peace, rest, (I.) in contrast with strife, and to denote the *absence or end of strife*; Herod. i. 87. 2, οὐδείς γὰρ οὕτω ἀνόητός ἐστι ὅστις πόλεμον πρὸ εἰρήνης αἰρέεται· ἐν μὲν γὰρ τῇ οἱ παῖδες τοὺς πατέρας θάπτουσι, ἐν δὲ τῇ οἱ πατέρες τοὺς παῖδας. Opposed to *μάχαιρα*, Matt. x. 34, cf. Jer. iv. 10; to *διαμερισμός*, Luke xii. 51, cf. Jer. ix. 7, τῷ πλησίον αὐτοῦ λαλεῖ εἰρηνικὰ καὶ ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἔχει τὴν ἔχθραν. In 1 Pet. iii. 11 in antithesis to *λαλεῖν δόλον*, ver. 10; to *ἀκαταστασία*, 1 Cor. xiv. 33.—Rom. xiv. 19; Gal. v. 22; Eph. iv. 3; 2 Tim. ii. 22; Heb. xi. 31, xii. 14; Rev. vi. 4; Luke xiv. 32; Acts vii. 26, xii. 20 (1 Cor. vii. 15?).

(II.) As used in the N. T., we observe the influence of the Hebrew *שָׁלוֹם*, which denotes a state of *wellbeing*, and only in a derivative manner “*peace*,” in contrast with strife. Accordingly, opposed to *κακά*, e.g. Isa. xlv. 7, ὁ ποιῶν εἰρήνην καὶ κτίζων κακά; Jer. xxix. 11, λογιοῦμαι . . . λογισμὸν εἰρήνης καὶ οὐ κακά, τοῦ δοῦναι ὑμῖν τὰ μετὰ ταῦτα καὶ ἐλπῖδα. Hence also opposed to *θλίψις*, *σύντριμμα*, etc., e.g. Zech. viii. 10, καὶ τῷ ἐκπορευομένῳ καὶ τῷ εἰσπορευομένῳ οὐκ ἔσται εἰρήνη ἀπὸ τῆς θλίψεως; cf. John xvi. 33, ταῦτα λελάληκα ὑμῖν, ἵνα ἐν ἐμοὶ εἰρήνην ἔχητε. ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ θλίψιν ἔχετε; Jer. vi. 14, ἰῶντο τὸ σύντριμμα τοῦ λαοῦ μου ἐξουθενοῦντες καὶ λέγοντες· εἰρήνη, εἰρήνη· καὶ ποῦ ἐστὶν εἰρήνη; viii. 11; Ezek. xiii. 10, 16, cf. 1 Thess. v. 3. Accordingly *εἰρήνη* denotes a state of *untroubled, undisturbed wellbeing*, synonymous with *ἀσφάλεια*, 1 Thess. v. 3; Acts ix. 31, ἡ μὲν οὖν ἐκκλησία . . . εἶχεν εἰρήνην, οἰκοδομουμένη κ.τ.λ.; xxiv. 2; cf. Luke xi. 21, ἐν εἰρήνῃ ἐστὶν τὰ ὑπάρχοντα—his goods are unattacked. Cf. Xen. *Cyrop.* vii. 4. 6, vi. 1. 18. In this sense we are to understand the form of salutation, ἡ εἰρήνη (cf. Luke xxiv. 36; John xx. 19, 21, 26), and of leave-taking, εἰς εἰρήνην, Mark v. 34, ὑπάγε εἰς εἰρήνην, καὶ ἴσθι ὑγιᾶς ἀπὸ τῆς μάστιγός σου; Luke viii. 48; Jas. ii. 16; Acts xv. 33, xvi. 36; 1 Cor. xvi. 11. Cf. *שָׁלוֹם* = *υγιαίνειν*, Gen. xxix. 6, xxxvii. 13, xliii. 27; = *σωτηρία*, Gen. xxvi. 31, xxviii. 21, xliv. 17; = *σωτήριον*, Gen. xli. 16. The word is

used in both senses as signifying *peace* as contrasted with strife, and *peace* as undisturbed wellbeing, in Jas. iii. 18, καρπὸς δὲ δικαιοσύνης ἐν εἰρήνῃ σπείρεται τοῖς ποιοῦσιν εἰρήνην.

(III.) This state is the object of divine and saving promise, and is brought about by God's mercy, granting deliverance and *freedom from all the distresses that are experienced as the result of sin* (cf. Job vii. 1, xiv. 1, 6, 14). Hence εἰρήνη joined with ἔλεος, Ps. lxxxv. 9, κύριος ὁ θεὸς . . . λαλήσει εἰρήνην ἐπὶ τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀσίους αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐπιστρέφοντας πρὸς αὐτὸν καρδίας, comp. ver. 8, δεῖξον ἡμῖν κύριε τὸ ἔλεός σου καὶ τὸ σωτήριόν σου δῶς ἡμῖν. Similar is the union of χάρις καὶ εἰρήνη or χάρις ἔλεος εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ Χριστοῦ κ.τ.λ. in the salutations of the Epistles; it denotes the εἰρήνη which is realized in and through Christ, and which is the object of saving promise and hope, Rom. i. 7; 1 Cor. i. 3; 2 Cor. i. 2; Gal. i. 3, vi. 16; Eph. i. 2, vi. 23; Phil. i. 2; Col. i. 2; 1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Thess. i. 2, iii. 16; 1 Tim. i. 2; 2 Tim. i. 2; Titus i. 4; Philem. 3; 1 Pet. i. 2, v. 14; 2 Pet. i. 2; 2 John 3; 3 John 15; Jude 2; Rev. i. 4. In this sense the greeting of His disciples by the risen Saviour, Luke xxiv. 36, John xx. 19, 21, 26, has a special significance. In like manner, cf. Matt. x. 12, 13; Luke x. 5, 6, ii. 29, vii. 50, xix. 38, 42; Rom. iii. 17; Luke i. 79. As sin and sorrow or distress are closely connected, so we find εἰρήνη named in connection with δικαιοσύνη as a Messianic blessing, Ps. lxxii. 7, lxxxv. 11, cf. Isa. lvii. 18, 19; Hag. ii. 9; Jer. xxxiii. 7; διαθήκη εἰρήνης, Ezek. xxxiv. 25, xxxvii. 26; Luke ii. 14; Rom. v. 1. *Peace as a Messianic blessing* is that state, brought about by the grace and loving mind of God, wherein the derangement and distress of life caused by sin are removed. Hence the message of salvation is called τὸ εὐ. τῆς εἰρήνης, Eph. vi. 15; cf. Isa. liii. 7, εὐαγγελίζεσθαι ἀκοὴν εἰρήνης; Nah. ii. 1; Eph. ii. 17; Rom. x. 15; Acts x. 36. This peace is the very εἰρήνη θεοῦ, Phil. iv. 7, Χριστοῦ, Col. iii. 15, and God is ὁ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης, Phil. iv. 9; 1 Thess. v. 23, which latter passage well presents to us the meaning of the word in its fullest range, αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης ἀγιάσαι ὑμᾶς ὁλοτελεῖς καὶ ὁλόκληρον ὑμῶν τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ καὶ τὸ σῶμα ἀμέμπτως . . . τηρηθεῖν. See Heb. xiii. 20; Rom. xv. 33, xvi. 20; 2 Cor. xiii. 11; cf. Heb. vii. 2, ὁ κύριος τῆς εἰρήνης, 2 Thess. iii. 16. In the same sense also we may take Eph. ii. 14, αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ εἰρήνη ἡμῶν, cf. ver. 17, ἔλθων εὐηγγελίστατο εἰρήνην ὑμῖν τοῖς μακρὰν καὶ εἰρήνην τοῖς ἐγγύς; vv. 13, 15; Isa. lvii. 19. See under ἀποκαταλλάσσειν. This peace can be the result only of accomplished reconciliation, Eph. ii. 16, 17; and as in Rom. v. 1 (εἰρήνην ἔχομεν πρὸς τὸν θεόν) εἰρήνη gives prominence to this one element, viz. *the new relationship between man and God brought about by the atonement* (cf. vv. 9, 10), without, however, attempting to seek or to discover a reference to this presupposition in every place; cf. Rom. viii. 6, ζωὴ καὶ εἰρήνη, opposed to θάνατος; Rom. xiv. 17, ἡ βασ. τ. θεοῦ ἐστὶν . . . δικαιοσύνη καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ χαρὰ ἐν πν. ἀγ. (cf. $\text{D}\text{H}\Psi = \text{χαίρειν}$, Isa. xlviii. 22, lvii. 21); Rom. xv. 13, ὁ δὲ θεὸς τῆς ἐλπίδος πληρῶσαι ὑμᾶς πάσης χαρᾶς καὶ εἰρήνης ἐν τῇ πιστεύειν.

Εἰρηνικός, pertaining to peace, e.g. εἰρηνικὰ ἐπιστήμαι, τέχναι, opposed to πολεμι-

καί; peaceful, e.g. Isocr. 82 C, ὃν δὲ ὑπελάμβανον τῶν λόγων εἰρηνικώτατον εἶναι. So in Jas. iii. 17, ἡ ἄνωθεν σοφία . . . εἰρηνική, opposed to ζῆλος, ἐριθεία, ver. 15. In Heb. xii. 11, καρπὸς εἰρηνικὸς δικαιοσύνης, opposed to οὐ δοκεῖ χαρὰς εἶναι ἀλλὰ λύπης, the reference is to εἰρήνη as the blessing of salvation, as it goes hand in hand with δικαιοσύνη.

Εἰρηνεύω, to live in peace, to keep peace, πρὸς τινα, Diod. Sic.; μετὰ τινος, 1 Kings xxii. 45; Rom. xii. 18; ἐν τινί, Mark ix. 50; 1 Thess. v. 3, opposed to μάχεσθαι, Plat. Theaet. 180 B; to πολεμεῖν, Dio Cass. lxxiv. 5; synonymous with τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν, 2 Cor. xiii. 11.

Εἰρηνοποιέω, almost exclusively in biblical and patristic Greek, as also εἰρηνοποιήσεις, εἰρηνοποιά = to make peace. Prov. x. 20, ὁ δὲ ἐλέγχων μετὰ παρρησίας εἰρηνοποιεῖ, over against συνάγει ἀνδράσι λύπας, where, according to the antithesis, εἰρηνοποιεῖν is rather to put an end to strife. In Col. i. 20, on the other hand, we find it side by side with ἀποκαταλλάξαι = to put an end to the disturbed relations between God and man, i.e. to restore the due relations.

Εἰρηνοποιός, ὁ, one who makes peace between two parties; Xen. Hell. vi. 3. 4, ὅταν δὲ ἡσυχίας ἐπιθυμήσῃ, εἰρηνοποιούς ἡμᾶς ἐκπέμπει; Greg. Nyss. i. 824, εἰρηνοποιός ἐστιν ὁ εἰρήνην δούς ἄλλῳ. In the sense of peaceable, it does not appear, not even in Pollux, Onom. 152, συμμάχων εἰρηνοποιῶν καὶ πολεμοποιῶν, for πολεμοποιός hardly means quarrelsome or warlike, but making enemies, exciting hostility. Hence with Matt. v. 9, μακάριοι οἱ εἰρηνοποιοί, we can hardly compare Prov. xii. 20, δόλος ἐν καρδίᾳ τεκταινομένου κακά, οἱ δὲ βουλόμενοι εἰρήνην εὐφρανθήσονται. It is better to take εἰρηνοποιός as = דִּלְפָּן יְהִי־לֶחֶם, Isa. xxxiii. 7; but we may take the εἰρήνη as in Isa. lii. 7, וְיִשְׁכַּח יְהוָה דִּלְפָּן, so that this word already leads on to the special application of the discourse to the inner circle of the disciples in vv. 11–16. Thus best can we understand the connection between the beatitude and the accompanying promise, ὅτι υἱοὶ θεοῦ κληθήσονται.

Ἑκὼν, οὖσα, ὄν, willing, unconstrained, gladly. It usually stands opposed to violence or compulsion, e.g. Soph. Oed. Col. 939; Plat. Soph. 240 C, ἡνάγκακεν ἡμᾶς οὐχ ἐκόντας ὁμολογεῖν; Xen. Hell. iii. 1. 4, Πέργαμον ἐκούσαν προσέλαβε, opposed to 5, κατὰ κράτος ἔλαβε; iv. 1. 1, τὰς μὲν βία, τὰς δὲ ἐκούσας προσελάμβανε. So 1 Cor. ix. 16, εἰ γὰρ ἐκὼν τοῦτο πράσσω, μισθὸν ἔχω· εἰ δὲ ἄκων, οἰκονομίαν πεπίστευμαι; cf. ver. 16, ἀνάγκη γάρ μοι ἀπόκειται; Rom. viii. 20, ἡ κτίσις ὑπετάγη οὐχ ἐκούσα, ἀλλ' . . . ἐπ' ἐλπίδι. In this general sense of willingness, of non-resistance, however, the fundamental meaning of the word is contained only in a weakened form; this is its positive meaning, voluntarily, with will and purpose, as it appears, for example, in combination with γινώσκων, Boeckh, Inscr. ii. 409. 21, οὐδὲ ἄλλῳ ἐπιτράψω ἔκων καὶ γινώσκων; Ex. xxi. 13, ὁ δὲ οὐχ ἐκὼν (sc. πατάξας καὶ ἀποθανών τινα) = הָרָגוֹ מִלִּי וְלֹא מִדֵּבָר. So especially in all cases where the topic in question is ἀδικεῖν, βλάπτειν, ἀμαρτάνειν. Here it always signifies design. Dem. in Mid. 520. 1, ἂν μὲν ἐκὼν βλάβῃ, διπλοῦν· ἂν δ' ἄκων, ἀπλοῦν τὸ βλάβος κελεύ-

ουσιν ἐκτίνειν; Plat. *Prot.* 345 E, where ἐκών is also used of one who obliges himself to something good. The voluntariness, when it anticipates necessity, becomes *willingness*; when it opposes constraint or law, it becomes *purpose*, eventually *contempt* or *wantonness*, e.g. Xen. *Hipp.* iv. 14, μήποτε κινδυνεύειν ἐκόντα. This is of importance as bearing upon the ἐκουσίως ἀμαρτάνειν, Heb. x. 26, see ἐκουσίως. Aristotle, *Ethic. Nicom.* v. 15, ἐκὼν δὲ (sc. ἀδικεῖ) ὁ εἰδὼς καὶ ὃν καὶ ᾧ; vii. 11, ἐκὼν . . . εἰδὼς καὶ ὁ ποιεῖ καὶ οὐ ἔνεκα.

Ἑκούσιος, α, ον, *voluntarily*, in the same range as ἐκών.—(I.) *Voluntarily, purposely*; Plato often combines βίαιον and ἐκούσιον, because an intention of violence lies at the root of it, or the purpose to assert itself by force, βίαιοι ἢ ἐκούσιοι πράξεις, *Rep.* x. 603 C; *Legg.* ix. 860 E, διοριεῖς οὖν αὐτοῖς ἀκούσιν τε καὶ ἐκούσια ἀδικήματα, καὶ τῶν μὲν ἐκουσίων ἀμαρτημάτων τε καὶ ἀδικημάτων μείζους τὰς ζημίας θήσομεν, τῶν δ' ἐλάττους; *Soph. Trach.* 1113, ἤμαρτεν οὐχ ἐκούσια.—(II.) *Willingly, uncompelled, gladly*; Thuc. viii. 27, καθ' ἐκούσιν ἢ πάνυ γε ἀνάγκη. So *Philem.* 14, χωρὶς δὲ τῆς σῆς γνώμης οὐδὲν ἠθέλησα ποιῆσαι, ἵνα μὴ ὡς κατὰ ἀνάγκην τὸ ἀγαθὸν σου ᾗ, ἀλλὰ καθ' ἐκούσιον.—Often in the LXX. = עָזָז, Lev. vii. 16; Num. xxix. 33, xv. 3.

Ἑκουσίως, (I.) *voluntarily, intentionally*; Heb. x. 26, ἐκουσίως γὰρ ἀμαρτανόντων ἡμῶν μετὰ τὸ λαβεῖν τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τῆς ἀληθείας, cf. under ἐκών. The intentionality comes out all the more clearly if we compare the passage in Aristotle, *Rhet.* i. 10, ἔστω δὴ τὸ ἀδικεῖν τὸ βλάπτειν ἐκόντα παρὰ τὸν νόμον. νόμος δ' ἐστὶν ὁ μὲν ἴδιος ὁ δὲ κοινός. λέγω δὲ ἴδιον μὲν καθ' ὃν γεγραμμένον πολιτεύονται, κοινὸν δὲ ὅσα ἀγραφα παρὰ πᾶσιν ὁμολογεῖσθαι δοκεῖ. ἐκόντες δὲ ποιοῦσιν ὅσα εἰδότες καὶ μὴ ἀναγκαζόμενοι. ὅσα μὲν οὖν ἐκόντες, οὐ πάντα προαιρούμενοι, ὅσα δὲ προαιροῦνται, εἰδότες ἅπαντα· οὐδεὶς γὰρ ὁ προαιρεῖται ἀγνοεῖ. δι' αὐτὰ δὲ προαιροῦνται βλάπτειν καὶ φαῦλα ποιεῖν παρὰ τὸν νόμον, κακία ἐστὶ καὶ ἀκрасία. Aristotle distinguishes further among the sins committed ἐκουσίως, those which are done designedly and with deliberation, in the face of better knowledge, from the point of view from which we often find the saying, οὐδεὶς ἐκὼν κακὰ ποιεῖ. Hence it is clear that the ἐκουσίως of Heb. x. 26 is more closely defined by the addition μετὰ . . . ἀληθείας in the sense in which Aristotle combines ἐκὼν καὶ προαιρούμενος, and thus the psychological difficulty of the statement is removed, so that the עָזָז, Num. xv. 30, ἐν χειρὶ ὑπερηφανίας, perfectly corresponds with it; comp. ver. 27, ἀκουσίως, עָזָז; comp. also ἄκων in antithesis to ἐξ ἐπιβουλῆς, Plato, *Hipp. Min.* 570 E.—(II.) *Willingly, unconstrained*, 1 Pet. v. 2, μὴ ἀναγκαστῶς ἀλλ' ἐκουσίως, cf. Ps. liii. 8.

Ἄκων, ουσια, ον, *unwillingly, against one's will, forced*; Job xiv. 17, εἴτε ἄκων παρέβην, an addition of the LXX.; so also Job xxxi. 33. In the N. T. only 1 Cor. ix. 17, see under ἐκών.—Ἀκουσίως often in the LXX. = עָזָז, Lev. iv. 21, 22, 27, v. 15; Josh. xx. 3, 9; comp. Num. xv. 22; עָזָז, Deut. xix. 4; cf. Lev. iv. 13, where it is an addition of the LXX.—Num. xv. 23, 24, the adjective; xv. 26, ἀκουσιάζομαι.

Ἑλέγχω, generally = to test, to try, to search out with an unfriendly purpose, e.g. Xen. *Anab.* iii. 5. 14, τοὺς αἰχμαλώτους ἤλεγχον τὴν κύκλῳ πᾶσαν χώραν τίς ἐκάστη εἴη; Plat. *Soph.* 241 B, τὰς ἄρχας πάσας πάσαις βασάνοις χρώμενοι ἐλεγχόντων. Then = to convince, to convict, to prove anything that was disputed or denied, and therefore implying opposition; Ar. *Plut.* 574, τινὰ περὶ τινος. Thus in John viii. 46, τίς ἐλέγχει με περὶ ἁμαρτίας; hence to reprimand, to blame, to chide, τινὰ, Matt. xviii. 15; Luke iii. 19; 1 Cor. xiv. 24; 1 Tim. v. 20; 2 Tim. iv. 2; Titus i. 9, 13, ii. 15; Heb. xii. 5; Jas. ii. 9; Jude 15, 22; Rev. iii. 19. τί, John iii. 20; Eph. v. 11, 13. Thus we must understand the passage concerning the so-called punitive office of the Holy Ghost, John xvi. 8, ἐλέγξει τὸν κόσμον περὶ ἁμαρτίας καὶ περὶ δικαιοσύνης καὶ περὶ κρίσεως; cf. 2 Tim. ii. 25; John xv. 24–26.—LXX. = עָרַב, Gen. xxi. 25, xxxi. 37; Lev. xix. 17; 2 Sam. vii. 14; Job v. 17, ix. 33, xiii. 10, xxxiii. 19; Ps. cv. 14.—עָרַב, rebuke, 2 Pet. ii. 16.

Ἑλεγχος, ὁ, (I.) proof, e.g. ἀρετῆς, εὐψυχίας. Means of conviction or of proof, Plat. *Gorg.* 471 D, οὗτος ὁ ἑλεγχος οὐδενὸς ἀξίός ἐστι πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν; Job xxiii. 7, ἀλήθεια καὶ ἑλεγχος παρ' αὐτοῦ; ver. 4, τὸ στόμα μου ἐμπλήσαι ἐλέγχων. In this sense the word occurs in Heb. xi. 1 in parathetic apposition (cf. Krüger, § 57, 9), ἔστι δὲ πίστις ἐλπιζομένων ὑπόστασις, πραγμάτων ἑλεγχος οὐ βλεπομένων. This passage describes what faith is to him who possesses it; it is neither a definition nor a description of faith, but simply a statement concerning faith—a predicate. Faith is for the believer ἐλπιζομένων ὑπόστασις, because it produces in him the recognition of the things which are unseen, it is the means of proof (Bengel, *quae sperantur, sunt species; genus quae non cernuntur*), cf. ver. 2.—(II.) Conviction, blame, Ps. lxxiii. 14, ὁ ἑλεγχός μου, parallel to ἐγενόμην μεμαστιγμένος, Job vi. 26, xiii. 6, xvi. 21; 2 Tim. iii. 16, ὠφέλιμος πρὸς . . . ἑλεγχον.

Ἑλεος, in classical Greek ὁ ἔλ, except Diod. Sic. iii. 18, where some read τὸ ἔλ, as for the most part in the LXX. and always in the N. T. = a feeling of sympathy; fellow-feeling with misery (ἔλεος = misery, Eurip. *Or.* 833; Jer. xlii. 2); Arist. *Rhet.* ii. 8, ἔστιω δὴ ἔλεος λύπη τις ἐπὶ φαινομένῳ κακῷ φθαρτικῷ.—Compassion, both as a feeling and a motive, and even as behaviour, Luke x. 37; Jas. ii. 13, iii. 17; Matt. ix. 13, xii. 7, xxiii. 23. In the LXX. it is the usual rendering of עָרַב (Isa. lx. 10 = עָרַב), which elsewhere is = εὐδοκία, χάρις κ.τ.λ.; Gen. xix. 19; Num. xi. 15 = עָרַב, which is usually rendered by χάρις. עָרַב = δικαιοσύνη, Gen. xx. 13, xxi. 23; Ex. xv. 13; ἐλεημοσύνη, Gen. xlvii. 29; Prov. iii. 3, xx. 28; οἰκτεῖρημα, Jer. xxxi. 3; χάρις, Esth. ii. 9; δόξα, Isa. xl. 7; ἐλπίς, 2 Chron. xxxv. 26. עָרַב, however, according to Fürst, probably means primarily “inclination,” and is “a specific term to designate the grace and mercy of God, especially towards His people Israel. . . . Thence it is applied to men, denoting their love and compassion towards each other by virtue of the sacred bond and covenant between them, and as a religious duty; as, for instance, between blood relations, superiors and inferiors, towards the unfortunate and the needy;” Hupfeld on Ps. iv. 4, *vid.* ὁσιος. (Ἑλεος is the god of pity, Apollod. ii. 8. 1, as distinct from δικαιοσύνη, towards the

poor and needy.) In the LXX. ἔλεος is the word used to denote God's bearing towards mankind or towards His people in the economy of salvation, and may be rendered *mercy*, *pity*, a feeling of sorrow (cf. Jer. xxxi. 20), as the case may be; opposed to κρίσις, Jas. ii. 13; Wisd. xii. 22; cf. ἔλεος = ὕψις, Isa. xlv. 8, ἀνατειλάτω ἡ γῆ καὶ βλαστησάτω ἔλεος. (There can be no more difference between ὕψις and ἔλεος than between condescending and merciful love.) Joined with διαθήκη, Ps. lxxxix. 29; Deut. vii. 9; cf. Ps. lxxxix. 50, cxxx. 7, xvii. 7, xxv. 6, 7; Isa. lxiii. 7; 1 Sam. xv. 6, xx. 8.—Isa. lvi. 1, ἡγγικε τὸ σωτήριόν μου παραγίνεσθαι καὶ τὸ ἑλεός μου ἀποκαλυφθῆναι = ἡγγικε.—In this sense, viz. as an appropriate word for God's merciful economy which meets the wants of human woe, we find it in Luke i. 54, ἀντελάβετο Ἰσραὴλ παιδὸς αὐτοῦ, μνησθῆναι ἐλέους, καθὼς ἐλάλησεν κ.τ.λ.; cf. Ps. xxv. 6.—Luke i. 50, 58, 72, 78; Rom. ix. 23, ἵνα γνωρίσῃ τὸν πλοῦτον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ σκεύη ἐλέους, ἃ προητοίμασεν εἰς δόξαν; xi. 31, τὸ ὑμέτερον ἔλεος, where God's gracious dealings are regarded as tending to the salvation of mankind, cf. Isa. lv. 3.—Rom. xv. 9, cf. ver. 8; 1 Pet. i. 3; Jude 21; 2 Tim. i. 16, 18. Joined with ἀγάπη, Eph. ii. 4 (cf. Isa. lx. 10, διὰ ἔλεον ἡγάπησά σε), with μακροθυμία, 1 Tim. i. 16; χάρις, Heb. iv. 16; in the introductory greetings of the Epistles, χάρις ἔλεος εἰρήνη, 1 Tim. i. 2; 2 Tim. i. 2; 2 John 3; ἔλεος and εἰρήνη, Gal. vi. 16; Jude 2.—The N. T. expression, however, which strictly corresponds with the O. T. ὕψις, is χάρις,—a term more appropriate to N. T. views, because it gives prominence to the freeness and unconditionality of God's love, an element which appears only in the ἔλεος of Titus iii. 5, οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων τῶν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ ὧν ἐποιήσαμεν ἡμεῖς, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος ἔσωσεν ἡμᾶς.

Ἐλεέω, sometimes ἐλεάω, Rom. ix. 16, 18, Jude 22, to have pity, to be compassionate, τινὰ towards any one, to have compassion upon him; Matt. ix. 27, xv. 22, xvii. 15, xviii. 33, xx. 30, 31; Mark v. 19, x. 47, 48; Luke xvi. 24, xvii. 13, xviii. 38, 39; Phil. ii. 27; Rom. xii. 8; 1 Cor. vii. 25.—As ἔλεος denotes God's mercy as the principle and rule of the revelation of His grace, so ἐλεεῖν, when applied to God, means to have mercy upon any one, to make him a partaker of saving grace, Rom. ix. 15, 16; in ver. 18 opposed to σκληρύνειν. The passive aor. ἡλεήθην, perf. part. ἡλεημένος, designates the person to whom mercy is shown, who is favoured, and admitted to a state of grace; it is used of the company of the redeemed, 1 Pet. ii. 10; Rom. xi. 30–32; of individuals, 2 Cor. iv. 1; 1 Tim. i. 13, 16; Matt. v. 7. In Jude 22 the reference, in like manner, is to the appropriation of Messianic salvation. For this application of the term we have no O. T. precedent. LXX. = לָחַם, מָחַ, מָחַ. Isa. xlv. 23 parallel to λυτροῦν, δοξασθῆναι.

Ἀνέλεος, unmerciful; a form unknown in classical Greek, adopted by Lachm. and Tisch. in Jas. ii. 13, ἡ γὰρ κρίσις ἀνέλεος τῷ μὴ ποιήσαντι ἔλεος κατακαυχᾶται ἔλεος κρίσεως; Received text, ἀνίλεως; classical form, ἀνηλεής.

Ἐλεύθερος, α, ον, connected with ΕΛΕΥΘΩ, whence ἐλεύσομαι, fut. of ἔρχομαι, therefore, perhaps, capable of movement. Curtius, p. 436, says, "As to ἐλεύθερος, the old derivation παρὰ τὸ ἐλεύθειν ὅπου ἐρᾷ (Etym. M. 329, 44) seems thoroughly justified . . .

at the same time, the mark of the free German was to go where he chose; because, among the numerous records of emancipation among the Greeks, ἀποτρέχειν οἷς κα θέλη, as the Delphic dialect expresses it, was always an essential sign of liberty."—(I.) Absolutely, *free, unconstrained, unfettered, independent*, of one who is not dependent upon another; for the most part in a social and political sense, opposed to δοῦλος, whose will and power another directs; cf. John viii. 32, 33. So in 1 Cor. vii. 21, 22, xii. 13; Gal. iii. 28; Eph. vi. 8; Col. iii. 11; Rev. vi. 15, xiii. 16, xix. 18; 1 Cor. ix. 1; cf. ver. 19, ἐλεύθερος γὰρ ὢν ἐκ πάντων πᾶσιν ἐμάντων ἐδούλωσα, vv. 20–22. The social relationship serves, in Gal. iv. 22–31, to illustrate the difference between the Old and New Test. economy (ἐλευθέρα opposed to παιδίσκη). It is there shown how the partakers of N. T. grace are free from Mosaic restrictions and regulations (vid. νόμος); cf. ver. 26, ἡ δὲ ἄνω Ἱερουσαλήμ ἐλευθέρα ἐστίν, opposed to ver. 25, δουλεύει κ.τ.λ.; cf. ver. 21, ὑπὸ νόμον εἶναι. Still the connection shows that another element is taken into account in contrasting O. T. bondage with N. T. freedom, viz. the κατὰ σάρκα γεννηθῆναι—according to the traditions of human nature—as opposed to the διὰ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας γενν. of ver. 23. The εἰς δουλείαν γενν. of ver. 24 answers to the κατὰ σάρκα γενν. of ver. 23. As the contrasted elements named in ver. 23 are not repeated in vv. 25, 26, we may conclude that as, in the apostle's view, the conditions of human nature in its present state (σάρξ) correspond with the state of thralldom to the legal restrictions of life (δουλεία), so in the conception of freedom, as he here employs it, independence of the σάρξ as pertaining to the promise is blended with liberation from the law. Our Lord draws the same comparison between ἐλεύθερος and δοῦλος in John viii. 32–36 when explaining the design of His gracious operations. The antithesis to ver. 33, ἐλεύθεροι γενήσεσθε, and ver. 36, ἐὰν οὖν ὁ υἱὸς ὑμᾶς ἐλευθερώσῃ, ὅτως ἐλεύθεροι ἔσεσθε, is not only δοῦλος τῆς ἁμαρτίας, ver. 34, so that that moral aspect only of freedom is insisted upon which is referred to in Xen. Mem. iv. 5. 2 sqq., ὅστις οὖν ἄρχεται ὑπὸ τῶν διὰ τοῦ σώματος ἡδονῶν καὶ διὰ ταύτας μὴ δύναται πράττειν τὰ βέλτιστα, νομίζει τοῦτον ἐλεύθερον εἶναι; ἦκιστα, ἔφη. Ἴσως γὰρ ἐλεύθερον φαίνεται σοι τὸ πράττειν τὰ βέλτιστα; it is the position designated by the word δοῦλος generally, which implies subjection to some foreign power, so that the individual is not his own master, see ver. 35. Man is in this bondage because he is δοῦλος τῆς ἁμαρτίας, vv. 34, 35; i.e. he is fettered in the possession and ordering of his own life, which cannot freely develope itself, which he cannot freely enjoy, because of the disturbing power of sin. Hence ἐλευθεροῦν, ἐλευθερός answer to what is afterwards called ἀπολυτροῦν. As to the range of its meaning, see ἐλευθερία. The word also denotes *independence of outward restraint*, and the *right to direct and govern oneself* (cf. Diog. Laert. vii. 121, ἐλευθερία . . . ἐξουσία αὐτοπραγίας; Plato, Deff. 415 A, ἐλεύθερον τὸ ἄρχον αὐτοῦ; 412 D, ἐλευθερία ἡγεμονία βλόν· αὐτοκράτεια ἐπὶ παντί· ἐξουσία τοῦ καθ' ἑαυτὸν ἐν βίῳ ἀφειδία ἐν χρήσει καὶ ἐν κτήσει οὐσίας), as belonging distinctively to the Christian state, wherein man is delivered from every hostile power; see 1 Pet. ii. 16 (ὑποτάγητε κ.τ.λ.), ὡς ἐλεύθεροι, καὶ μὴ ὡς ἐπικάλυμμα ἔχοντες τῆς κακίας τὴν ἐλευθερίαν, ἀλλ' ὡς θεοῦ δοῦλοι; cf. 2 Pet. ii. 19; Gal. v. 13; 1 Cor. x. 29.

(II.) Relatively, free, separate from or independent of; with the genitive, *e.g.* ζημίας, φόβου, and other words. Instead of the simple genitive we have in Rom. vii. 3, ἐλ. ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου; 1 Cor. ix. 19, ἐκ πάντων. It is joined with the dative in Rom. vi. 20, ὅτε γὰρ δούλοι ἦτε τῆς ἁμαρτίας, ἐλεύθεροι ἦτε τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ, but this is never found in classical Greek; it may be best understood in the same manner as is the dative with ὑπήκοος, δούλος, the genitive denoting the objective relation of dependence, and the dative the moral relation of subjective surrender; cf. ver. 19, παρεστήσατε τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν δούλα τῇ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ, τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ, which alone expresses, and without any redundancy, the due relation of the antecedent to the consequent; *vid.* Krüger, § xlvii. 26. 2.—In Matt. xvii. 26, ἐλεύθεροί εἰσιν οἱ υἱοί, we must supply from the context κήνσου, or the like; cf. Dem. xxxv. 21, χρήματα ἐλεύθερα, *property free of encumbrance.*

Ἐλευθερία, ἡ, freedom, independence, in social and national life, opposed to δουλεία, the state of dependence; usually denoting the absence of all limitations to independent action, *to be lord and master of oneself*, ἐξουσία αὐτοπαρίας; 1 Cor. x. 29, ἡ ἐλευθερία μου — ἔξεστι, ver. 23. Freedom is a distinctive blessing of the economy of grace, which, in contrast with the O. T. economy, is represented as including independence of legal restrictions and rules of life, Gal. ii. 4, v. 1, 13; or, in contrast with the present subjection of the creature to the bondage of corruption, as the future state of the children of God, Rom. viii. 21, ἡ κτίσις ἐλευθερωθήσεται ἀπὸ τῆς δουλείας τῆς φθορᾶς (cf. ver. 20) εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης τῶν τέκνων τοῦ θεοῦ; cf. ver. 23, ἀπεκδεχόμενοι τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν. It further becomes manifest in παρρησία, and in ἐλπίς τῆς δόξης, 2 Cor. iii. 17; cf. vv. 12, 18 (cf. Lucian, *Piscat.* 17, ὦ Ἐλευθερία καὶ Παρρησία), as the Lord the Spirit removes the state described in ver. 14, ἐπωρώθη τὰ νοήματα αὐτῶν,—οὐ δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα κυρίου, ἐλευθερία. Whatever be the definite form it assumes in the varying relations of life, we must take Christian freedom (like ἀπολύτρωσις) to denote the one essential and comprehensive result of redemption, the correlative of life, see ζωή; for it is not only freedom from the consequences of sin, but (if we may use the expression) *it restores the man to himself*, makes him his own master, independent of every power alien to his higher nature,—of sin in all its forms and consequences,—and guarantees for him unhindered possession and unfettered action of his life in a manner conformable to his real self. Accordingly, Jas. i. 25, νόμος τέλειος ὁ τῆς ἐλευθερίας; ii. 12, οὕτως ποιεῖτε ὡς διὰ νόμου ἐλευθερίας μέλλοντες κρίνεσθαι, because Christianity puts the man's free act in the place of the act legally enforced, the man's independent decision in lieu of the legal necessity. Ἐλευθερία is free and true independence, as distinct from that fettered arbitrariness which is only an apparent freedom; 2 Pet. ii. 19, ἐλευθερίαν ἐπαγγελλόμενοι, αὐτοὶ δούλοι ὑπάρχοντες τῆς φθορᾶς. Hence the exhortations in Gal. v. 13; 1 Pet. ii. 16.

Ἐλευθερόω, to make free, to liberate, τοὺς δούλους, Thuc. viii. 15; John viii. 32, 36; Rom. viii. 21; Gal. v. 1 = *to save from thralldom*, a positive expression for

λυτροῦν, ἀπολυτροῦν. *Vid.* ἐλεύθερος, ἐλευθερία. Rom. vi. 18, 22, ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας; viii. 2, ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου τῆς ἁμαρτίας καὶ τοῦ θανάτου.

Ἄπελεύθερος, emancipated,—1 Cor. vii. 22, ὁ γὰρ ἐν κυρίῳ κληθεὶς δοῦλος ἀπελεύθερος κυρίου ἐστίν,—because the dependence which the earthly relation may involve does not really exist in the new sphere into which the calling introduces, Philem. 16; 1 Tim. vi. 2; or because the state of servitude in which the slave is, ceases to be a state of oppressive dependence through the gift of a higher independence; *vid.* ἐλευθερία.

Ἐλπίς, ἴδος, ἡ, hope, *i.e.* expectation of something future, and, indeed, προσδοκία ἀγαθοῦ, Plat. *Deff.* 416; from ἔλπω, ἔλπομαι, which is the middle = *to imagine or expect something of the future*, also of *anxious expectation*, *e.g.* Herod. vi. 109. 3, ix. 113, ἐλπί-μενος δὲ τί οἱ κακὸν εἶναι. Thucyd. uses ἐλπίζω more frequently indefinitely as = *to expect*, yet not of arbitrary, but always of well-grounded expectation. Thuc. vii. 61, ἡ τῶν μελλόντων κακῶν ἐλπίς; Plat. *Rep.* i. 330 E, ζῆ μετὰ κακῆς ἐλπίδος, *Legg.* i. 644 C, πρὸς δὲ τούτοις ἀμφοῖν αὐτῶν δόξας μελλόντων οἷν κοινὸν μὲν ὄνομα ἐλπίς ἴδιον δὲ φόβος μὲν ἡ πρὸ λύπης ἐλπίς, θάρρος δὲ ἡ πρὸ τοῦ ἐναντίου. The word, indeed, includes the idea of some future and wished-for good as the object of aspiration, together with the probability that this hoped-for good will be realized; but it is nevertheless observable that here the distinctive idea of *hope* is absent from the word, and that just in later Greek, when in the sphere of Christianity hope became so strong and clear an element, ἐλπίς occurs frequently no longer in the undefined sense of *expectation*, but as signifying *anxiety* and *fear*,—a meaning which there is no trace of in the LXX. nor in the N. T. Thus, already Eurip. *Or. προσῆλθεν ἐλπίς*, ἣν φοβουμένη κ.τ.λ.; Thuc. vii. 61; Lucian, *Tyran.* 3. So ἐλπίζω = *to fear*, see below. Acts xxvii. 20, περιηρεῖτο ἐλπίς πᾶσα τοῦ σώζεσθαι ἡμᾶς; Acts xvi. 19, ἐξῆλθεν ἡ ἐλπίς τῆς ἐργασίας αὐτῶν; Rom. viii. 24, 25, ἐλπίς δὲ βλεπομένη οὐκ ἔστιν ἐλπίς· εἰ δὲ δὲ οὐ βλέπομεν ἐλπίζομεν, δι' ὑπομονῆς ἀπεκδεχόμεθα. Hope, accordingly, is a prospect, gladly and firmly held as a well-grounded expectation of a future good; 2 Cor. x. 15; Phil. i. 20; 1 Cor. ix. 10. See the collection of sayings in Stobaeus, *Florilegium*, 110, where hope is described as the tendency of the desires (peculiar to man) towards the future, and towards some good, supposed or real, but at present hidden. Thus, for example, ἐλπίς βροτοῖς κάκιστον, ἡ πολλὰς πόλεις συνῆψ', ἄγουσα θυμὸν εἰς ὑπερβολάς (Eurip. *Suppl.* 479); ἄνθρωπος ἀτυχῶν σώζεθ' ὑπὸ τῆς ἐλπίδος (Menand.); ἐν ἐλπίσι χρῆ τοὺς σοφοὺς ἔχειν βίον (Eurip.); ἐλπίς γὰρ ἡ βόσκουσα τοὺς πολλοὺς βροτῶν, and others. Comp. Eccles. ix. 4. We must distinguish between hope in a subjective and hope in an objective sense.

(I.) Subjective: a dearly cherished and apparently well-grounded (or supposed to be well-grounded) expectation and prospect of some desired good, Acts xxvii. 20, xvi. 19; 2 Cor. x. 15; Phil. i. 20; expectations generally, wherewith a man shapes the future in his favour, 1 Cor. ix. 10, ὀφείλει ἐπ' ἐλπίδι ὁ ἀροτριῶν ἀροτριᾶν, καὶ ὁ ἀλοῶν ἐπ' ἐλπίδι τοῦ μετέχειν; Rom. iv. 18, παρ' ἐλπίδα ἐπ' ἐλπίδι ἐπίστευσεν, where ἐλπίς is to be taken

both times in a subjective sense, not in an objective sense first, cf. Plat. *Alc.* i. 105 A, ἐπὶ τίνι ἐλπίδι ζῆς; Soph. *Ant.* 392, ἡ ἐκτὸς καὶ παρ' ἐλπίδας χαρά. In the N. T. hope is described as the distinguishing blessing of those who are within the range of God's economy of grace; Eph. ii. 12, ποτὲ ὑμεῖς τὰ ἔθνη ἐν σαρκὶ . . . ἐλπίδα μὴ ἔχοντες; 1 Thess. iv. 13, οἱ λοιποὶ οἱ μὴ ἔχοντες ἐλπίδα; for, as the reasonable expectation of a future good, i.e. as the prospect of the future revelation of final salvation, it can spring only from the promises of salvation, which give reason and form to the wishes of men, and concentrate their shaken and scattered longings upon one firm and certain point. For this connection of hope with the promises of salvation, cf. Acts xxvi. 6, ἐπ' ἐλπίδι τῆς εἰς τοὺς πατέρας ἐπαγγελίας γενομένης ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ; Rom. xv. 4, ἵνα διὰ τῆς ὑπομονῆς καὶ τῆς παρακλήσεως τῶν γραφῶν τὴν ἐλπίδα ἔχωμεν. (Sophocles, on the contrary, calls prophecy conversely the child of hope, *Oed. R.* 157, εἰπέ μοι, ὦ χρυσέας τέκνον Ἑλπίδος, ἄμβροτε Φάμα.) Hence it is that in the O. T. ὑπομονή is used more frequently than ἐλπίς; and the tone of language in the LXX. clearly shows that hope in this sense possesses a psychological definiteness,—the certainty and clearness of its goal, as well as a definiteness of object,—which all hope apart from Scripture was destitute of. The distinctive O. T. word for hope is נִחְּוָה, נִחְּוָה, נִחְּוָה. To this corresponds ὑπομένειν, ὑπομονή, Ps. xxvii. 14, xxvii. 34, xxv. 5; Jer. xiv. 19; Ps. lxxi. 5. Jehovah, i.e. the God of promise, is the ὑπομονή Ἰσραήλ, Jer. xiv. 8, xvii. 13. נִחְּוָה, on the contrary, is fitly rendered by ἐλπίς, Job v. 16, vi. 8, εἰ γὰρ τὴν ἐλπίδα μου δώῃ ὁ κύριος; xiv. 7, ἔστι γὰρ δένδρῳ ἐλπίς; vii. 6, ὁ βίός μου ἐπόλωλε ἐν κενῇ ἐλπίδι = נִחְּוָה נִחְּוָה. For the import of hope in Jewish life, see Jer. xxix. 11, נִחְּוָה נִחְּוָה נִחְּוָה נִחְּוָה, LXX. τοῦ δοῦναι ὑμῖν ταῦτα; Zech. ix. 12, נִחְּוָה נִחְּוָה. Elsewhere ἐλπίς, ἐλπίζειν = נִחְּוָה, נִחְּוָה, side by side with πεποιθέναι. Ps. xl. 5, lxxv. 6, lxxi. 5; Jer. xvii. 7, εὐλογημένος ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὃς πέποιθεν ἐπὶ τῷ κυρίῳ καὶ ἔσται κύριος ἐλπίς αὐτοῦ. The world-embracing fulness of hope which the N. T. unfolds is unknown beyond its sphere, inasmuch as the promises and operations of grace are unknown (Eph. ii. 12, ξένοι τῶν διαθηκῶν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, ἐλπίδα μὴ ἔχοντες; Matt. xii. 21, τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ ἔθνη ἐλπιούσιν), and because that hope reasonably expects the removal of all the evils of life, and is an assurance of final salvation, including even death in its reckoning, which cannot fail, Rom. v. 5, ἡ δὲ ἐλπίς οὐ κατασχύνει. With this cf. 1 Pet. iii. 15, ἔτοιμοι ᾗ πρὸς ἀπολογίαν παντὶ τῷ αἰτοῦντι ὑμᾶς λόγον περὶ τῆς ἐν ὑμῖν ἐλπίδος. Accordingly, God is ὁ θεὸς τῆς ἐλπίδος, Rom. xv. 13. The promises of the O. T. involve the facts of the N. T., and in particular, the resurrection of Christ as the beginning of their fulfilment (1 Cor. xv. 20; Col. i. 18; Acts xxvi. 23), and herein afford a new ground of hope, cf. Acts xxiii. 6; 1 Pet. i. 3, ὁ . . . ἀναγεννήσας ἡμᾶς εἰς ἐλπίδα ζωῆς δι' ἀναστάσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκ νεκρῶν, ver. 21. (Cf. Wisd. iii. 4.) The better hope (Heb. vii. 19) guaranteed by the kingly high-priesthood of Christ is "better," not only in the subject-matter of it, but in its psychological definiteness also; and the κρείττων must be explained by comparison with the preceding οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐτελείωσεν ὁ νόμος. The object of hope is σωτηρία, 1 Thess. v. 8, cf. Rom. viii. 24; ζωὴ αἰώνιος, Tit. i. 2, iii. 7; ἡ δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ, Rom. v. 2,

cf. Col. i. 27; ἀνάστασις τῶν νεκρῶν, Acts xxiv. 15, xxiii. 6,—and therefore the full realization of salvation in all its bearings, cf. 1 John iii. 2, 3; 2 Cor. iii. 12, 18. Hence the prominence given to hope as outweighing tribulation, Rom. v. 3, 4, ἡ θλίψις ὑπομονὴν κατεργάζεται, ἡ δὲ ὑπομονὴ δοκιμὴν, ἡ δὲ δοκιμὴ ἐλπίδα; Rom. xii. 12, τῇ ἐλπίδι χαίροντες, τῇ θλίψει ὑπομένοντες; 1 Thess. i. 3, ἡ ὑπομονὴ τῆς ἐλπίδος. It thus embraces the entire sphere over which the results of sin have spread, Rom. viii. 20, τῇ ματαιότητι ἡ κτίσις ὑπετάγη, οὐχ ἐκούσα, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ὑποτάξαντα ἐπ' ἐλπίδι, cf. vv. 19, 21. N. T. hope, in a word, includes the prospect of a state wherein all needs shall be supplied, all wants satisfied, all the hindrances of life and results of sin removed, raising upon the basis of trusted Scripture promise and the facts of redemption a future full of bliss, in contrast with the unsatisfying present. Cf. Jer. xxix. 11; Rom. viii. 24, τῇ ἐλπίδι ἐσώθημεν; Acts ii. 26, ἡ σὰρξ μου κατασκηνώσει ἐπ' ἐλπίδι, cf. ver. 27. Like salvation itself, it is *moral* in its nature, cf. Prov. xxviii. 7, ἐλπίς δὲ ἀσεβῶν ἀπολείται, consequently we find it closely connected with δικαιωθῆναι, δικαιοσύνη, Rom. v. 1 sqq.; Gal. v. 5, ἡμεῖς γὰρ πνεύματι ἐκ πίστεως ἐλπίδα δικαιοσύνης ἀπεκδεχόμεθα, where δικ. must be taken as the subjective genitive, and not as the genitive of the object; for this latter would not be in keeping with the Pauline doctrine, according to which righteousness, as the privilege and state of the believer, is already present, cf. 2 Tim. iv. 8; Gal. ii. 17; Rom. v. 1 sqq. Thus rendered, ver. 5 stands in striking contrast with ver. 4, *we wait in faith*—wherein we are justified—for the hope which righteousness has. Cf. Phil. iii. 9; Bengel, "*Justitia jam est praesens eaque nobis spem in reliquum praebet*, Rom. iv. 4, 5." Rom. v. 19, δίκαιοι καταστήσονται οἱ πολλοί, cannot be referred to as sanctioning the taking δικ. as the genitive of the object, because (comp. ver. 21) the future there refers, not to the final judgment, but to a fact which is not yet ended, but is continually being realized, cf. iii. 22, εἰς πάντας καὶ ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς πιστεύοντας. *Vid.* Krüger, § liii. 10. 4. This moral character of hope, however, exercises a moral influence upon the subject of it, 1 John iii. 3, πᾶς ὁ ἔχων τὴν ἐλπίδα ταύτην ἐπ' αὐτῷ ἀγνίζει ἑαυτόν. Cf. 2 Cor. iii. 12 with ver. 9. It is a necessary element in the Christian character, 1 Cor. xiii. 13, 1 Thess. i. 3, v. 8, and is the fruit of the faith which lays hold of the promises and facts of redemption, and appropriates them, cf. Rom. xv. 13, ὁ δὲ θεὸς τῆς ἐλπίδος πληρῶσαι ὑμᾶς πάσης χαρᾶς καὶ εἰρήνης ἐν τῷ πιστεύειν, εἰς τὸ περισσεύειν ὑμᾶς ἐν τῇ ἐλπίδι ἐν δυνάμει πνεύματος ἁγίου. Accordingly, faith is ἐλπιζομένων ὑπόστασις, Heb. xi. 1. It differs from hope just as the present possession of grace differs from its future accomplishment. Hope is the necessary safeguard of faith amid the contradictions of this present life, "the high courage that abides firm in every attack" (Luther); hence Heb. iii. 6, ἐὰν τὴν παρρησίαν καὶ τὸ καύχημα τῆς ἐλπίδος κατασχῶμεν; cf. vii. 19; 2 Cor. iii. 12; Heb. vi. 11, ἐνδείκνυσθαι σπουδὴν πρὸς τὴν πληροφορίαν τῆς ἐλπίδος ἄχρι τέλους; x. 23, κατέχωμεν τὴν ὁμολογίαν τῆς ἐλπίδος ἀκλινῇ. (It is no contradiction of this to say that hope may be objectively an incentive to faith, Col. i. 5.) The bearing of the hoping subject is expressed by ἐλπίζειν, ἀπεκδέχεσθαι, ἐκδέχεσθαι, ἐπιζητεῖν, ὀρέγεσθαι, ἀποβλέπειν, ὑπομένειν.

(II.) Objective, the expected good, that for which we hope. Thus in Acts xxviii. 20, ἡ ἐλπίς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ; Eph. i. 18, εἰς τὸ εἰδέναι ὑμᾶς τίς ἔστιν ἡ ἐλπίς τῆς κλήσεως αὐτοῦ; iv. 4, ἐκλήθητε ἐν μιᾷ ἐλπίδι τῆς κλήσεως ὑμῶν; Col. i. 5, ἡ ἐλπίς ἡ ἀποκειμένη ὑμῖν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς,—in which sense hope is the motive for the Christian's walk in faith and love. Col. i. 23, ἡ ἐλπίς τοῦ εὐαγγελίου; Titus ii. 13; Heb. vi. 18; Rom. viii. 24; Gal. v. 5. In keeping with this, that upon which one fixes his hope, for which we hope, is called ἐλπίς, e.g. children are ἡ γονέων ἐλπίς. Thuc. iii. 57, ὑμεῖς, ὦ Λακεδαιμόνιοι, ἡ μόνη ἐλπίς. Christ also is ἡ ἐλπίς τῆς δόξης, Col. i. 27; cf. 1 Tim. i. 1; 1 Thess. ii. 19, τίς γὰρ ἡμῶν ἐλπίς; Cf. Zöckler, *De vi ac notione vocabuli ἐλπίς in N. T.* (Giessen 1856).

Ἑλπίζω, fut. ἐλπιδῶ, Matt. xii. 21, from Isa. xlii. 4; Rom. xv. 12, from Isa. xi. 10. Perf. ἤλπικα = to expect, to hope; in the Scripture sense = δι' ὑπομονῆς ἀπεκδέχεσθαι, Rom. viii. 25 (see under ἐλπίς. Also = to fear, e.g. Soph. *Ajax*. 799; Plato, *Rep.* viii. 572 E; Herod. viii. 12; Herodian, viii. 8. 3; Eurip. *Ion*. 348).—(I.) With a statement of the object, i.e. the blessing, which is not present to the subject, but longed for and expected with fancied or real probability = to hope for anything. Rom. viii. 24, 25, δὲ γὰρ βλέπει τις, τί καὶ ἐλπίζει; εἰ δὲ δὲ οὐ βλέπομεν, ἐλπίζομεν, δι' ὑπομονῆς ἀπεκδεχόμεθα. Cf. 1 Thess. i. 3, ἡ ὑπομονὴ τῆς ἐλπίδος; 1 Cor. xiii. 7, ἡ ἀγάπη πάντα ἐλπίζει,—charity hopes of and for others all that can be the subject-matter of hope; cf. Phil. i. 6; 2 Cor. ii. 7, etc.; 2 Cor. viii. 5. With the infinitive following, Luke vi. 34, xxiii. 8; Acts xxvi. 7; Rom. xv. 24; 1 Cor. xvi. 7; 2 Cor. v. 11; Phil. ii. 19, 23; 1 Tim. iii. 14; 2 John 12; 3 John 14. With ὅτι following, Luke xxiv. 21; Acts xxiv. 26; 2 Cor. i. 10, 13, xiii. 6; Philem. 22. The part. pass. τὰ ἐλπιζόμενα, Heb. xi. 1, denotes the blessings hereafter to be revealed, so far as the Christian puts himself in relation with them.

(II.) Without object = to set one's hope upon something, i.e. the hope of future good fortune, 1 Tim. vi. 17, ἡλπικέναι ἐπὶ πλούτου ἀδηλότητι. Thus very rarely in classical Greek; mostly in biblical and ecclesiastical Greek only, and to denote the hope of salvation, *vid.* ἐλπίς (cf. Luke xxiv. 21; Acts xxvi. 7; Rom. viii. 24, 25). So in John v. 45, ἔστιν ὁ κατηγορῶν ὑμῶν, Μωϋσῆς, εἰς ὃν ὑμεῖς ἠλπίκατε. With εἰς, in 1 Pet. iii. 5; 2 Cor. i. 10 (cf. Ps. cxlv. 15; Isa. li. 5). With ἐν, 1 Cor. xv. 19, ἐν Χριστῷ ἠλπικότες (cf. Phil. ii. 19; 2 Kings xviii. 5; Ps. xxvii. 3). With the dative simply, Matt. xii. 21, τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ ἔθνη ἐλπιούσιν, from Isa. xlii. 4. (Cf. Thuc. iii. 97, ἐλπίσας τῇ τυχῇ.) Oftener with ἐπὶ followed by the dative or accusative. The latter in 1 Pet. i. 13, τελείως ἐλπίσατε ἐπὶ τὴν φερομένην ὑμῖν χάριν ἐν ἀποκαλύψει Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (iii. 5); 1 Tim. v. 5, ἠλπικεν ἐπὶ τὸν θεόν, καὶ προσμένει ταῖς δεήσεσιν κ.τ.λ. With the dative, Rom. xv. 12, ἐπ' αὐτῷ ἔθνη ἐλπιούσιν (from Isa. xi. 10 = יְהוָה בְּיָמָיו); 1 Tim. iv. 10, ἠλπίκαμεν ἐπὶ θεῷ ζῶντι, ὅς ἐστιν σωτὴρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων, μάλιστα πιστῶν. Here σωτηρία, in its fullest extent, is the object of the hope. The frequent use of the perfect in this sense is worthy of notice. In the LXX. the compound verb ἐπελπίζειν occurs, 2 Kings xviii. 30;

Ps. lii. 7, cxix. 43, 49, 81. In the N. T. προελπίζειν, Eph. i. 12 (distinguishing Israel from the believing Gentiles).

Ἔργον, τό, work, performance, the result or object of employment, making, or working ("The word had originally the digamma, and hence appears its identity with the German *Werk* and the English *work*," Passow, *Wörterb.*; Old High German *uuerah*, from *uueran*, "to make, to do," cf. Curtius, p. 165). As against βουλή, Acts v. 38, cf. Hom. *Il.* ix. 374; λόγος and the like, 2 Cor. x. 11, οἳ οἱ ἐσμεν τῷ λόγῳ δι' ἐπιστολῶν ἀπόντες, τοιοῦτοι καὶ παρόντες τῷ ἔργῳ,—a frequent antithesis admitting of various shades of contrast; Matt. xxiii. 3; 1 John iii. 18; Herod. iii. 135, ταῦτα εἶπε καὶ ἅμα ἔπος τε καὶ ἔργον ἐποίεε; Titus i. 16, θεὸν ὁμολογοῦσιν εἰδέναι, τοῖς δὲ ἔργοις ἀρνοῦνται; i.e. profession and practice, saying and doing, do not correspond; Eurip. *Alc.* 340, λόγῳ ἦσαν οὐκ ἔργῳ φίλοι. Thus we understand 2 Thess. ii. 17, ὁ θεὸς . . . παρακαλέσει ὑμῶν τὰς καρδίας καὶ στηρίξει ἐν παντὶ ἔργῳ καὶ λόγῳ ἀγαθῷ, i.e. Christian profession and practice in their due connection with each other. On the other hand, Col. iii. 17, πᾶν ὃ τι ἂν ποιήτε ἐν λόγῳ ἢ ἐν ἔργῳ, πάντα ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, seems, according to the context, to be more appropriately explained by the analogy of Matt. xii. 36, 37. The same connection or antithesis we find in Luke xxiv. 19; Acts vii. 22. Cf. λόγος εἰδωλῶν ἔργων, λόγος σκιά ἔργων, M. Neander, *Gnomol.* 1, in Düsterdieck on 1 John iii. 18.—Ἔργον denotes (according to the connection) *that work which each one has to do*, as in Mark xiii. 34, δούς ἐκάστῳ τὸ ἔργον αὐτοῦ, or *that which each is doing or has done*. The uses of the word, especially in the N. T., may be classified as follows:—

I. (a.) Work as a single performance. Matt. xxvi. 10, ἔργον καλὸν εἰργάσατο εἰς ἐμέ; Mark xiv. 6; John vii. 21, x. 32, 33; 1 Cor. v. 2. Especially in the plural, τὰ ἔργα, e.g. τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, Matt. xi. 2; and in the Gospel of St. John, of Christ's miracles, John v. 20, 36, vii. 3, x. 25, 32, 38, xiv. 10, 11, 12, xv. 24; ἔργα τοῦ θεοῦ, what God has brought to pass, created or done, Heb. iii. 9, iv. 4, 10, i. 10; cf. Rev. ix. 20; Acts vii. 41; John vi. 28, τι ποιῶμεν ἵνα ἐργαζώμεθα τὰ ἔργα τοῦ θεοῦ. Here τ. θεοῦ is the *gen. qualitatis* = *works such as God does*, like ἔργα ἀνδρῶν, γυναικῶν = *men's work, women's work*. On the other hand, ver. 29, τὸ ἔργον τοῦ θεοῦ = *what God requires to have done*. The question in ver. 28 implies a misapprehension of Christ's words, which He corrects in ver. 29. Regarding τὰ ἔργα τοῦ πατρός μου, whereby Christ describes His own works (John x. 37, cf. ix. 3, 4), Leyser observes, "*Non solum similia et aequalia, sed eadem cum patre*;" cf. xiv. 10, ὁ δὲ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοὶ μένων ποιεῖ τὰ ἔργα αὐτός; v. 36, τὰ ἔργα ἃ ἔδωκέ μοι ὁ πατὴρ ἵνα τελειώσω αὐτά.—More particularly, (b.) τὰ ἔργα is used to denote the *sum of those acts and performances wherein one and the same moral individuality is embodied*, cf. 1 Pet. ii. 12, τὰ καλὰ ἔργα with ἀναστροφή καλή; Matt. xxiii. 3, 5, πάντα δὲ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν ποιῶσιν πρὸς τὸ θεαθῆναι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις; John iii. 20, 21, ἵνα φανερωθῇ αὐτοῦ τὰ ἔργα, ὅτι ἐν θεῷ ἐστὶν εἰργασμένα; viii. 39, τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Ἀβραάμ; ver. 41; Luke xi. 48; Jas. iii. 13. In classical Greek some adjunct is always required, such as σχέτλια

(Hesiod); *κακά, καλά, ἀγαθά*, especially Xen., also Plat., Soph., and others. So also in the N. T. *καλά*, Matt. v. 16; 1 Tim. v. 10, 25, vi. 18; Titus ii. 7, 14, iii. 8, 14; Heb. x. 24; 1 Pet. ii. 12; *ἀγαθά*, Acts ix. 36; Rom. xiii. 3; Eph. ii. 10; Col. i. 10; 1 Tim. ii. 10, v. 10; 2 Tim. ii. 21, iii. 17; Titus i. 16, iii. 1; Heb. xiii. 21; 2 Cor. ix. 8; *ἔργα τὰ ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ ἃ ἐποιήσαμεν*, Titus iii. 5; *πονηρά*, John iii. 19; Col. i. 21; 1 John iii. 12; 2 John 11; *ἄνομα*, 2 Pet. ii. 8; *νεκρά*, Heb. ix. 14, vi. 1. With a genitive, *τὰ ἔ. τῆς σαρκός*, Gal. v. 19, opposed to *ὁ καρπὸς τοῦ πνεύματος*, ver. 22; *ἀσεβείας*, Jude 15; *τοῦ σκότους*, Rom. xiii. 12, v. 11; *μετανοίας ἔργα*, Acts xxvi. 20; *τὰ ἔργα τοῦ νόμου* = *works answering to the law which enjoins them*, Rom. iii. 20, 28, ix. 32; Gal. ii. 16, iii. 2, 5, 10. The law spoken of is a *νόμος τῶν ἔργων*, characterized by its demanding such observances, Rom. iii. 27, in contrast with *νόμος πίστεως*, *vid. νόμος*. These performances, corresponding with the law, are called in Titus iii. 5, *ἔργα τὰ ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ ἃ ἐποιήσαμεν*, cf. Rom. ii. 14, or simply *ἔργα*, performances which as such are after the pattern of the law, cf. Rom. iii. 27. So Rom. iv. 6, ix. 11, xi. 6; Eph. ii. 9; 2 Tim. i. 9. Over against these *performances*, which lay claim to merit and recognition, or bar any such claim, *grace* is represented as the principle of salvation, 2 Tim. i. 9; Rom. xi. 6, cf. iv. 4, ix. 6. This we find in the Pauline phraseology, in which those works to which Christians are called are designated not simply *ἔργα*, but *ἔργα ἀγαθά*, etc. But it is otherwise in the Epistle of James. There *ἔργα* generally denotes *acts in which the man proves what he is*; and the faith in virtue of which he assures himself of future safety (ii. 14) is to realize itself in action, by which it becomes what it is supposed to be, ii. 22, *ἐκ τῶν ἔργων ἡ πίστις ἐτελειώθη*, namely, the medium of present deliverance (ii. 25) and permanent salvation (ver. 23). Without such works faith does not exist, or ceases to exist, ii. 26, *ἡ πίστις χωρὶς τῶν ἔργων νεκρά ἐστίν*.—ii. 14, 20, 21, 24. The Pauline *ἔργα* differ from those St. James has in his eye, as *ἔργα νόμου* from the *ἔργα τῆς πίστεως*, cf. Heb. xi. St. James directly deals with a mistake concerning faith, which only loomed before St. Paul (Rom. vi.) as a dangerous possibility. St. James is not treating of the plan of salvation in its objective principles, vindicating it (as St. Paul in the Galatian Epistle) against opponents and doubters, or exhibiting it as in that to the Romans in its universal import; he has to correct a practical abuse of the plan of salvation already known.—Elsewhere *τὰ ἔργα* usually denotes comprehensively *what a man is and how he acts*, Rom. ii. 6, *ἀποδώσει ἐκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ*; 2 Cor. xi. 15; 2 Tim. iv. 14; 3 John 10; Rev. ii. 2, 5, 6 (ix. 13, not in Tisch.), xix. 22, 23, iii. 1, 2, 8, 15, xiv. 13, xvi. 11, xviii. 6, xx. 12, 13.—*τὰ ἔργα μου*, Rev. ii. 26, in Christ's mouth, are contrasted with *τὰ ἔργα τῆς Ἰεζάβελ*, ii. 22, works as they proceed from Jezebel.—(c.) Finally, *ἔργον* is also used to denote *any matter or thing, any object which one may have to do or attain*; e.g. Soph. *Tr.* 1147, *ἄκουε τοῦργον*; *Oed. T.* 847, *τοῦτ' ἐστὶ τοῦργον εἰς ἐμὲ ῥέπον*; Xen. *Cyr.* i. 4. 24. So in 2 Tim. iv. 18, *ῥύσεται με ὁ κύριος ἀπὸ παντὸς ἔργου πονηροῦ*. Perhaps also in 1 Tim. iii. 1, *εἴ τις ἐπισκοπῆς ὀρέγεται, καλοῦ ἔργου ἐπιθυμεῖ*, unless *ἔργον* here be taken to denote *a calling* (II. b.).

II. *The general object or result of doing and working*; an object or result whose attainment or realization is not accomplished by a single act, but by accumulated labour and continued work. Thus (a.) *that which is brought into being or accomplished by labour*, as, e.g., a statue or a treatise, 1 Cor. ix. 1, τὸ ἔργον μου ὑμεῖς ἐστὲ ἐν κυρίῳ, cf. Philem. 10; 1 Cor. iv. 15; Rom. xiv. 20, τὸ ἔργον τοῦ θεοῦ, cf. Acts xiii. 41; Phil. i. 6, ὁ ἐναρξάμενος ἐν ὑμῖν ἔργον ἀγαθόν; Heb. iv. 3, τὰ ἔργα, *the sum total of created things*. This meaning may be included under I. a., and admits of a plural; whereas, in the instances now to be given, it occurs only in the singular, viz. (b.) = *calling, occupation*, 1 Thess. v. 13; Acts xiv. 26, xiii. 2; 2 Tim. iv. 5, ἔργον εὐαγγελιστοῦ; Eph. iv. 12. So also in John iv. 34, ἵνα ποιῶ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πέμψαντός με καὶ τελειώσω αὐτοῦ τὸ ἔργον; xvii. 4, τὸ ἔργον ἐτελείωσα δ κ.τ.λ. By τὸ ἔργον τοῦ κυρίου, 1 Cor. xv. 58, xvi. 10, and the absolute τὸ ἔργον, Acts xv. 38, Phil. i. 22, ii. 30, is meant *labour enjoined by and done for Christ*, viz., the spreading of His gospel and the furthering of His church. Cf. ἔργον ἔχω τοῦτο σκοπεῖν, Xen. Mem. ii. 10. 6; ἱερεῦ, σὸν ἔργον, θύε τοῖς θεοῖς, Ar. Av. 862; Xen. Hell. iv. 4. 12, ἔδωκε γὰρ τότε γε ὁ θεὸς αὐτοῖς ἔργον οἶον οὐδ' εὐξαντό ποτ' ἄν.—(c.) In an ethical sense, of *moral conduct*, τὸ ἔργον, the sum of τὰ ἔργα, cf. 1 Pet. i. 17, κρίνειν κατὰ τὸ ἐκάστου ἔργον, with Rom. ii. 6, δς ἀποδώσει ἐκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ. So 1 Cor. iii. 13, cf. vv. 12, 14, 15; 1 Thess. i. 3, τὸ ἔργον τῆς πίστεως, as in 2 Thess. i. 11; Heb. vi. 10, οὐ γὰρ ἄδικος ὁ θεὸς ἐπιλαθέσθαι τοῦ ἔργου ὑμῶν; Gal. vi. 4; Jas. i. 4, 25; Rev. xxii. 12. So also Rom. ii. 15, τὸ ἔργον τοῦ νόμου, i.e. *all that the law demands*, cf. ver. 7, τοῖς καθ' ὑπομονὴν ἔργον ἀγαθοῦ. With a more active meaning, *efficiency, activity*, which some try to give the word in Rom. ii. 15, the usage of Aristotle certainly corresponds; with him ἔργον is not only = *opus*, but also = *opera et actio*; still it is against the N. T. usage, and especially the Pauline, apart from the γραπτὸν of the context, which by its form and import makes this meaning inadmissible. The exposition is preferable, though not very different, which takes τὸ ἔργον in this passage as the object of the law = *what the law is supposed to effect or realize*,—an explanation which is as much in keeping with the thought as with the context. Τὸ ἔργον, as well as τὰ ἔργα, in this ethical sense, seems to be unknown in classical Greek.

Ἐργάζομαι. Instead of the usual augment εἰ in this verb, Lachm. and Tisch. read in Acts xviii. 3, ἡργάζετο. Tisch. in Matt. xxv. 16, Mark xiv. 6, ἡργάσατο = *to prosecute, realize, or complete a work*.—(I.) Without object = *to be active, to labour, to do*, e.g. ἐν τῷ ἀμπελῶνι, Matt. xxi. 28; xxv. 16, ὁ τὰ πέντε τάλαντα λαβὼν εἰργάσατο ἐν αὐτοῖς, *did business with it, took trouble about it*, cf. e.g. Dem. xxxvi. 44, ἐν ἐμπορίῳ καὶ χρήμασιν ἐργ.; Ecclus. xxiv. 22.—Luke xiii. 14; John v. 17, ix. 4; 1 Cor. iv. 12, ix. 6; 1 Thess. ii. 9, iv. 11; 2 Thess. iii. 8, 10, 12; Acts xviii. 3. In Rom. iv. 4, 5, τῷ δὲ ἐργαζομένῳ ὁ μισθὸς οὐ λογίζεται κατὰ χάριν ἀλλὰ κατὰ ὀφείλημα· τῷ δὲ μὴ ἐργαζομένῳ, πιστεύοντι δὲ κ.τ.λ., St. Paul might certainly have meant the word according to ordinary usage, as = *to earn or merit for oneself*; but it would appear rather that he means the ideal object of

the ἐργάζεσθαι, viz. the ἔργα, in the sense in which they stand contrasted with πίστις and with χάρις, just as Luther renders it = *to busy oneself about works*. Cf. Xen. *Mem.* i. 2. 57, τοὺς μὲν ἀγαθὸν τι ποιοῦντας ἐργάζεσθαι ἔφη.—The object which the verb implies is repeated by ἔργον more explicitly (cf. Krüger, § xlvi. 5. 1) = *to prosecute a work*, Matt. xxvi. 10, ἔργον γὰρ καλὸν εἰργάσατο εἰς ἐμέ; Mark xiv. 6; John vi. 28, ix. 4; Acts xiii. 41; 1 Cor. xvi. 10, τὸ γὰρ ἔργον κυρίου ἐργάζεται.—(II.) With object = *to prosecute, do, accomplish something*, 2 Cor. vii. 10, μετάνοιαν; 2 Thess. iii. 11, μηδὲν ἐργ. ἀλλὰ περιεργάζεσθαι = *to do nothing, but attend to trifles*; Eph. iv. 28; Col. iii. 23; 2 John 8; John vi. 27, ἐργάζεσθαι μὴ τὴν βρώσιν κ.τ.λ. = *procure for yourselves food*, cf. χρήματα, ἀργύριον, βίον ἐργάζεσθαι; Rev. xviii. 17, ὅσοι τὴν θάλασσαν ἐργάζονται = *to labour upon the sea*, Plut., Dion. Hal., and others, of sailors and fishermen, like τὴν γῆν ἐργ. of agriculture; cf. 1 Cor. ix. 13, τὰ ἱερὰ ἐργ., of the temple service. Ἐργάζεσθαι τί τινι, εἰς τινα, πρὸς τινα = *to do to a person*, κακόν, ἀγαθόν, καλά, for which in classical Greek τινά τι. Rom. xiii. 10; 3 John 5; Gal. vi. 10. It occurs seldom with an ethical object in classical Greek, e.g. in Isocrates, ἐργ. ἀρετὴν, σωφροσύνην = *to practise*, as ἐργ. τέχνην, ἐπιστήμην. In the N. T. Matt. vii. 23, τὴν ἀνομίαν; Jas. ii. 9, ἀμαρτίαν; Acts x. 35, Heb. xi. 33, Jas. i. 20, δικαιοσύνην; Rom. ii. 10, τὸ ἀγαθόν, cf. Eph. iv. 28.—LXX. Ps. v. 6, xiv. 4, xxxv. 13, τὴν ἀνομίαν; Ps. xv. 2, δικαιοσύνην.—The perf. εἰργασμαι in a passive meaning, John iii. 21, as often in classical Greek.—Hence in the N. T. the compounds κατεργάζομαι, περιεργάζομαι, προσεργάζομαι.

Ἄργος, ἡ, ον, so since Aristotle, but in Attic Greek usually ο, ἡ; formed from ἀεργος (as to the accent, see Krüger, xlii. 9. 9).—(I.) *Active*, the opposite of ἐνεργός = *labourless, idle, inactive, unfruitful, unemployed*; Matt. xx. 3, 6; 1 Tim. v. 13; Titus i. 12, Κρήτες αἰεὶ ψεύσται, κακὰ θήρια, γαστέρες ἀργαί. Cf. Plato, *Rep.* ix. 572 E, ἔρωτά τινα αὐτῷ . . . ἐμποῦησαι, προστάτην τῶν ἀργῶν καὶ τὰ ἔτοιμα διανεμομένων ἐπιθυμῶν.—2 Pet. i. 8, οὐκ ἀργούς οὐδὲ ἀκάρπους καθίστησιν εἰς τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐπίγνωσιν. In this combination also in Plutarch, *Poplic.* 8, ἀργὸν χωρίον καὶ ἄκαρπον, as it often occurs joined with χωρίον, χώρα, γῆ, ἄγρος, to denote land lying fallow, in opposition to ἐνεργός; and then (II.) *passive* = *unwrought, neglected, undone*. The passive meaning is not, indeed, to be recognised in all the combinations cited as examples, because very often the active sense suits better, e.g. χρήματα ἀργά, of dead capital, bringing in no interest, opposed to ἐνεργά, which produces interest. Theophr. *Fr. 2 de Lap.* 27, ἀργὴ οὖσα ἢ σμάραγδος, οὐ λαμπρά. Still in other cases the passive meaning is certain, e.g. ἀργαὶ βίρσαι, *rough raw hides*; so also of unwrought metals. Further, compare Eurip. *Phoen.* 778, ἔν ἐστιν ἡμῖν ἀργόν, *one is still for us undone, remains to be done*. It is doubtful how the word is to be explained in Matt. xii. 36, πᾶν ῥῆμα ἀργὸν ὃ λαλήσουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι, ἀποδώσουσιν περὶ αὐτοῦ λόγον. Corresponding to Josephus, *Antt.* xv. 7 4, τὸν λόγον ἀργὸν εἶναι, *to leave the word unregarded*, it might here mean *unconsidered*; but apart from the absence of an analogous usage, this would agree as little with vv. 37, 34

as the other explanation, *idle, superfluous*, cf. Aristotle, *Pol.* viii. 12, τὸ διατρίβειν νῦν ἀκριβολογούμενους καὶ λέγοντας περὶ τῶν τοιούτων ἀργάν ἐστιν, as it often occurs in this connection and sense. If also in itself the thought in the necessary limitation contains a truth, still in this general and therefore rugged form it would agree neither with the analogous declarations of Scripture, much more precise and determined by the context, such as Eph. iv. 29, v. 4, Prov. xvii. 27, 28, xviii. 20, 21, Eccles. v. 1 sqq. (where in no case are meant merely idle, superfluous words, which may be either objectionable or unobjectionable), nor with the *κενοφωνίαι*, 1 Tim. vi. 20, 2 Tim. ii. 16, nor with the significance which generally, and especially in the context before us, is attributed to words as the expression of the attitude of the heart, cf. Rom. x. 9, 10. If ἀργός here must express a moral characteristic of the words, it is certainly in a very general way, answering to the progress of the discourse. That it is suitable for this, is clear from 2 Kings ii. 24, where the *Codex Alexandrinus* has the words, τέκνα παραβάσεως καὶ ἀργίας (with which nothing in the Hebrew text corresponds). Thus Symmachus translates, Lev. xix. 7, the Hebrew לִנְפֹשׁ, *res abominanda*, LXX. ἄθυτόν ἐστιν, οὐ δεχθήσεται, by ἀργόν; and though this deviates from the usage of classical Greek, it is still akin to the moral import of ἀργία, cf. the above cited passage of Plato, *Rep.* ix. 572 E. Ἀργία signifies both rest from labour and the good-for-nothing idleness subject to legitimate punishment, 2 Kings ii. 24, clearly = *worthlessness*. Thus also ἀργός in Wisd. xv. 16, οἱ πόδες αὐτῶν ἀργοὶ πρὸς ἐπίβασιν, means more than *idle*, it is = *good for nothing*. Thus taken in the passage before us, it affords a sense decidedly more accurate = *every worthless word*, than in the signification *idle, superfluous* (so in substance already Schleusner).

Ἀργέω, to be an ἀργός, to be idle, to do nothing; Ezra iv. 24, ἤργησε τὸ ἔργον = *to cease*; 2 Pet. ii. 3, οἷς τὸ κρίμα ἔκπαλαι οὐκ ἀργεῖ = *to be inactive, to rest*.

Καταργέω = ἀργὸν ποιεῖν; the preposition κατὰ gives to the intransitive ἀργεῖν a transitive meaning. In classical Greek very seldom; only two instances are given, Eurip. *Phoen.* 760, ἀλλ' εἰμ' ὅπως ἂν μὴ καταργῶμεν χέρα; Schol. ὅπως μὴ ἐμποδίζωμεν τὸ τῶν χειρῶν ἔργον, τουτέστιν τὸν πολεμόν; and Polyb. in Suidas, καταργηκέναι καὶ καταπρόεσθαι τοὺς καιροὺς, where it corresponds with ἀργός in its passive sense, *to leave unused*. In biblical Greek it occurs in the LXX. as = לָמַד, *to make to cease*, Ezra iv. 21, 23, v. 5, vi. 8; further, once in Luke xiii. 7, once in Heb. ii. 14, and often by Paul, who uses it very freely and with preference, and with whom it clearly signifies more than hindering, or cessation from outward activity, or to rest, as in Luke xiii. 7, ἵνατί τὴν γῆν καταργεῖ, where we must then resort to the use which by γῆ ἀργή denotes not unused, untilled, but unfruitful, land lying fallow, the opposite of ἐνεργός. In all other cases it signifies *to make to cease*, cf. Ezra iv. 21, καταργῆσαι τοὺς ἀνδρας ἐκείνους, καὶ ἡ πόλις ἐκείνη οὐκ οἰκοδομηθήσεται ἔτι. So ver. 23, v. 5, vi. 8; cf. iv. 24, τότε ἤργησε τὸ ἔργον . . . καὶ ἦν ἀργοῦν ἕως κ.τ.λ. Thus also in Rom. iii. 31, τὸν νόμον καταργεῖν, over against ἰστάναι, not *to make the law of none effect*, but *to abrogate, to make void, to do away with, to put an end to*,

cf. Eph. ii. 15, τὸν νόμον τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασιν καταργήσας; Rom. iii. 3, μὴ ἡ ἀπιστία αὐτῶν τὴν πίστιν τοῦ θεοῦ καταργήσῃ; With object of the thing again in 1 Cor. xiii. 11, κατήργηκα τὰ τοῦ νηπίου; xv. 24, ὅταν καταργήσῃ πᾶσαν ἀρχὴν καὶ πᾶσαν ἐξουσίαν καὶ δύναμιν; Gal. iii. 17, τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν; 2 Tim. ii. 10, τὸν θάνατον. Combined with a personal object, the intensive meaning which the word has specially for St. Paul comes out clearly, more intensive than, for instance, in the two other places in the N. T., Luke xiii. 7, Heb. ii. 14, ἵνα . . . καταργήσῃ τὸν τὸ κράτος ἔχοντα τοῦ θανάτου, as compared with 2 Thess. ii. 8, ὃν ὁ κύριος ἀναλώσει . . . καὶ καταργήσῃ κ.τ.λ.; 2 Tim. i. 10, καταργήσαντος μὲν τὸν θάνατον κ.τ.λ. We might suppose that St. Paul regarded the preposition as adding force to the conception (as in κατακόπτειν, κατακτείνειν, and others). With him it always denotes a complete, not a temporary or partial ceasing. Elsewhere it signifies a putting out of activity, out of power or effect; but with St. Paul it is = *to annihilate, to put an end to, to bring to nought*; 1 Cor. vi. 13, ὁ θεὸς τὴν κοιλίαν καὶ τὰ βρώματα καταργήσῃ; i. 28, ἐξελέξατο ὁ θεὸς τὰ μὴ ὄντα, ἵνα τὰ ὄντα καταργήσῃ. We cannot render the passive καταργεῖσθαι, especially where it has a personal subject, in a passive sense. Cf. Ezra vi. 8, ἐπιμελῶς δαπάνη ἔστω διδομένη τοῖς ἀνδρασιν ἐκείνοις τὸ μὴ καταργηθῆναι; Rom. vii. 2, ἡ γὰρ ὑπανδρος γυνὴ . . . κατήργηται ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου τοῦ ἀνδρός = has as such ceased, and is free from the law, cf. ver. 3, ἐλευθέρᾳ ἐστὶν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου; ver. 6, νυνὶ δὲ κατηργήθημεν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου ἀποθανόντος ἐν ᾧ κατειχόμεθα; Gal. v. 4, κατηργήθητε ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, τῆς χάριτος ἐξεπέσατε; 1 Cor. ii. 6, τῶν ἀρχόντων τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου τῶν καταργουμένων.—With a thing as subject, 1 Cor. xiii. 8, 10, synonym. with παύεσθαι; xv. 26, καταργεῖται ὁ θάνατος, cf. 2 Tim. i. 10; Gal. v. 11, κατήργηται τὸ σκάνδαλον; 2 Cor. iii. 7, 11, 13, 14.

Ἐνεργής, ἐς, like ἐνέργεια, ἐνεργεῖν, belonging only to later Greek; in Polyb. often = ἐνεργός, *engaged in work, capable of doing, active, powerful*, 1 Cor. xvi. 9; Philem. 6; Heb. iv. 12. Plut. Sol. 31, χώρα ἐνεργεστέρα, *fruitful land*. Ἐνεργής, ἐνέργεια, ἐνεργεῖν seem to have been used almost exclusively as medical terms, e.g. ἐνεργεῖν εἰς τὸν κόλπον, of medical treatment and the influence of medicine. Dioscorides, *de mater. med.* i. 2 C, τὰ τε γένη καὶ τὰς ἐνεργείας τῶν δυνάμεων; i. 18, δύναμιν ἔχει ἐνεργεστάτην. In the N. T. these words occur with a few exceptions (Heb. iv. 12; Matt. xiv. 2; Mark vi. 14; Jas. v. 16) in Pauline language only. In the O. T. comparatively seldom, and without any special peculiarity, ἐνεργεῖν, Prov. xxi. 6; Isa. xli. 4; Wisd. xv. 11, xvi. 17; ἐνέργεια, Wisd. vii. 17, 26, xiii. 4, xviii. 22; 2 Macc. iii. 29.

Ἐνέργεια, ἡ, *active power, energy*; not ability to do anything aptly, or power at rest, but *activity showing itself with vigour*, Col. i. 29. In Aristotle opposed to ἐξῆς; cf. *Eth.* ii. 5, ἔξεις δὲ λέγω, καθ' ὅς πρὸς τὰ πάθη ἔχομεν εὖ ἢ κακῶς. Dioscorides, *de mater. med.* i. 2 C, *vid.* ἐνεργής. In Pauline language ἐνέργεια is the word used to denote *the efficiency of divine power* in the economy of salvation, *vid.* δύναμις, e.g., in the administration of the apostle's office, Col. i. 29, Eph. iii. 7; in the resurrection of Christ, as this is connected

with the operations of grace in the individual, Col. ii. 12; Phil. iii. 21; Eph. i. 19, εἰς τὸ εἰδέναι ὑμᾶς . . . κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ κράτους τῆς ἰσχύος, where κράτος denotes the nature of the ἰσχύς. Again, in Eph. iv. 16, κατ' ἐνέργειαν . . . τὴν αὔξησιν τοῦ σώματος ποιείται; 2 Thess. ii. 11, ἐνέργεια πλάνης, εἰς τὸ πιστεῦσαι αὐτοὺς τῷ ψεύδει; ver. 9, οὐ ἐστὶν ἡ παρουσία κατ' ἐνέργειαν τοῦ σατανᾶ.

Ἑνεργέω, to be active and energetic, to effect, to prove oneself strong. Often in Polyb., e.g. xvii. 14. 8, πάντα κατὰ δύναμιν ἐνεργεῖν. In Aristot., of mental activity. In medical phraseology, of the influence of medicine. In the N. T. by St. Paul only, with the exception of Matt. xiv. 2, Mark vi. 14, ἐνεργοῦσιν αἱ δυνάμεις ἐν αὐτῷ; Jas. v. 16, δέησις δικαίου ἐνεργουμένη. The Pauline use of the verb may be divided into that of the active and that of the middle. (a.) The active is used of divine activity (cf. Isa. xli. 4), and power in the economy of salvation, God being always the subject; in Eph. i. 20, in reference to Christ's resurrection; in Gal. ii. 8, concerning the apostolic office; in Gal. iii. 5, 1 Cor. xii. 6, 11, concerning the special gifts of healing in the early church; Phil. ii. 13, with reference to God's spiritual working in the individual, ὁ ἐνεργῶν ἐν ὑμῖν καὶ τὸ θέλει καὶ τὸ ἐνεργεῖν, cf. Eph. i. 11, where ἐνεργεῖν is likewise the correlative of the will.—(b.) The middle = to prove oneself strong, to make oneself felt by energetic working, is always (except Phil. ii. 13) used by the apostle when he predicates it of other subjects. So in Rom. vii. 5, τὰ παθήματα ἐνεργεῖτο κ.τ.λ., 2 Cor. i. 6, iv. 12; Gal. v. 6; 1 Thess. ii. 13; 2 Thess. ii. 7; Col. i. 29; Eph. iii. 20.

Ἑνεργημα, τό, effect, energy, e.g. Diodor. iv. 51, τῶν δὲ ἐνεργημάτων ὑπὲρ τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην φύσιν φανέντων. In the N. T. 1 Cor. xii. 6, 10, of extraordinary gifts and manifestations, which were connected with the revelation and possession of the N. T. blessing within the church.

Ἑριθεία, ἡ, still by Schenkl derived from ἔρις, which, however, is not possible. It comes rather from ἔριθος, one who works for hire; in Homer, of hired field-labourers, e.g. of reapers. Later, of female spinners or weavers, e.g. Isa. xxxviii. 12, as Soph. *Fragm.* 269, and Philostr. *Imag.* 854, call spiders; comp. ἐριθεύω, Tob. ii. 11. — Συνέριθος, co-worker, and, indeed, with reference to pay or result, as συνεργός, denotes companion in labour, assistant, e.g. Plato, *Rep.* vii. 533 D, συνέριθοι καὶ συμπεριαγωγοὶ τέχναι.—Ἑριθεύω, to work for hire, usually in the middle, has since Aristotle been used in a bad sense of those who seek only their own in the State, who take bribes; Aristot. *Polit.* v. 3, μεταβάλλουσι δ' αἱ πολιτεῖαι καὶ ἀνευ στάσεως διὰ τε τὰς ἐριθείας ὥσπερ ἐν Ἡραίᾳ (ἐξ αἰρετῶν γὰρ διὰ τοῦτο ἐποίησαν κληρωτὰς, ὅτι ἡρουντο τοὺς ἐριθενομένους) καὶ δι' ὀλιγωρίαν; here, accordingly, as in *ibid.* v. 2, side by side with ὀλιγωρία, neglect, depreciation; ἐριθεία therefore is not = bribery, "sneaking after situations of honour," but susceptibility of being bribed, corruptibility, selfishness. Cf. Philo, *de virtut.* ii. 555, ed. Mang., τί δὲ ἄμεινον εἰρήνης; εἰρήνη δὲ ἐξ ἡγεμονίας ὀρθῆς φύεται ἡγεμονία δ' ἀφιλόνηκος καὶ ἀνερίθευτος ὀρθή μόνη. Cf. Hesych., Ἑριθευμένων πεφιλοτιμημένων. Ἑριθείετο ἐφιλονεῖκει, of ambition and

ambitious litigiousness. In Ignat. *ad Philadelph.* 8, παρακαλῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς μηδὲν κατ' ἐριθείαν πράσσειν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ χριστομαθίαν, it signifies clearly, according to the connection, *self-willed positiveness.* Ἐριθευτικός in Eustath. *Opusc.* lxxviii. 53, βλάβημος ἄρα ἐστὶ καὶ ἐριθευτικός καὶ φιλονεικος. Instructive is also Polyb. x. 25. 9, οἱ δὲ τῆς στρατηγίας ὀρεγόμενοι, διὰ ταύτης τῆς ἀρχῆς ἐξεριθεύονται τοὺς νέους καὶ παρυσκευάζουσιν εὐνους συναγωνιστὰς εἰς τὸ μέλλον = to manage the youth for self. The explanation, therefore, of Suidas is correct, that ἐριθεύεσθαι is eventually = δεκάζεσθαι, *to let oneself be bribed*; but, except by the passage cited from Polybius, the further statement can hardly be maintained, ἡ ἐριθεία εἴρηται ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ μισθοῦ δόσεως. The original meaning is perhaps the opposite.—Suidas adduces κατεριθεύομαι τὸ ἐναντίον to maintain the opposite. Thus we may perhaps describe the general meaning of ἐριθεία, *selfishness, self-willedness.* (That it appears “very often in classical Greek,” as Weiss on Phil. i. 17 asserts, to denote *intrigue, party action*, is certainly false. Apart from the passages cited, which do not belong to classical Greek, such a meaning could be only very seldom proved.) In the N. T. Phil. i. 17, οἱ δὲ ἐξ ἐριθείας τὸν Χριστὸν καταγγέλλουσιν οὐχ ἄγνως, οἰόμενοι θλίψιν ἐγείρειν τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου; Phil. ii. 3, μηδὲν κατὰ ἐριθείαν μηδὲ κατὰ κενοδόξIAN ἀλλὰ τῇ ταπεινοφροσύνῃ ἀλλήλους ἡγούμενοι ὑπερέχοντας ἑαυτῶν, μὴ τὰ ἑαυτῶν ἕκαστοι σκοποῦντες. This reference to *self-seeking, self-willedness*, as in Ign. *l.c.*, lies here and everywhere in the word, and this, indeed, as *wrangling* is akin to *litigiousness*, but is not the same; and if this meaning is reflected upon the word, as in Jas. iii. 14, 16, it is to give prominence to, and to characterize a special feature; Jas. iii. 14, εἰ δὲ ζῆλον πικρὸν ἔχετε καὶ ἐριθείαν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμῶν, μὴ κατακαυχᾶσθε καὶ ψεύδεσθε κατὰ τῆς ἀληθείας; ver. 16, ὅπου γὰρ ζῆλος καὶ ἐριθεία, ἐκεῖ ἀκαταστασία καὶ πᾶν φαῦλον πρᾶγμα.—Elsewhere still, Rom. ii. 8, τοῖς δὲ ἐξ ἐριθείας καὶ ἀπειθοῦσιν μὲν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, where the meaning *litigiousness* certainly gives no admissible sense; Gal. v. 20, ἔρις, ζῆλος, θυμοί, ἐριθείαι κ.τ.λ.; 2 Cor. xii. 20, ἔρις, ζῆλος, θυμοί, ἐριθείαι, καταλαλαίαι κ.τ.λ.

Ἐρχομαι, to come, the opposite of ὑπάγειν, Mark vi. 31, John viii. 14. For the grammatical forms, cf. Winer, § xv.; Krüger, § xl. Among the specialities of N. T. usage may be named—

(I.) Ἐρχεσθαι ἐν, answering to the Hebrew בָּ מֵיב, to denote a special mode of coming, which is of characteristic import for the given case. This must not be confounded with the Attic use of ἐν in verbs of motion. So in Luke ii. 27, ἦλθεν ἐν τῷ πνεύματι εἰς τὸ ἱερόν; cf. 1 Kings xiii. 1, ἄνθρωπος τοῦ θεοῦ ἐξ Ἰούδα παρεγένετο ἐν λόγῳ κυρίου εἰς Β.; Ps. lxxvi. 13, εἰσελεύσομαι εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου ἐν ὀλοκαυτώμασιν; Ps. lxxi. 16; Lev. xvi. 3; Heb. ix. 25, ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς εἰσέρχεται εἰς τὰ ἅγια κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν ἐν αἵματι ἀλλοτρίῳ. This is an expression or representation familiar to us only in such connections as ἐν χαρᾷ ἔρχ., Rom. xv. 32; ἐν λύπῃ, 2 Cor. ii. 1. The subject characterizes itself in the given manner. Ἐρχεσθαι denotes an appearing or self-manifestation, and by ἐν the distinctive form or manner of the manifestation is specified; Matt. xxi. 32, ἦλθεν γὰρ Ἰωάννης πρὸς ὑμᾶς

ἐν ὁδῷ δικαιοσύνης καὶ οὐκ ἐπιστεῖσάτε αὐτῷ; 1 Cor. iv. 21, ἐν ῥάβδῳ ἔλθω πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἢ ἐν ἀγάπῃ πνεύματί τε πραύτητος. Thus we are to understand Matt. xvi. 27, μέλλει ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἔρχεσθαι ἐν τῇ δόξῃ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ μετὰ τῶν ἀγγέλων αὐτοῦ; ver. 28, ἕως ἂν ἴδωσιν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐν τῇ βασίλειᾳ αὐτοῦ; Luke xxiii. 42; Matt. xxv. 31; Mark viii. 38; Luke ix. 26; Mark ix. 1, ἕως ἂν ἴδωσιν τὴν βασίλειον τοῦ θεοῦ ἐληλυθυῖαν ἐν δυνάμει; Jude 14. The significance of this mode of expression is very important in 1 John v. 6, ὁ ἐλθὼν ἐν τῷ ὕδατι καὶ ἐν τῷ αἵματι, parallel to δι' ὕδατος καὶ αἵματος, and 1 John iv. 2, ὁμολογεῖν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθότα, because it is just the manifestation of Christ in the σάρξ which gives definiteness and importance to the confession, cf. Luke xii. 9. *Vid.* ὁμολογεῖν.

(II.) Ἔρχεσθαι, of the accomplishment and occurrence of foretold and expected things, like the Hebrew **בָּרַח**, Josh. xxi. 45; 1 Sam. ix. 6; Isa. xlii. 9; Jer. xvii. 15, xxviii. 9. So in the Lord's Prayer, ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου, Matt. vi. 10; Luke xi. 2; cf. Mark xi. 10; Luke xvii. 20, xxii. 18.—Luke xix. 38, ὁ ἐρχόμενος βασιλεὺς ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου; John vi. 14, ὁ προφήτης ὁ ἐρχόμενος εἰς τὸν κόσμον; John xi. 27, σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ. ὁ εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἐρχόμενος; Matt. xxi. 9, ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου; xxiii. 39. Thus, too, we should perhaps explain the designation given to the expected Messiah simply as ὁ ἐρχόμενος in Matt. xi. 3; Luke vii. 19, 20; Heb. x. 37; cf. John vi. 14, xi. 27,—an appellation not in the remotest degree connected with John i. 15, 27, ὁ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος (cf. ver. 30), or with iii. 31, ὁ ἄνωθεν, ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐρχόμενος. Rather is it to be taken as connected with τὰ ἐρχόμενα, "things future," *that which is to come*, John xvi. 13. Ἔρχεσθαι does not, like ἦκω, denote *presence*, it leads on to and causes presence; accordingly τὰ ἐρχόμενα = *what will be there*, i.e. *what is to come*; ὁ ἐρχόμενος = *he who is to come*. It has been asked from what O. T. word the designation ὁ ἐρχόμενος is borrowed, and reference has been made to Ps. xl. 8, or Ps. cxviii. 26, or Mal. iii. 1; Dan. vii. 13; Zech. ix. 9. Hardly any of these passages, however, except Ps. cxviii. 26, furnish sufficient ground whence the expression could have grown into a distinctive appellation of the Messiah; and Ps. cxviii. 26 corresponds rather with the constant expression, ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου, Matt. xxi. 9, xxiii. 39. Ὁ ἐρχόμενος is far rather to be regarded as an expression drawn from prophecy generally, like ὁ αἰὼν ὁ ἐρχόμενος, Mark x. 14; Luke xviii. 30, αἰὼν οὗτος, μέλλον; βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ. Reference may rather be made, comp. Heb. x. 37, to Hab. ii. 3, where the neuter subject in the Hebrew text—**בָּרַח** **בָּרַח** = *it will certainly come or be fulfilled*, viz. the vision or prophecy—is by the LXX. construed as a personal subject, ἐρχόμενος ἥξει; and this is not an unwarrantable change, because the passage treats of the Messianic future, the goal of time, cf. ii. 14, iii. 1–3. In Rev. i. 4, 8, iv. 8, ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, as a title given to κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ, ὁ ἐρχόμενος denotes *God as the God of the future revelation of salvation*, cf. Isa. xl. 9; and the title as a whole is given to *God as the God of an eternal and unchangeable covenant*; it may be compared with the Pauline *πρόθεσις τῶν αἰώνων*, Eph. iii. 11, and with Eph. i. 4–10.

Ἑλευσις, ἡ, only in later Greek, e.g. Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* ἐποίησαντο τὴν ἐπὶ τοὺς Ρωμαίους ἔλευσιν οἱ Τυρρῆνοί = *march*. So in Justin Martyr of Christ's ascension, ἡ εἰς οὐρανὸν ἔλευσις. But in Acts vii. 52, ἀπέκτειναν τοὺς προκαταγγέιλαντας περὶ τῆς ἐλεύσεως τοῦ δικαίου, of the (approaching) manifestation of the Messiah, it is to be referred to ἔρχομαι as it is used in reference to prophecy. Thus it is used also by Macarius (see Suiceri *Thes. s.v.*) of the appearing and revelation of Christ generally, e.g. διὰ τοῦτο ἡ ἔλευσις τοῦ κυρίου γεγένηται κ.τ.λ.

Προσέρχομαι, to come or go to, Matt. iv. 3, 11, and often in the Gospels. Elsewhere only in 1 Tim. vi. 6; Heb. iv. 16, vii. 25, x. 1, 22, xi. 6, xii. 18, 22; 1 Pet. ii. 4. Judging from Heb. x. 1, the word seems to be a *term. techn.* as used by the author of the Epistle, ὁ νόμος . . . κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν ταῖς αὐταῖς θυσίαις αἷς προσφέρουσιν εἰς τὸ διηνεκὲς οὐδέποτε δύναται τοὺς προσερχομένους τελειῶσαι. The προσερχόμενοι are *they who desire the blessing of the sacrifice*. But it is doubtful whether they, as the קָהָל לְעֹבְדֵי, the congregation for whom the sacrifice is offered, and to whom it belongs, are to be distinguished from the προσφέροντες, כֹּהֲנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, the officiating priests,—doubtful whether the word be borrowed from the O. T. *cultus* (Delitzsch). For, first, it does not occur, as used by the LXX., as the usual translation of קָרַב as a sacrificial term; this, in this sense, is almost always rendered by προσάγειν, προσφέρειν, as the Hiphil; cf. Lev. xvi. 1. Then, again, קָרַב is not used specially of those in whose behalf the offering is made, and who have presented it; but, as the Hiphil, of the officiating priests, Lev. xvi. 1, ix. 7, xxi. 17, xxii. 3; Ezek. xlv. 7. Elsewhere it is used of *those who for any purpose appear before God* (Ex. xvi. 9), especially of *persons praying*, Ps. xxxii. 9; Zeph. iii. 2; Ps. cxix. 168. In these cases it is as frequently rendered by ἐγγίζειν as by προσέρχεσθαι; cf. Heb. vii. 19. Besides, the object of approach is never wanting, so that the word in itself already means *to draw nigh to God*. In explanation of its use in Heb. x. 1, we may rather either refer to Lev. xxi. 17, where in like manner προσέρχεσθαι and προσφέρειν occur together, οὐ προσελεύσεται προσφέρειν τὰ δῶρα τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτοῦ, or take it, as in x. 22, cf. vv. 19–21, as = *to approach God, in order to receive His atonement and grace*; so that the absolute προσέρχεσθαι is = προσέρχεσθαι τῷ θεῷ, Heb. vii. 25, xi. 6, τῷ θρόνῳ τῆς χάριτος, iv. 16, and in general synonymous with ἐκζητεῖν τὸν θεόν, xi. 6. For this, cf. Ecclus. i. 28, πρ. τῷ κυρίῳ; in ver. 30, on the contrary, we have προσέρχεσθαι absolutely; ii. 1, εἰ προσέρχῃ δουλεύειν κυρίῳ θεῷ.—1 Pet. ii. 4, πρὸς δὲ προσερχόμενοι, corresponds, as the connection shows, with what is quoted in ver. 6, ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ' αὐτῷ. Cf. Xen. *Mem.* i. 2. 38, of the disciples who attached themselves to Socrates. With 1 Tim. vi. 3, πρ. ὑγιαίνουνσιν λόγοις, cf. Plut. *Cat. min.* 12, τῇ πολιτείᾳ, *to occupy oneself in the affairs of State*.

Προσήλυτος, ὁ, new-comer, stranger, properly an adj. Often used in the LXX. = גֵּר, which elsewhere is = ξένος, πάροικος, γείτων (γειώρας, Isa. xiv. 1; Ex. xii. 1). So in Ex. xii. 48, x. 10, xxii. 21, xxiii. 8; Ps. xciv. 6; 1 Chron. xxii. 2. In all these

passages it simply denotes a *foreigner, one who does not belong to the nation*; cf. Ex. xxii. 21, xxiii. 9, αὐτοὶ γὰρ προσήλυτοι ἦτε ἐν γῇ Αἰγύπτῳ. In Matt. xxiii. 15, Acts ii. 10, vi. 5, xiii. 43, on the contrary, it denotes *those who (though not originally Israelites in the sense of Ex. xii. 48) have been received into the fellowship of Israel, partners with the Jews* (ἔσται ὥσπερ καὶ ὁ αὐτόχθων τῆς γῆς; cf. Isa. lvi. 6, xli. 1; Neh. x. 28; Suid. οἱ ἐξ ἐθνῶν προσεληλυθότες καὶ κατὰ τοὺς θείους πολιτευόμενοι νόμους). Compare 2 Chron. v. 6, πᾶσα συναγωγή Ἰσραὴλ καὶ οἱ φοβούμενοι καὶ οἱ ἐπισυνηγμένοι αὐτῶν. We cannot exactly say when the word first came to be used in this sense, probably it was at the time when ἔθνη (which see) received its special meaning. For a fuller account of this term, see Leyrer in Herzog's *Realencycl.* xii. 237; Winer, *Realwörterb.* ii. 285.

ΕΡΩ, to say, of which are used the fut. ἐρῶ, perf. εἶρηκα, pass. εἶρημαι; in quotations the participle τὸ εἰρημένον, Luke ii. 24; Acts ii. 16, xiii. 40; Rom. iv. 18. Cf. τὰ ῥήματα τὰ προειρημένα, Jude 17; aor. pass. ἐρρήθην, later ἐρρέθην, *vid.* Winer, § 15. Hence—

ῬΗΤΟΣ, the verbal adj. with the signification of the participle perf. passive; *spoken, expressly named*, e.g. ἐς χρόνον ῥητόν, Herod. i. 177; v. 57, ἐπὶ ῥητοῖσι, *certis, definitis conditionibus* (Schweigh.). The same phrase in Plato, *Conviv.* 213 A, *Legg.* viii. 850 A. The adv. ῥητῶς occurs, especially in later writers, as = *expressly*, to denote the literalness of the quotation; 1 Tim. iv. 1, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ῥητῶς λέγει, seems, however, rather to refer to the clearness of the statement cited, *what one can express, what has no mystery about it*, and therefore perhaps = *manifest*, as contrasted with ἄρρητος = *what cannot or dare not be uttered, unknown, full of mystery*, 2 Cor. xii. 4.

Ῥῆμα, τό, *that which is said, utterance, word* (to be distinguished from ὄνομα, *vox*), Matt. iv. 4; Mark ix. 32; John x. 21, etc. Ῥῆμα θεοῦ, *a declaration or command of God*, Luke iii. 2; cf. Jer. i. 2; 1 Kings xiii. 20; 1 Chron. xxii. 8; Luke ii. 29. — In St. John's Gospel the plural only is used, τὰ ῥήματα τοῦ θεοῦ, John iii. 34, viii. 47; cf. xiv. 10, xvii. 8, to denote (as the article shows) *all that God says or has said*; John vi. 68, ῥήματα ζωῆς αἰωνίου. The reading in Rev. xvii. 17, τὰ ῥήμ. τ. θ., instead of οἱ λόγοι, would recommend itself accordingly by its Johannine impress. — Rom. x. 17; Eph. vi. 17; Heb. vi. 5, ῥῆμα θεοῦ, *what God has said or spoken*, without reference to the extent of this sphere, as, perhaps, *the written and defined word of God*, though (as the connection shows) with special reference to *the gospel message*, cf. Eph. vi. 15; Rom. x. 16; and with Heb. vi. 5, the מִקְרָא, Josh. xxi. 45; Zech. i. 13. In like manner τὸ ῥῆμα κυρίου . . . τὸ ῥῆμα τὸ εὐαγγελισθὲν εἰς ὑμᾶς. Τὸ ῥῆμα absolutely, in Rom. x. 8, denotes, according to the connection, *the word of the gospel*; according to the remote object, τὸ ῥ. τῆς πίστεως. — As the words and sayings of Jesus are called ῥ. ζωῆς αἰ., so the apostolic preaching is designated πάντα τὰ ῥήματα τῆς ζωῆς ταύτης, see ζωή. — The difficult expression ἐν ῥήματι, Eph. v. 26, is explained by Harless as = *according to the promise*, but this is inadmissible; for though a promise may be called ῥῆμα, ῥῆμα is not =

promise, Luke ii. 29, see above. Ἐν ῥήματι, if it be joined with καθαρίσας or with τῷ λούτρῳ τοῦ ὕδατος, means *in virtue of a word*, viz. of the word of salvation preached, ἐν being taken as in Acts iv. 7, 9, 10, and not, as Hofmann would explain it (*Schriftbew.* ii. 2. 191), of the word whereby a man declares his will to take a woman to wife and removes the dishonour of her unmarried state; but this καθ. τῷ λ. τοῦ ὕδ. possesses its distinctive force and power because it takes place in virtue of a word, and ἐν ῥ. serves only to complete the thought, the description of baptism. Hence the omission of the article. — Like the Hebrew רִמָּה, ῥήμα stands for the subject-matter of the word, for *the thing* which is spoken of, in Luke i. 37, ii. 15; Acts x. 37; 2 Cor. xiii. 1.

Παρρησία, ἡ, for πανρησία, freedom or frankness in speaking; Dem. lxxiii. 17, τάληθῃ μετὰ παρρησίας ἐρῶ πρὸς ὑμᾶς καὶ οὐκ ἀποκρύψομαι. So in John x. 24, xi. 14; cf. ver. 11, xvi. 25, 29, as contrasted with ἐν παροιμίαις λαλεῖν; xviii. 20; Mark viii. 32; Acts ii. 29, xxviii. 31, κηρύσσων . . . καὶ διδάσκων . . . μετὰ πάσης παρρησίας ἀκολούτως; John vii. 13, 26. It is sometimes a frankness which, considering the circumstances, amounts to intrepidity, cf. John vii. 13; so in Acts iv. 13, 29, 31, Eph. vi. 19, in contrast with cowardice; positively, *outspokenness*, e.g. Philem. 8, πολλὴν ἐν Χριστῷ παρρησίαν ἔχων ἐπιτάσσειν σοι. It is to be understood as *fearless candour* also in Phil. i. 20, ἐν οὐδενὶ αἰσχυνθήσομαι, ἀλλ' ἐν πάσῃ παρρησίᾳ . . . μεγαλυνθήσεται Χριστός, i.e. the position of the apostle, wherein Christ was magnified; cf. Prov. xiii. 5, ἀσεβὴς δὲ αἰσχύνεται καὶ οὐχ ἔξει παρρησίαν. It is the *open-hearted* ("Freidigkeit," as Luther writes), *confident boldness* of a joyous heart (*cheerfulness*), not only in word but in deed also; Plato, *Legg.* viii. 829. So in Col. ii. 15, ἀπεκδυσάμενος τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας ἐδειγμάτισεν ἐν παρρησίᾳ; cf. Lev. xxvi. 13, ἤγαγον ὑμᾶς μετὰ παρρ., where, however, the μετὰ π. refers perhaps to the object. Hence generally *candour, boldness, undauntedness, a confident spirit* in all circumstances and relations, e.g. Wisd. v. 1, τότε στήσεται ἐν παρρησίᾳ πολλῇ ὁ δίκαιος κατὰ πρόσωπον τῶν θλιφάντων αὐτόν; Job xxvii. 10, μὴ ἔχει τινὰ παρρησίαν ἔναντι τοῦ θεοῦ; 2 Cor. vii. 4, πολλή μοι παρρησία πρὸς ὑμᾶς. In particular (especially in Hebrews and 1 John), the word in this sense is used to denote *the unwavering, fearless, and unhesitating confidence of faith*, in communion with God, in fulfilling the duties of evangelist, in holding fast our hope, and in every act which implies a special exercise of faith; Eph. iii. 12; 1 Tim. iii. 13; 2 Cor. iii. 12; Heb. iv. 16 (cf. Job xxvii. 10); Heb. x. 35; 1 John ii. 28. It removes fear and anxiety, which characterize man's relations to God, upon the ground of guilt being set aside (1 John iv. 17; Heb. x. 19; cf. vv. 17, 18; 1 John iii. 21), and manifests itself in *undoubting confidence in prayer* (1 John v. 14; Heb. iv. 16). Hence—

Παρρησιάζεσθαι, to speak openly, boldly, and without constraint, Acts ix. 27, 28, xiii. 46, xiv. 3, xviii. 26, xix. 8, xxvi. 26; Eph. vi. 20; 1 Thess. ii. 2, προπαθόντες καὶ ὑβρισθέντες . . . ἐπαρρησιασάμεθα ἐν τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν λαλῆσαι . . . ἐν πολλῷ ἀγῶνι.

Ἐσχατος, η, ον, probably connected with ἔχω, primarily (in Homer always) with reference to place, the extreme, the most remote, Acts i. 8, xiii. 47; then, with reference to time, the last, generally *that which concludes anything*, Rev. xv. 1, etc.; Matt. xii. 45; Luke xi. 26, τὰ ἔσχατα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκείνου; cf. 2 Pet. ii. 20; Job viii. 7; Lam. i. 9. Also with reference to rank or order, generally in a bad sense, Luke xiv. 9. Of persons, the lowest, Mark ix. 35, εἴ τις θέλει πρῶτος εἶναι, ἔσται πάντων ἔσχατος καὶ πάντων διάκονος; John viii. 9; 1 Cor. iv. 9. Sometimes denoting a moral lowness, as in Arist. Pol. iii. 4, ἔσχατος δῆμος. So, perhaps, in a moral sense, Matt. xix. 30, xx. 16; Mark x. 31; Luke xiii. 30. — Special attention must be paid to the phrases ἐπ' ἔσχατου τῶν ἡμερῶν, Heb. i. 2; τῶν χρόνων, 1 Pet. i. 20; ἐπ' ἔσχατων τῶν ἡμ., 2 Pet. iii. 3 (al. ἔσχατου); ἐν ἔσχατῳ χρόνῳ, Jude 18 (Lachm. and Tisch., ἐπ' ἔσχατου τοῦ χρόν.); καιρὸς ἔσχατος, 1 Pet. i. 5; αἱ ἔσχ. ἡμ., Acts ii. 17; and without the article, 2 Tim. iii. 17; Jas. v. 3. They correspond with the O. T. עֵשְׂרֵת הַיָּמִים, which is rendered by the LXX. = ἐπ' ἔσχατων τῶν ἡμ., Gen. xlix. 1; Jer. xxx. 24; Ezek. xxxviii. 16; Hos. iii. 5 (cf. ἐπ' ἔσχατων ἐτῶν, Ezek. xxxviii. 8); ἐν ταῖς ἔσχ. ἡμ., Jer. xlviii. 47; Isa. ii. 2; ἐπ' ἔσχατου τῶν ἡμ., Jer. xxiii. 20, xlix. 39; Num. xxiv. 14; ἐπ' ἔσχατῳ τῶν ἡμ., Deut. iv. 30; ἔσχατον τῶν ἡμ., Deut. xxxi. 29; cf. Isa. xli. 23, ἀναγγείλατε τὰ ἐπερχόμενα ἐπ' ἔσχατου = יְהִי, Ecclus. xlviii. 24. It thus denotes the time when the development of God's plan of salvation shall come to a close, the time of the final and decisive judgment. See αἰών. (The substantival ἔσχατον corresponds better with the O. T. expression than does the adjective.) This conclusive character of the final time is narrowed to ἔσχατη ἡμέρα, John vi. 39, 40, 44, 54, xi. 24, xii. 48. — The ἔσχεται ἡμέραι, which in Acts ii. 17 denote the time and era there named, are referred, rather than restricted, to the time previous to Christ's second advent in 2 Tim. iii. 1; Jas. v. 3; cf. ver. 7; and in view of the pressing shortness of this time, John designates it (1 John ii. 18) ἔσχατη ὥρα. — The name which the exalted Saviour gives Himself, ὁ πρῶτος καὶ ὁ ἔσχατος, Rev. i. 17, ii. 8, and without the article, xxii. 13, corresponds with the name by which God designates Himself, אֶתְנֵן, אֶתְנֵן, Isa. xli. 4, xlv. 6, μετὰ ταῦτα; xlviii. 12, εἰς τὸν αἶωνα, with reference to His creative omnipotence, because through this alone the accomplishment of salvation can be expected.

Ἐχω, to have or to hold, "of temporary holding and of lasting possession," Passow. Hence—

Κατέχω, (I.) to hold back, to retain, Philem. 13; to limit, to hinder, Luke iv. 42; Rom. i. 18; 2 Thess. ii. 6, 7; καὶ νῦν τὸ κατέχον οἶδατε, εἰς τὸ ἀποκαλυφθῆναι αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ ἑαυτοῦ καιρῷ· τὸ γὰρ μυστήριον ἤδη ἐνεργεῖται τῆς ἀνομίας, μόνον ὁ κατέχων ἄρτι ἕως ἐκ μέσου γένηται (Gen. xxiv. 56). The question arises, What does the apostle mean by this hindrance of the mystery of iniquity? In ver. 5 he reminds the Thessalonians of what he had told them when present with them. Now, as the description of the man of sin in vv. 3, 4 reminds us of Dan. xii., Hofmann thinks that the explanation of τὸ κατέ-

χον, ὁ κατέχων must also be sought in the Book of Daniel; and referring to Dan. x., he finds in the background of the history an active angelic power "which may be designated both masculine—for it is a man who speaks to Daniel—and neuter—for it is a πνεῦμα," Baumgarten, *Apostelgesch.* § 28. It is said to denote, accordingly, "the spirit of nationalities bound together in moral order" (Hofmann, *die heilige Schrift N. T.'s*, i. 326), "the good genius of the heathen world-power, whose it is to help on the accomplishment of God's gracious purposes in the heathen world" (Auberlen, *Dan. u. Apok.* p. 67; cf. Hofmann, *Schriftbeweis*, i. 332). Even if the matter in Dan. x. be recognised, it is still very questionable whether this reference corresponds with the mind of the apostle here. In the information which he gives the Thessalonians, he recommends them to notice the time when the κατέχων will be removed. But the presence or remoteness of angelic powers could hardly be discerned save by express revelation, and the apostle does not direct their attention to anything of that kind. Besides, the spiritual background is nevertheless to correspond to the moral tottering of the world-power, so that the time of the removal of the κατέχων and the nearness of the man of sin could not thereby be recognised. I therefore think it nearer the mark to seek for an explanation within the range of N. T. prophecy, more in harmony with the consciousness of the early church, and better suited to the design of this passage. We naturally call to mind the eschatological discourses of our Lord, and here it is important to do so all the more because our Lord Himself has to bring within its due bounds the too precipitate expectation of the end. The divine order in the world's history is insisted upon, namely, that εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη πρῶτον δεῖ κηρυχθῆναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, Mark xiii. 10; Matt. xxiv. 14. We must regard this divine order as itself a κατέχων, even apart from the apostle's statement here; and I do not see why we should not regard the same thing as τὸ κατέχων of the passage before us. This is Calvin's view. Ὁ κατέχων, accordingly, will mean, *whoever hinders* (not *the hinderer*) or *delays this divine order*; the article with the participle is used generically, not demonstratively, cf. Eph. iv. 28, as well as where, according to the context, the generic term designates a known subject, *e.g.* Matt. xxvii. 40; Gal. i. 23. See Matthiae, § 270; Krüger, § 1. 3. 4. When this last link of connection between the church and the world is broken, and all relation of the one to the other is at an end, the mystery of iniquity will appear. This information is far more important and weighty in its bearing upon the life of the church, and its conduct with respect to the future, than is the other reference.

(II.) to hold fast, to maintain, τὸν λόγον, Luke viii. 15; τὰς παραδόσεις, 1 Cor. xi. 2; τὸ καλόν, 1 Thess. v. 21; τὴν παρρησίαν κ.τ.λ., Heb. iii. 6, 14, x. 23; 1 Cor. xv. 2, to keep in memory; Luke xiv. 9; 2 Cor. vi. 10. Passive, to be held, to be bound, John v. 4; Rom. vii. 6; to possess, 1 Cor. vii. 30.

(III.) To hold out, to steer for, Acts xxvii. 40. See Lexicons.

Z

Ζάω, ζῶ, ζῆν, fut. ζήσω, ζήσομαι; aor. ἔζησα; imperf. ἔζων, *vid.* Winer, § 80. According to Curtius and others, it is connected with the Sanscrit root *gi, giv, to live*, Latin *vivo*, Old High German *quek*, Middle High German *quicken, to revive*, and stands for *διάω*, akin to which is *δίαίτα, manner of living*. “Ζωή is *animal life, bare existence*; βίος (*vis, vigere, vita*), *mental life with consciousness*; or, as Aristotle calls it in Ammon. 30, *λογικὴ ζωή*. The ζωή is only the antecedent condition or basis of the βίος. Cf Vömel, *Synon.* p. 168, whose observation that a biography is not called ζωή, but βίος, makes the relation between the two words very clear.” Döderlein, *Lat. Synon.* iv. 449. More precisely, ζωή is the *life of quickening or motion*; βίος (which is of the same stem), *the life which one leads*, qualified life; “ζωή, *vita qua vivimus* (opposed to θάνατος, ἀποθνήσκειν); βίος, *vita quam vivimus*,” cf. Trench, *Synonymys, etc.*, p. 104 sqq.

= (I.) *to live*; in a literal sense, of the form of existence distinctive of individualized being (hence ζῶσα, 1 Cor. xv. 45, Rev. xvi. 3, a distinctive epithet of ψυχή), especially of man; see under ζωή.

(a.) Of *physical life*, and in general contrasted with ἀποθανεῖν, τελευτῆσαι, νεκρὸν εἶναι, and others. Acts xvii. 28, ζῶμεν καὶ κινούμεθα καὶ ἐσμέν; Matt. ix. 18, xxvii. 63; Mark v. 23, xvi. 11; Luke xxiv. 5, 23; John iv. 50, 51, 53; Acts i. 3, and often. The aorist ἔζησα = *became alive*, Rom. xiv. 9; Rev. ii. 8, xiii. 14, xx. 4, 5; cf. Krüger, § liii. 5. 1. The designation of God as *the living, the actively living One*,—(ὁ) θεός, (ὁ) ζῶν, Matt. xvi. 16, xxvi. 63; Acts xiv. 15; Rom. ix. 26; 2 Cor. iii. 3, vi. 16; 1 Thess. i. 9; 1 Tim. iii. 15, iv. 10 (vi. 17); Heb. iii. 12, ix. 14, x. 31, xii. 22; Rev. vii. 2, xv. 7, cf. iv. 9, 10, x. 6, opposed to τὰ μάταια, Acts xiv. 15; τὰ εἰδωλα, 1 Thess. i. 9, strengthened by the addition of ἀληθινός, 1 Thess. i. 9, answering to the Hebrew יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ, Josh. iii. 10; Hos. ii. 1; Ps. xlii. 2, lxxxiv. 3; יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ, 2 Kings xix. 4, 16; Isa. xxxvii. 4, 17, cf. the יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ, חַי־וְחַיִּים, חַי־וְחַיִּים, (ζῶ ἐγώ, Num. xiv. 21; Deut. xxxii. 40, ζῶ ἐγὼ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα; Rom. xiv. 11),—emphasizes the truth and reality of the God of revelation which belongs to Him alone, and the certainty of the accomplishment by Him of His will and purpose in redemption (Acts xiv. 15–17; 2 Cor. iii. 3) in spite of the greatest obstacles. Comp. especially, Deut. xxxii. 40, xxx. 20; Dan. v. 23; Jer. ii. 13. The fact that God is the *living* God lies at the foundation of worship (see the places cited from Revelation) and of conduct answering thereto in man (Heb. ix. 14, x. 31), as well as of our hope of salvation, 1 Tim. iv. 10, vi. 17. Cf. ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ζῶντος, Matt. xvi. 16; υἱοὶ θεοῦ ζ., Rom. ix. 26; ἐκκλησία θ. ζ., 1 Tim. iii. 15.

(b.) Like חַי, *to live*, in the concrete = *to be well* or *happy*, e.g. Deut. viii. 1, xxx. 16; Ps. xxii. 27, lxix. 33; 1 Sam. x. 21; 2 Sam. xvi. 16 (1 Thess. iii. 8); Prov. iii. 22, cf. viii. 35, 36; ζῆν also may denote the absence of anything that is a hindrance to the individual in the preservation and realization of his life, and thus it denotes a spiritual life

which does not come under the power of any destructive influence such as death, and a life free from the destructive effects of sin—*life in the state of salvation* (wherein the man is again, and in a Godlike manner, free and master of himself, see ἐλεύθερος, cf. Rom. v. 17). Cf. Eccclus. xlviii. 11, καὶ γὰρ ἡμεῖς ζωῇ ζήσόμεθα. Thus it occurs in John vi. 57, ζήσεται δι' ἐμέ; 1 John iv. 9, ἵνα ζήσωμεν δι' αὐτοῦ; John vi. 51, 58, ζήσεται εἰς αἰῶνα; xi. 25, 26, ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ κἀν ἀποθάνῃ ζήσεται, καὶ πᾶς ὁ ζῶν καὶ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ οὐ μὴ ἀποθάνῃ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. In St. Paul's writings, Rom. i. 17, vi. 13, viii. 13, x. 5; 2 Cor. iv. 11, v. 15, vi. 9, xiii. 4; Gal. ii. 20; Phil. i. 21; 1 Thess. v. 10; Heb. x. 38, xii. 9; 1 Pet. iv. 6. See ζωή. The ὁ ζῶν πατήρ, John vi. 57, corresponds with this life communicated to man. In like manner the designation of Christ as *the Living One*, ὁ ζῶν, Luke xxiv. 5, Rev. i. 18, not only with reference to His resurrection, but to the reality of His life, over which death and corruption could have no power, cf. Rom. vi. 9; John vi. 57, xiv. 19; Heb. vii. 8, 25.—The participle ζῶν, moreover, is joined with substantives of which it is not elsewhere predicated, ὕδωρ ζῶν, John iv. 10, 11, vii. 38; ἄρτος, John vi. 51; λόγια, Acts vii. 38; θυσία, Rom. xii. 1; ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, Heb. iv. 12; 1 Pet. i. 23; ὁδός, Heb. x. 20; λίθος, 1 Pet. ii. 4, 5. In such cases, occurring in classical Greek, it denotes, *to be strong and permanent*, e.g. τὰ νόμιμα μαντεῖα κ.τ.λ. So, perhaps, in Heb. iv. 12. In the other texts it refers to the life which salvation gives, and the expression used associates this life figuratively with the things named. Cf. the substantival combination, ὕδωρ ζωῆς κ.τ.λ., under ζωή. With Acts vii. 38, cf. Deut. xxxii. 47, οὐχὶ λόγος κένος οὗτος ὑμῖν, ὅτι αὕτη ἡ ζωὴ ὑμῶν κ.τ.λ.

(II.) In a more definite and formal sense, *to spend one's life in a certain way*, e.g. Luke xv. 13, ζῶν ἀσώτως; Acts xxvi. 5, ἔζησα Φαρισαῖος; Gal. ii. 14, ἐθνικῶς ζ.; 2 Tim. iii. 12, and Tit. ii. 12, εὐσεβῶς ζ.; Rom. vii. 9, ἔζων χωρὶς νόμου. So κατὰ σάρκα ζῆν, Rom. viii. 12, 13, cf. ἐν σαρκί, Gal. ii. 20; Phil. i. 22; ἐν κόσμῳ, Col. ii. 20; ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν κ.τ.λ., Col. iii. 7; ἐν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, Rom. vi. 2; ἐν πίστει, Gal. ii. 20; but ἐκ πίστεως ζῆν, Heb. x. 38, Rom. i. 17, Gal. iii. 11, cf. ver. 12 (Luke xii. 15), is not to be reckoned, for in these places ζῆν has the meaning given in (I.) (b.). Still, according to the analogy of the main text in the Hebrew, Hab. ii. 4, ἐκ πίστεως is to be joined with the verb and not with ὁ δίκαιος, not only in Heb. x. 38, where this admits of no doubt, but in the other passages; because, even if it were grammatically allowable to join it with the noun, it would still be extremely difficult, and no logical reason requiring such a combination could be made out. Cf. also Gal. iii. 12, where ζῆν ἐν τοῖς τοῦ νόμου ἔργοις is contrasted with ζῆν ἐκ πίστεως, ver. 11.—We find ζῆν joined with an ethical dative (cf. Krüger, § xlvi. 6, as in Rom. vii. 2) in Luke xx. 38; Rom. vi. 10, 11, xiv. 7, 8; 2 Cor. v. 15; Gal. ii. 19; 1 Pet. ii. 24. Cf. Dem. lxxx. 26, οἱ οὐκ αἰσχύνονται Φιλίππῳ ζῶντες καὶ οὐ τῇ ἐαυτῶν πατρίδι; Dion. Hal. iii. 18 (in Tholuck on Rom. xiv. 7, 8), εὐσεβὲς μὲν πρᾶγμα ποιεῖτε, ὦ παῖδες, τῷ πατρὶ ζῶντες καὶ οὐδὲν ἀνεῦ τῆς ἐμῆς γνώμης διαπραττόμενοι. The context must show of what kind the ethical relation of the life is in the given case. We find the compound ἀναζάω, *to live again*, in Luke xv. 24, 32, cf.

above (I.) (b.); Rom. vii. 9, xiv. 9; Rev. xx. 5; *συζῆν*, Rom. vi. 8; 2 Cor. vii. 3; 2 Tim. ii. 11.

Ζωή, ἡ, life, the kind of existence possessed by individualized being, to be explained as self-governing existence (cf. the Aristotelian definition of life as *vis se ipsum movendi*), which God is, and man has or is said to have, and which, on its part, is supreme over all the rest of creation. Hence follow the other limitations which Tholuck explains in his *Comment. on Rom.* v. 12; in the N. T., of God and of men only.—(I.) In a physical sense of earthly existence, Acts xvii. 25; Luke xvi. 25 (i. 75, Rec. text); Acts viii. 33; 1 Cor. xv. 19, *ἐν ζωῇ ταύτῃ*; Phil. i. 20; Heb. vii. 3; Jas. iv. 14; 1 Cor. iii. 22; Rom. viii. 38. These are the only texts wherein *ζωή* denotes the earthly life of the individual, or rather existence in the present state, with which St. Paul contrasts the *ὄντως ζωή*, 1 Tim. vi. 19 (cf. Luke xii. 15). It is the life which does not continue as it is (cf. Jas. iv. 14), and is contrasted with (II.) a *ζωή ἀκατάλυτος*, Heb. vii. 16, which is not merely a temporary, but a perfect and abiding antithesis to death. By virtue of this antithesis, and on account of the close affinity between the conceptions *life and happiness* (*unhindered and free existence*, see *ζῆν*), there is concentrated in the conception of life every good which man can desire or enjoy; thus in Prov. xii. 28, xiii. 14, xiv. 27, ii. 19, v. 6; Ps. xxxiv. 13, cf. Ps. xxvii. 13, *πιστεύω τοῦ ἰδεῖν τὰ ἀγαθὰ κυρίου ἐν γῇ ζώντων*; Ps. xxxvi. 11; Jer. viii. 3; Deut. xxxii. 47; Ezek. xviii. 21, xx. 11. See especially, Deut. xxx. 19, *τὴν ζωὴν καὶ τὸν θάνατον δέδωκα πρὸ προσώπου ὑμῶν, τὴν εὐλογίαν καὶ τὴν κατάραν ἔκλεξαι τὴν ζωὴν σύ κ.τ.λ.*, cf. *ζωοποιεῖν*, Eccles. vii. 3. Life is not only the opposite of death, but a positive freedom from death, Acts ii. 28 (from Ps. xvi. 11); 2 Cor. v. 4, *ἵνα καταποθῇ τὸ θνητὸν ὑπὸ τῆς ζωῆς*. It is possession in the highest sense, the first and the last blessing of man, and, as has been well said, *the essence of all happiness* (see John x. 10). While in the profane sphere, in all times, this life has been confounded with the present form of human existence (cf. the sayings collected in Stobaeus, *Floril.* 119, 121); in Scripture, and in the N. T. particularly, it is clearly distinguished therefrom, cf. 1 Cor. xv. 19, *ἐν τῇ ζωῇ ταύτῃ*, usually tacitly and by implication, but sometimes characterized by the addition of *αἰώνιος*, and in 1 Tim. vi. 19, *ἡ ὄντως ζωή*. Synonymous with *ἀφθαρσία*, 2 Tim. i. 10. So *ζωή*, Matt. vii. 14, over against *ἀπώλεια*, cf. xviii. 8, 9, xix. 17; Mark ix. 43, 45; Acts xi. 18; Rom. v. 17, 18, vi. 4, vii. 10, viii. 2, 6, 10; 2 Cor. ii. 16, iv. 12, v. 4; Phil. ii. 16; Col. iii. 3, 4; 2 Tim. i. 10; Jas. i. 12; 1 Pet. iii. 7, 10; 2 Pet. i. 3. *Ζωή αἰώνιος* (first in Dan. xii. 2; for other references, *vid. αἰώνιος*) describes life, not so much as distinct from our present earthly existence, but rather as directly and in the clearest way contrasted with death in its widest range, cf. Rom. v. 21, *ἵνα ὥσπερ ἐβασίλευσεν ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ, οὕτως καὶ ἡ χάρις βασιλεύσῃ διὰ δικαιοσύνης εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον*; vi. 22, cf. vv. 21, 23.

In this sense life is described as the sum of the divine (Eph. iv. 18) promises under the gospel, Tit. i. 2, *ἐπ' ἐλπίδι ζωῆς αἰωνίου, ἣν ἐπηγγείλατο ὁ ἀψευδὴς θεὸς πρὸ χρόνων*

αἰώνιων; 2 Tim. i. 10, κατ' ἐπαγγελίαν ζωῆς τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, cf. Acts ii. 28; and of the revelation of grace, Tit. i. 2; 1 John i. 2, ἡ ζωὴ ἐφανερώθη κ.τ.λ.; Acts iii. 15, τὸν ἀρχηγὸν τῆς ζωῆς ἀπεκτείνετε; and even of gospel preaching, 2 Tim. i. 10, φωτίσαντος ζωὴν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγ.; 1 John i. 2. Hence the expression τὰ ῥήματα τῆς ζωῆς ταύτης, Acts v. 20, cf. John vi. 63, 65. λόγος ζωῆς, Phil. ii. 16; 1 John i. 1, 2; Tit. i. 2. Cf. 2 Cor. ii. 16, ὁσμὴ ζωῆς εἰς ζ. Cf. John vi. 35, 48, ὁ ἄρτος τῆς ζωῆς, cf. ver. 51; John viii. 12, τὸ φῶς τῆς ζωῆς; Rom. xi. 15. It is closely connected with Christ, Rom. vi. 23; 2 Tim. i. 1. And Christ is, Col. iii. 4, ἡ ζωὴ ἡμῶν. Cf. John i. 4, ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἦν καὶ ἡ ζ. ἦν τὸ φῶς τῶν ἀνθρώπων; 2 Cor. iv. 10, 11, ἵνα καὶ ἡ ζωὴ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ . . . φανερωθῇ. As a Messianic blessing, it belongs to the αἰὼν ἐρχόμενος, Mark x. 30; Luke xviii. 30; and as blessedness in the future, it is the object of Christian desire and hope; cf. ζ. αἰ. κληρονομεῖν, Matt. xix. 29; Mark x. 17; Luke x. 25, xviii. 18; εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν ζ., Matt. xviii. 8, 9, xix. 17; Mark ix. 43, 45, cf. Matt. vii. 14, xxv. 46. (As God's saving gift, it is the antithesis of κρίσις, ὀργὴ θεοῦ, ἀπώλεια.) So in the synoptical Gospels, Jude 21; Jas. i. 12; while in the writings of St. Paul and St. John it is indeed, similarly and distinctively, a future blessing,—John iv. 14, 36, v. 29, vi. 27, xii. 25; 1 John ii. 25; Rom. ii. 7, v. 21, vi. 22; Gal. vi. 8; 2 Cor. v. 4; Phil. iv. 3; 1 Tim. iv. 8, vi. 19; Tit. i. 2, iii. 7; cf. Rom. v. 10,—but at the same time belonging to those to whom the future is sure, already in the possession of all who are partakers of the N. T. salvation “that leadeth unto life,” and who already in this life begin life eternal. See for this also, Acts xi. 18, xiii. 46, 48. Cf. Matt. xix. 16, ἵνα ἔχω ζωὴν αἰ.,—a Johannine expression, for which Tischendorf reads σχω.

In the writings of St. Paul ζωὴ is the substance of gospel preaching (see above, ζωὴ θεοῦ, Eph. iv. 18), the final aim of faith, 1 Tim. i. 16, the possession and state of those who receive the gospel, 2 Cor. ii. 16, and of the justified, Rom. v. 17, viii. 10; hence δικαίωσις ζωῆς, Rom. v. 18, corresponding with the opposite connection of sin and death, —a state which exerts an influence upon the conduct of the subject of it (Rom. vi. 4), and which stands in the closest mutual connection therewith, Rom. viii. 6, 10. There is, however, a difference between this state and the outward condition and circumstances of the believer, just as between “the inward and the outward man,” 2 Cor. iv. 10, 11, 16–18, and the solution of this difference is reserved for the future, especially for the second coming of Christ, Col. iii. 3, 4.

In the writings of St. John, life, which primarily and essentially belongs to God and Christ, and, indeed, to God as revealing Himself in redemption as the Father and the Son, John v. 26, is the subject-matter and aim of divine revelation, John v. 39, xii. 50, is described as present in Christ, i. 4, x. 10, xiv. 6; 1 John v. 20; as given to the world through Him, vi. 33, 35, 48, xvii. 2; and especially through His death, vi. 51, iii. 15, in the possession of those who by faith have come to Him, iii. 15, 16, 36, v. 24, 40, vi. 40, 47, 51, 53, 54, xx. 31; 1 John v. 13; cf. viii. 12, x. 28; 1 John iii. 14, 15, v. 11, 12. (On John xvii. 3, see γινώσκω.) But a reference to the still future consummation of the plan

of redemption is everywhere apparent; *e.g.* in the contrast between life and condemnation, John v. 24; and ἀπώλεια, iii. 15, 16; ὀργή θεοῦ, iii. 36, but especially in the connection between life and the future resurrection, v. 29, vi. 40. Cf. the passages cited above.

There remain still to be named the combinations βίβλος ζωῆς, Phil. iv. 3; Rev. iii. 5, xiii. 8, xx. 15; βιβλίον ζ., Rev. xvii. 8, xx. 12, xxi. 27 (opposed to κρίσεως, cf. Rev. xx. 12); στέφανος ζωῆς, Jas. i. 12; Rev. ii. 10; ξύλον τ. ζ., Rev. ii. 7, xxii. 2, 14, 19; ὕδωρ ζ., Rev. vii. 17, xxi. 6, xxii. 1, 17, comp. Ezek. xlvi.—In its distinctively Messianic sense, ζωή is an exclusively N. T. word.

Ζῶον, τό (by Lachm. always written ζῶον, which is the more correct spelling, but less frequently used), *animal*, Heb. xiii. 11; 2 Pet. ii. 12; Jude 10. Properly a *living creature*; and this essential meaning—which also occurs elsewhere still in profane Greek, where ζῶον, a post-Homeric word, generally signifies *living creature*, and only in special instances a *beast*, θηρίον = *animal*, as embracing all living beings—must be retained in the Revelation, where four ζῶα are represented as being between God's throne and those of the elders which surround it, Rev. iv. 6–9, v. 6, 8, 11, 14, vi. 1, 3, 5–7, vii. 11, xiv. 3, xv. 7, xix. 4, the description given of which, iv. 6–8, resembles that of the נִינְיָ in Ezek. i. 5 sqq.; the cherubim in Ezek. x., cf. Ps. xviii. 1, xcix. 1, lxxx. 2; 1 Sam. iv. 4; 2 Sam. vi. 2; 2 Kings xix. 15. They are named “living creatures” here and in Ezek. i. on account of *the life* which is their main feature. They are usually the signs and tokens of majesty, of the sublime majesty of God both in His covenant relation and in His relation to the world (for the latter, see Ps. xcix. 1), and therefore it is that they are assigned so prominent a place, though no active part, in the final scenes of sacred history, Rev. vi. 1–7. The appearance of four represents the concentration of all created life in this world, the original abode of which, Paradise, when life had fallen to sin and death, was given over to the cherubim. They do not, like the angels, fulfil the purposes of God in relation to men; they are distinct from the angels, Rev. v. 11. We are thus led to conclude that they materially represent the ideal pattern of the true relation of creation to its God. Cf. Bähr, *Symbolik des Mos. Cultus*, i. 340 sqq. Also Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* i. 364 sqq.; Kurtz in Herzog's *Realencycl.* ii.

Ζωογονέω, to give birth to living creatures. In general also = to vivify, to make alive. Thus opposed to θανατοῦν, 1 Sam. ii. 6, κύριος θανατοῖ καὶ ζωογονεῖ, κατάρχει εἰς ἄδου καὶ ἀνάγει. 2 Kings v. 7 = נִינְיָ, Piel. In the N. T. 1 Tim. vi. 13, παραγγέλλω σοι ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζωογονοῦντος τὰ πάντα, with reference to the preceding admonition, ἐπιλαβοῦ τῆς αἰωνίου ζωῆς; cf. Neh. ix. 6. Then in a weakened sense, in the LXX., to leave alive, to let live = נִינְיָ, in Piel, Ex. i. 17, 18, 22; 1 Kings xx. 31; Hiphil, Judg. viii. 19. In the N. T. Acts vii. 19, Luke xvii. 33, ὃς ἐὰν ἀπολέσῃ, ζωογονήσκει αὐτήν (*sc.* τὴν ψυχὴν) = to retain life; cf. the parallels in Matt. xvi. 25 = σώσει τὴν ψ.; x. 39 = εἰρρίσκειν; John xii. 25, τὴν ψ. εἰς ζωὴν αἰ. φυλάσσειν.

Ζωοποιέω, to make alive, to vivify, John vi. 63, τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστιν τὸ ζωοποιεῖν; 1 Cor. xv. 45; 2 Cor. iii. 6. For the most part in the N. T. of raising the dead to life, 1 Cor. xv. 22, 36; Rom. iv. 17, viii. 11; 1 Pet. iii. 18; John v. 21. Generally in a soteriological sense, answering to the Pauline connection between δικαιοσύνη and ζωή, Gal. iii. 21, εἰ γὰρ ἐδόθη νόμος ὁ δυνάμενος ζωοποιῆσαι, ὅντως ἐκ νόμου ἂν ἦν ἡ δικαιοσύνη. The law promised life, ver. 12, but did not give it. From this universally to be acknowledged fact, St. Paul argues what was necessary with reference to justification. Cf. 2 Cor. iii. 6, τὸ γὰρ γράμμα ἀποκτείνει, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ζωοποιεῖ; *vid.* γράμμα. See Job xxxvi. 6, ὁ κύριος . . . ἀσεβῇ οὐ μὴ ζωοποιήσῃ, καὶ κρίμα πτωχῶν δώσει.

Ζέω, to seethe, to bubble, connected with ζῆλος, zeal, with the German *Gischt*, of boiling water, of the roaring and foaming of the sea, of the fermentation of wine, etc. Aristotle explains ζέσις as ὑπερβολὴ θερμότητος, as opposed to πήξις, *De gener. et corrupt.* ii. 3. Figuratively, of mental states and emotions, especially of wrath, as ἐκζέω, ἀναζέω, etc., e.g. Plat. *Rep.* iv. 440 C, ὅταν ἀδικεῖσθαι τις ἡγήται, οὐκ ἐν τούτῳ ζεῖ τε καὶ χαλεπαίνει καὶ ξυμμαχεῖ τῷ δοκοῦντι δικαίῳ; cf. Aristot. *de anim.* i. 1, ἡ ὀργὴ ζέσις τοῦ περὶ τὴν καρδίαν αἵματος καὶ θερμοῦ; of voluptuousness, Plut. *Mor.* 1088 f, ἡδονὴ ζέσασα ἐπὶ σαρκί; of youth, *ibid.* 791 C, ζέουσιν ἐν δῆμῳ νεότητα; Aeschyl. *Sept.* 708, νῦν δ' ἔτι ζεῖ, sc. δαίμων, for which the Schol. ἐκμαίνεται, ἀκμάζει. It denotes also an enhancing or climax of emotion or impulse. Cf. also the passage cited by Bretschneider, *Act. Thom.* 34, ζέουσα ἀγάπη.—In the N. T. Acts xviii. 25, ζέων τῷ πνεύματι, ἐλάλει καὶ ἐδίδασκεν ἀκριβῶς τὰ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, either of the impulse to this activity making itself felt in the mind with power, or of the affection of the spirit, of the inner life, as Apollos, κατηχημένος τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ κυρίου, possessed it. Comp. Acts ii. 2–4. In Rom. xii. 11, the warning, taken quite generally, τῷ πνεύματι ζέοντες, between τῇ σπουδῇ μὴ ὀκνηροί and τῷ καιρῷ δουλεύοντες, reminds us primarily of the impulse to love, ver. 9, cf. Hofmann *in loc.*, yet should not be limited to this, because ver. 12 regulates and determines the high standard of the inner life required by the τῷ πνεύματι ζέοντες, and the entire conduct of those who are said τῷ καιρῷ δουλεύοντες.

Ζεστός, ἡ, ον, cooked, seething, hot. Figuratively in Rev. iii. 15, οὔτε ψυχρὸς εἶ, οὔτε ζεστός; ver. 16; cf. Luke xii. 49, xxiv. 32; Matt. xxiv. 12.

II

Ἡμέρα, ἡ, the day, Rev. viii. 12; Luke vi. 13; and often qualitatively in distinction from the night, and quantitatively as a division of time. Also sometimes used of a longer space of time, yet simply as a more vivid designation, e.g. Aristot. *Rhet.* ii. 12, 13, concerning the aged, εἰσὶ δὲ φιλόζωοι καὶ μάλιστα ἐπὶ τῇ τελευταίᾳ ἡμέρᾳ. Elsewhere only in poetical language. In the N. T. we might take the expression ἡμέρα σωτηρίας, 2 Cor. vi. 2, in the same manner, if it did not designate a definite time when help and

salvation would appear; cf. Isa. xlix. 8; and as borrowed from this passage in the N. T., the time following thereupon is described as a continuing *ἡμέρα σωτηρίας*. Peculiar to the N. T. is (I.) the figurative use of the word "*the day*," being *the season of un hindered work and labour*, John ix. 4, the time for that morally pure, wakeful, and conscious action, Rom. xiii. 13, which has the blessing of the light (John xi. 10), is conditioned by the light, and has nothing to conceal, Job xxiv. 16; 1 Thess. v. 5-8 (cf. 1 Cor. iii. 13, *ἡ γὰρ ἡμέρα δηλώσει*). Day is the time of light; light is the emblem of salvation; therefore the day is the time of salvation (Rom. xiii. 12; cf. 2 Pet. i. 19), corresponding with the use of *φῶς* and *σκότος*; cf. Job iii. 4, v. 14, xvii. 12; Ezek. xxx. 3 sqq.; Amos v. 8, viii. 9, Isa. xxxviii. 13. — (II.) The expression *ἡμ. τοῦ κυρίου*, and the various epithets applied to it, especially in the O. T. The phrase itself, *ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ κυρίου*, in 1 Thess. v. 2, 2 Thess. ii. 2, 2 Pet. iii. 10, Acts ii. 20, is = *יְהוָה בֵּרֵךְ*, Isa. ii. 12, xiii. 6, 9; Ezek. xiii. 3, xxx. 3; Joel i. 15, ii. 1, 11, iii. 4; Amos v. 18, 20; Obad. 15; Zeph. i. 14, ii. 7. This expression denotes in prophecy the end of everything hostile to God, the day whose import and significance shall consist in the self-assertion of the God of revelation and of promise against all beings hostile to Him among or external to His people. It is called *ἡμέρα ἐπισκοπῆς*, Isa. x. 3; 1 Pet. ii. 12; *ἡμ. ὀργῆς*, Zeph. i. 15, 18, ii. 2, 3; Isa. xiii. 13; Ezek. vii. 19; cf. Rom. ii. 5, *ἡμ. ὀργῆς καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως δικαιοκρισίας τοῦ θεοῦ*; again, *ἡ ἡμ. ἡ μεγάλη*, Rev. vi. 17, xvi. 14 (Jude 6; Acts ii. 20); cf. Jer. xxx. 7; Joel ii. 11, 31; Zeph. i. 14; Mal. iii. 23. In the N. T. still *ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμ.*, 2 Pet. iii. 12; *ἡμ. κρίσεως*, Matt. x. 15, xi. 22, 24, xii. 36 (Mark vi. 11, Received text); 2 Pet. iii. 7; 1 John iv. 17; cf. Rom. ii. 16, *ἐν ἡμ. ὅτε κρινεῖ ὁ θεὸς κ.τ.λ.*; Jude 6, *εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμ.* Further, *ἐκείνη ἡ ἡμ.*, Matt. vii. 22; Luke x. 12; 2 Thess. i. 10; 2 Tim. i. 12, 18, iv. 8. Absolutely, *ἡ ἡμέρα*, 1 Thess. v. 4; 1 Cor. iii. 13; Heb. x. 25; cf. 1 Cor. iv. 3, *ἵνα . . . ἀνακριθῶ . . . ὑπὸ ἀνθρωπίνης ἡμέρας*; in contrast with this *ἡμ. κυρίου*, *vid. ver. 4*. For *ἔσχαται ἡμ.*, see *ἔσχατος*. While, for some, this day is the terrible end, to be anticipated with dread, for others (the oppressed people of God in the O. T.) it is the hoped-for beginning of a new and better state, of a new order of things. This latter aspect, however, is comparatively seldom dwelt upon, see Isa. lxi. 2; Zech. xiv. 7; cf. Ezek. xiii. 5; Jer. xxv. 29, xlix. 12; Ezek. ix. 6. But in Eph. iv. 30 it is called *ἡμέρα ἀπολυτρώσεως* for the church of Jesus Christ, cf. Luke xxi. 8. In that day Christ is to be judge (Matt. vii. 22); by Him the resurrection of the dead will be accomplished, John vi. 39, 40, 44, 54; cf. John v. 27; He on this day will appear in the glory of the Father (the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ = *πατήρ*, see *κύριος*), Matt. xvi. 27. This day is therefore called *ἡ ἡμ. τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν*, 1 Cor. i. 8; *τοῦ κυρ. Ἰησοῦ*, 2 Cor. i. 14; *ἡμ. Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, Phil. i. 6; *Χριστοῦ*, Phil. i. 10; Luke xvii. 30, *ἡ ἡμ. ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρ. ἀποκαλύπτεται*; cf. *ver. 31*; Matt. xxiv. 36, 42, 44, 50; Luke xxi. 34, cf. vv. 27, 28, xvii. 24, answering to the *παρουσία* (which see). In this designation, however, we discover a difference between the day spoken of in the O. T. and that mentioned in the N. T. In the latter, the element of hope preponderates, and the distinction between *ἡμέρα τοῦ κυρίου* and *ἡμέρα τοῦ κυρίου*

Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is analogous to that between the two lines of prophecy, the one connecting itself with the stem of David, the other looking towards the coming of Jehovah. — The *ἡμέραι τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρ.*, Luke xvii. 22–26, cannot, as the connection shows, refer to the days of His earthly life. One might be tempted to take ver. 22 as referring to the time when the *παρουσία* should begin, but ver. 26 obliges us to fix upon a time previous to this; for as the *ἡμέρα* on which Noah entered into the ark (ver. 27) is distinct from the *ἡμέραις Νῶε*, so *the day of the Son of man* is distinct from *the days of the Son of man*. *The days of the Son of man* denote a time defined by the still impending, as well as by the actually present, *παρουσία*. — In John viii. 56, Ἀβραὰμ ἠγαλλίασατο ὅτι ἵδεν τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ἐμήν, Christ (as it appears to me) has still in His mind *the day of His ever approaching manifestation in glory* (see *παραβολή*). Concerning *ἡμέρα αἰῶνος*, 2 Pet. iii. 18, see *αἰών*.

Θ

Θεός, ὁ, God; Döderlein (*Synonymik*, vi. 101; *Hom. Gloss.* 2500) and Curtius (*Grundzüge der Griech. Etymol.* 230, 450 sqq.) derive this word from the root *thes* in *θέσσαι*, “to implore” (Pindar, Hesiod); because, as the latter proves, the usual derivation of the word with the Latin *deus*, from the Sanscrit *div*, “to give light,” *dēvas*, see *δαίμων*, is decidedly false. Θεός therefore is = *He to whom one prays, who is implored*, an appellative for the *Being* who is absolutely raised above the world and man, their dependence on whom mankind acknowledge. Others refer the word to *θαύμαι*, *θαῦμα*, *τίθημι*, etc., as forms connected with the same root as *θεός*. Herod. ii. 52. 1, θεὸς δὲ προσωνόμασάν σφας ἀπὸ τοῦ τοιούτου ὅτι κόσμῳ θέντες τὰ πάντα πρήγματα καὶ πάσας νομὰς εἶχον. This last explanation, which A. Göbel in the *Zeitschr. für vergl. Sprachforschung*, xi. 55, adopts, Curtius describes as hardly in keeping with the Greek views of the Godhead. As to the German word *Gott*, it is still doubtful whether it springs, with Wuvtan, Odin, from *vatan*, *to go*, and signifies, perhaps, “the world-travelling light;” cf. Simrock, *deutsche Mythol.* p. 150, “The root-meaning of the name *Gott* (Gothic, *Guth*), Grimm, *deutsche Mythol.* 12, says is undiscovered; and he still rejects its connection with the adjective *gut* (Gothic, *gōds*), which has a long vowel. In the *Gesch. der deutschen Spr.* 541, he owns that recently (Ernst Schulze’s *goth. Gloss.* p. xviii.) a path has been opened which may lead to this connection *which the conception demands* and language in its laws of rhythm indicates, since it calls God the good and kind.” Hebrew = *אֱלֹהִים*, which is akin to *אֱל*, so that the fundamental thought is *the strong one*; = *אֱלֹהִים*, which Fürst, indeed, derives from the same root; but according to the latest and apparently conclusive investigations (Delitzsch, *Fleischer bei Delitzsch*, *Genesis*, pp. 30, 64), the true root is to be recognised in the Arabic *aliha*, whose fundamental meaning is “helpless wandering,” “refuge-seeking terror.” As a *nom. infin.* from *אָלַח* in this logically established meaning, *אָלַח*, Aram. *אָלַח*, signifies *fear* or *terror*, and then (like *אָלַח*, which is synonymous with it,

in Gen. xxxi. 42, 53, and אָרֵץ, Ps. lxxvi. 12; Isa. viii. 12 sqq.; cf. 2 Thess. ii. 4) *the object of fear*, Delitzsch as above. Cf. אָרֵץ, Ps. cxi. 9; דְּרֵם, *dream*. The plural is the plural of abstraction, like חַיִּים, *life*, from חָיָה, *living*.

We must, however, notice Hupfeld's observation (on Ps. viii. 6): "אלהים, like אֱלֹהִים, is contrasted with man (אָדָם and אִנְשִׁים), with reference to His power and His position, especially in the expression אֱלֹהִים אֶלְאֵל, Hos. xi. 9; or אֱלֹהִים אֶלְאֵלֶיךָ, Ezek. xxviii. 2, 9; Isa. xxxi. 3, which is employed when man in his pride forgets his true limits, and imagines himself like God." Cf. Acts xii. 22; Gal. i. 10; John x. 33.

(I.) As an **appellative**: *that which is divinely revered, regarded as God*, Acts xii. 22, θεοῦ φωνὴ καὶ οὐκ ἀνθρώπου; xvii. 23, ἀγνώστῳ θεῷ; xxviii. 6, ἔλεγον θεὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι; 2 Thess. ii. 4, ὁ ἀντικείμενος καὶ ὑπεραιρόμενος ἐπὶ πάντα λεγόμενον θεὸν ἢ σέβασμα. Cf. Dan. xi. 36, 37; 2 Cor. iv. 4, ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου,—who assumes the place of God. Hence ὁ, ἡ θεός (Acts xix. 37, otherwise *θεά*, xix. 27), *θεοί* in the pagan sense, Gal. iv. 8, οἱ φύσει μὴ ὄντες θεοί; Acts vii. 43, xix. 26; 1 Cor. viii. 5; Acts vii. 40, and often. Akin to this is the peculiar use of *θεοί*, like אֱלֹהִים, John x. 34, 35, of judges and magistrates, Ps. lxxxii. 1, 6; Ex. xxi. 6, xxii. 8, 9, 28, so far as anything belongs to them which is distinctive not of man but of God. But in the sphere of revelation the principle ever holds, οὐδεὶς θεὸς ἕτερος εἰ μὴ εἰς, 1 Cor. viii. 4; and thus *θεός*, אֱלֹהִים, is appellative, referring exclusively to **the God of revelation**, especially in the O. T. Deut. vii. 9; 2 Sam. vii. 22; 1 Kings xviii. 39; 2 Kings v. 15; Ps. xviii. 32, xxxiii. 12, cxliv. 15, xc. 17, c. 3, and often in the second part of Isaiah. Cf. Ruth i. 16; Isa. xxxvii. 16.

(II.) Hence *θεός*, ὁ *θεός*, is a **proper name**, GOD, who is the God of revelation or of redemption ("אלהים has been made known to man from the beginning as יהוה אלהים, and יהוה as אֱלֹהִים in an exclusive sense," Hofmann). Accordingly, κύριος ὁ *θεός* is = יהוה אֱלֹהִים, Luke i. 16; Acts vii. 27; 1 Pet. iii. 15; Rev. i. 8, iv. 8, xxii. 5, 6; cf. Matt. iv. 7, 10, xxii. 37, and other places. Without the article, as Winer observes, oftenest in the Epistles, when it is dependent on another substantive without the article, Matt. vi. 24, xiv. 33; Luke xi. 20; John i. 12; Rom. i. 4, 7, 16, 17, 18, etc. Described according to His attributes by the addition of ἄφροτος, Mark v. 7; Luke viii. 28; Acts xvi. 17; Heb. vii. 1; παντοκράτωρ, Rev. xix. 15, cf. i. 8, etc.; *θεὸς σωτήρ*, 1 Tim. i. 1, ii. 3; Tit. i. 3, iii. 4. For other additions, see Rom. xvi. 26, 27; 1 Tim. i. 11, 17; Tit. i. 2.—2 Cor. xiii. 11, ὁ *θεὸς τῆς ἀγάπης*; 1 Pet. v. 10, ὁ *θ. πάσης χάριτος*; 2 Cor. i. 3, *πάσης παρακλήσεως*; Rom. xv. 13, *τῆς ἐλπίδος*, cf. ver. 5, *τῆς ὑπομονῆς*; Rom. xvi. 20; Phil. iv. 9; Heb. xiii. 20; 1 Cor. xiv. 33, ὁ *θ. τῆς εἰρήνης*. *Θεός* especially is often joined with the genitive of the person, μου, σου, ὑμῶν, Matt. xxvii. 46; Heb. xi. 16; Rev. xxi. 3; cf. ver. 7, ἔσομαι αὐτῷ *θεός*, cf. Heb. viii. 10; Rom. i. 8; 1 Cor. i. 4; 2 Pet. i. 1; Rev. vii. 12, xix. 5. In explanation of this, cf. Acts xxvii. 23, τοῦ θεοῦ οὐ εἰμί, φ καὶ λατρεύω, ἄγγελος, and Rev. xxi. 3, αὐτὸς ὁ *θεὸς* ἔσται μετ' αὐτῶν *θεὸς* αὐτῶν. Expression is given to the connection wherein the person stands to God and God to him, so that both exist for each other, cf. Phil. iii. 19; Matt. xxii. 32, οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ *θεὸς* *θεὸς νεκρῶν*.

We must especially notice the historical and even Christian relationship expressed by the genitive of the person, which affirms that God has shown in reference to the person named what He is and will be; *ὁ θ. Ἀβραάμ, Ἰσαάκ, Ἰακώβ*, Matt. xxii. 32; Mark xii. 26; Luke xx. 37; Acts iii. 13, xxii. 14, vii. 32, 46; Heb. xi. 16; *τοῦ Ἰσραήλ*, Luke i. 68; Matt. xv. 31; cf. Acts xiii. 17; *ὁ πατρῷος θεός*, Acts xxiv. 14. In all these cases the appellative import of the word is more or less also to be kept in mind; cf. Rom. iii. 29. In the place of this O. T. name of God as the God of salvation, we have in the N. T. the designation *ὁ θεὸς τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, Eph. i. 17; compare the addition *ὁ πατὴρ τῆς δόξης*, as in John xx. 17,—a relationship which is so peculiar that it is not thus simply expressed elsewhere as in this single passage, but rather *ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, Rom. xv. 6; 2 Cor. i. 3 (with the addition, *ὁ πατὴρ τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν καὶ θεὸς πάσης παρακλήσεως*); 2 Cor. xi. 31; Eph. i. 3; Col. i. 3; 1 Pet. i. 3; Rev. i. 6; cf. Gal. i. 1; Eph. v. 20, iii. 14; and as in the O. T. God's relation to His covenant people collectively and individually was thus expressed, so the N. T. relationship is still more clearly expressed by the phrases *ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ ἡμῶν*, Gal. i. 4; Phil. iv. 20; 1 Thess. i. 3, iii. 11, 13; *θεὸς πατὴρ ἡμῶν*, Rom. i. 7; 1 Cor. i. 3; 2 Cor. i. 2; Eph. i. 2; Phil. i. 2; Col. i. 2; 2 Thess. i. 2; 1 Tim. i. 2; Philem. 3; *ὁ θ. καὶ πατὴρ*, 1 Cor. xv. 24; Eph. v. 20; Jas. i. 27, iii. 9; *θεὸς ὁ πατὴρ*, 1 Cor. viii. 6; *θεὸς πατὴρ*, Gal. i. 3; Eph. vi. 23; Phil. ii. 11; 2 Tim. i. 2; Tit. i. 4; 1 Pet. i. 2; 2 Pet. i. 17; 2 John 3; *vid. πατὴρ*.

It is a matter of question whether the name *θεός* is given to Christ in Rom. ix. 5; Tit. ii. 13; 2 Thess. i. 12; 2 Pet. i. 1; cf. Jude 4, as it undoubtedly is in John i. 1, *καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος*; xx. 28, *ὁ κύριός μου ὁ θεός μου*. Compare Acts xx. 28, Cod. Sin., *ποιμαίνειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ ἣν περιποιήσατο διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ ἰδίου*. The objections against the Pauline passages referred to may be all reduced to one, upon the basis of which alone (according to the common view of the interpreters in question) the rest have any force, viz. that it is inconsistent with the apostle's dogmatic convictions to call Christ *God*. But apart from this individual view of his dogmatic convictions, not only is the transition from *υἱὸς θεοῦ* to *θεός* a very easy one, cf. John x. 33, but the *ἄνθρωπος* (1 Tim. ii. 5; Rom. v. 15; 1 Cor. xv. 21) might be considered as equally beset with difficulty on account of its supposed inconsistency with the usual language of the apostle, who never speaks of Christ as *υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*. It is more strictly correct for us, as has hitherto been held, to argue, with Beck (on Rom. ix. 5, p. 24), from the *υἱὸς θεοῦ* the *Χριστὸς θεός* is inferred, with the same justice as is the *ἄνθρωπος Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς* (1 Tim. ii. 5 and Rom. v. 15) from the *υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου*. As to Tit. ii. 13, *προσδεχόμενοι τὴν μακαρίαν ἐλπίδα καὶ ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, the question arises whether the two genitives attached to *δόξης, τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, denote two subjects with one article, or one subject. Both are possible. Even when two subjects are thus joined, the article belonging to the second may be omitted. It is incorrect (as was stated in the first edition) that this cannot be proved

with reference to the N. T.; cf. not only passages such as Matt. xvi. 21, xx. 18, xxvi. 17 xxvii. 3, 41, but also, *eg.*, Acts xv. 22, apart from the omission of the second article in other ways, Col. ii. 22; Luke xiv. 23, i. 6; Mark xii. 33; Rev. v. 12, which is more frequently the case in profane Greek than in the N. T. If, accordingly, in general it may be regarded as *possible* even in our text that God and Christ may be thus distinguished, and that the predicate *God* may not be given to *Christ*, the question arises further, whether a more definite result can be obtained by an examination of those cases where, as a rule, the article *must* be repeated, and where it *cannot* be repeated. The article *must* be repeated (1) when a confounding of the two subjects has to be avoided, Acts xxvi. 30, ἀνέστη ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ ὁ ἡγεμὼν; 1 Cor. iii. 8, ὁ φυτεύων δὲ καὶ ὁ ποτίζων ἓν εἶναι; cf. Jas. iv. 12, εἰς ἐστὶν ὁ νομοθέτης καὶ κριτής; (2) when some qualifying word is put to one substantive which is not to be applied to the other, Mark vi. 21, τοῖς μεγιστᾶσιν αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῖς χιλιάρχοις καὶ τοῖς πρώτοις τῆς Γαλιλαίας; this, however, is not without a few rare exceptions, cf. 1 Tim. iv. 6 with Col. ii. 8. As to 2 John 9, πᾶς ὁ προάγων καὶ μὴ μένων, the article cannot here be repeated, because *μὴ* cannot be regarded as a limitation to *μένων*, but *μὴ μένων* is one conception in itself, and is the second predicate of the same subject. — On the other hand, the article *must not* be repeated (1) when a plurality of conceptions (as in 2 John 9) are predicated of one and the same subject, cf. John xxi. 24, ὁ μαρτυρῶν περὶ τούτων καὶ γράψας ταῦτα; Mark vi. 3, ὁ τέκτων, ὁ υἱὸς Μαρίας ἀδελφὸς δὲ Ἰακώβου; Luke vi. 49, ὁ δὲ ἀκούσας καὶ μὴ ποιήσας; (2) when a substantive is provided with an attributive limitation which is to be applied to both members, Heb. iii. 1, κατανοήσατε τὸν ἀπόστολον καὶ ἀρχιερέα τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν,—this, again, not without exception when repetition of the article would involve no ambiguity, cf. Matt. xxi. 12 with Mark ii. 15, Eph. iii. 10, 1 Cor. ii. 27.

These are the only sure points to which importance can be attached with reference to the repetition or omission of the article. But the question just is, whether τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν are two predicates of one subject Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, or whether θεός and Ἰησοῦς Χριστός are two different subjects in such a sense that it was not necessary to guard against a confusion of both by repeating the article. The above rules, therefore, do not enable us to decide. Still there are two other points which put the right decision beyond doubt. If Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ were not there, but simply τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν, there could be no doubt that only one subject was intended, because σωτήρ, in profane Greek a common attribute of the gods, is in the LXX., and especially in the pastoral Epistles, a frequent predicate of God; cf. Titus ii. 10, iii. 4, i. 3; 1 Tim. i. 1, ii. 3, iv. 10 (besides Titus i. 4, cf. ver. 3, iii. 6, cf. ver. 4, 2 Tim. i. 10, where it is the predicate of Christ). Hence the question now shapes itself thus, Is the addition Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ enough to forbid the combination of σωτήρος with θεοῦ? To help us in deciding this, we have not only the consideration whether it must be regarded as generally inadmissible, or at least as foreign to the N. T. manner of speaking, to designate Christ as θεός or as μέγας θεός, but a very definite feature of the context, namely ver. 14, which

not only by its form already indicates that in ver. 13 only one subject is presented, but which contains the expression *λαὸς περιούσιος*—*הָאֵלֹהִים*,—an expression to which unmisstakeably the predicate **God** corresponds, the people being viewed as the *περιουσία* of God, cf. Ex. xix. 5; Deut. xxvi. 17, 18, vii. 6, xiv. 2; and this predicate here is He, *ὃς ἔδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, ἵνα λυτρώσῃται ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης ἀνομίας καὶ καθάρῃ ἑαυτῷ λαὸν περιούσιον*, so that, to the expression complete in itself, *τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν*, the designation of the person of Christ seems to be added, only with reference to, and on account of, this relative clause. — According to this, there can be no longer any doubt as to 2 Thess. i. 12; 2 Pet. i. 1 (cf. iii. 18) likewise.

Θεότης, ἡ, the Godhead. Col. ii. 9, *ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖ πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος*. *Θεότης* is to be distinguished from *θεότης* thus, *θεότης* = *that which God is*, *θειότης* = *that which is of God*. Plut. *de def. orac.* 10, οὕτως ἐκ μὲν ἀνθρώπων εἰς ἥρωας, ἐκ δὲ ἡρώων εἰς δαίμονας αἱ βελτίονες ψυχαὶ τὴν μεταβολὴν λαμβάνουσιν. ἐκ δὲ δαιμόνων ὀλίγαι μὲν ἔτι χρόνῳ πολλῷ δι' ἀρετῆς καθαρθεῖσαι παντάπασιν θεότητος μετέσχον. Luc. *Icaromen.* 9, διελόμενοι τὸν μὲν τινα πρῶτον θεὸν ἐπεκάλουν, τοῖς δὲ τὰ δεύτερα καὶ τρίτα ἔνεμον τῆς θεότητος. In the later ecclesiastical writers, *θεότης*, like *τὸ θεῖον* in classical Greek, is used of the Godhead, see *θεῖος*.

***Αθεος, ον, destitute of God, without God**, cf. *ἄλογος*. — (I.) Primarily, actively = *godless, forgetful of God*, of one who does not care about the existence of the gods, who does not honour them. Xen. *Anab.* ii. 5. 39, *σὺν Τισσαφέρνει τῷ ἀθεωτάτῳ τε καὶ πανουργοτάτῳ*; Plat. *Polit.* 309 A, *ἀθεότης καὶ ὕβρις καὶ ἀδικία*. In Aesch. *Eum.* 151 (154), and Soph. *Oed. R.* 1329 (1360), the sinner is given “the name still unknown to Homer, *ἄθεος ἀνὴρ*,” cf. Nägelsbach, *nachhom. Theol.* 319. — Next (II.), passively = *without divine help, forsaken by God, excluded from communion with God*; Soph. *Oed. T.* 663. So in the Pauline *ἄθεοι ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ*, Eph. ii. 12. That it means there more than *they know not God* (1 Thess. iv. 5; cf. the *ἡ ἄθεος πολυθεότης* of Origen), is clear both from the context and from the analogy of Gal. iv. 9, *νῦν δὲ γνόντες θεόν, μᾶλλον δὲ γνωσθέντες ὑπὸ θεοῦ*, cf. ver. 8.

Θεῖος, α, ον, divine, what is God's, especially what proceeds from Him. So in the LXX. Ex. xxxi. 3, xxxv. 31; Prov. ii. 17; Job xxvii. 3, xxxiii. 4 (Eccles. vi. 35). So, too, in the N. T. 2 Pet. i. 3, *θεία δύναμις*; ver. 4, *θείας φύσεως*. *Τὸ θεῖον* often in classical Greek means *the Godhead* “in speaking of the working or power of the gods, without intending or being able to name any one particular god,” Pape; Acts xvii. 29.

Θειότης, the divinity, divine character or essence. Plut. *cur Pythia nunc non reddat cet.* 8, *τούτων μέρος μηδὲν εἶναι κενὸν μηδὲ ἀναισθητόν, ἀλλὰ πεπλησθαι πάντα θειότητος*; Rom. i. 20, *ἥ τε αἰδὶς αὐτοῦ δύναμις καὶ θειότης*. As *θεότης* is = *τὸ εἶναι τινα θεόν* (Fritzsche), so *θειότης* is = *τὸ εἶναι τι, τινὰ θεῖον*. So Wisd. xviii. 9.

Θεοδιδάκτος, instructed or taught of God, only in 1 Thess. iv. 9 and in ecclesi-

nastical Greek, e.g. *Ep. Barn.* 21, γίνεσθε δὲ θεοδιδάκτοι, cf. John vi. 45 (Isa. liv. 13); Heb. viii. 10, 11; 1 John ii. 20.

Θεομαχέω, to oppose God, to resist divine necessity. Rec. text, Acts xxiii. 9, cf. e.g. Eurip. *Iph. A.* 1409, τὸ θεομαχεῖν γὰρ ἀπολιπούς, ὃ σου κρατεῖ, ἐξελογίσω τὰ χρηστὰ τὰναγκαῖά τε; Xen. *Oecon.* xvi. 3, οὐκέτι συμφέρει θεομαχεῖν,—with reference to the laws of soil and climate, which must be attended to in agriculture.

Θεόμαχος, fighting against God, only in Acts v. 39.

Θεόπνευστος, prompted by God, divinely inspired. 2 Tim. iii. 16, πᾶσα γραφὴ θ. In profane Greek it occurs only in Plut. *de placit. philos.* v. 2, ὄνειροι θεόπνευστοι (κατ' ἀνάγκην γίνονται), opposed to φυσικοί. The formation of the word cannot be traced to the use of πνέω, but only of ἐμπνέω. Cf. Xen. *Hell.* vii. 4. 32, τὴν ἀρετὴν θεὸς μὲν ἐμπνεύσας; Plat. *Conv.* 179 B, μένος ἐμπνεῦσαι ἐνίοις τῶν ἡρώων τὸν θεόν; Hom. *Il.* xx. 110; *Od.* xix. 138. The simple verb is never used of divine action. How much the word corresponds with the scriptural view is evident from 2 Pet. i. 21.

Θεοσεβής, es, one who fears God and therefore avoids evil, God-fearing, John ix. 31. Cf. σέβεσθαι. Hence θεοσέβεια, the fear of God; 1 Tim. ii. 10, ἐπαγγέλλεσθαι θεοσ., to profess to be God-fearing.

Θεοστυγής, es, seldom in classical Greek (Eurip. *Troad.* 1213, *Cycl.* 396, 603), and in a passive sense, like θεομισής = hated of God, but without expressly emphasizing the hatred on God's part; rather = cursed; cf. Eurip. *Cycl.* 396 of Hades. This passive meaning cannot be given to the word in Rom. i. 30, where heinous crimes and vices are enumerated, and θεοστυγεῖς are named side by side with ὑβρισταί; cf. Plat. *Polit.* 309 A (*vid.* ἄθεος), where ὕβρις occurs side by side with ἀθεότης. The active sense, moreover, of the synonymous word θεομισής is established by the note of the Schol. on Aristoph. *Av.* 1555. "We must have in mind such heathen as Cyprian speaks of; men who, when any heavy calamity befalls them, arraign the gods and accuse Providence—characters like Prometheus," Tholuck on Rom. i. 30, who refers also to the very strong expression θεοσεχθρία, Arist. *Vesp.* v. 418. Still it may be more correct to regard the word as a strong and pregnant synonym for ἄθεος, rather than to find in it characters so extreme in wickedness and so rare. Cf. Clem. Rom. *ad Cor.* i. 35, ἀπορρήψαντες ἀφ' ἐαυτῶν πᾶσαν ἀδικίαν καὶ ἀνομίαν, πλεονεξίαν, ἔρεις, κακοηθείας καὶ δόλους, ψιθυρισμούς, τε καὶ καταλαλίαν, θεοστυγίαν, ὑπερηφανίαν τε καὶ ἀλαζονείαν κενοδοξίαν τε καὶ ἀφιλοξενίαν. Ταῦτα γὰρ οἱ πράσσοντες, στυγητοὶ τῷ θεῷ ὑπάρχουσιν, οὐ μόνον δὲ οἱ πράσσοιτες αὐτὰ, ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ συνευδοκοῦντες αὐτοῖς.

Θνήσκω (ΘΑΝ-), aor. ἔθανον, perf. τέθνηκα, to die, Matt. ii. 20; Mark xv. 44; Luke vii. 12, viii. 49; John xi. 21 (39, 41, Rec. text), 44, xii. 1; Acts xiv. 19, xxv. 19. — 1 Tim. v. 6, ἡ δὲ σπαταλώσα ζῶσα τέθνηκεν, as contrasted with ver. 4, ἀπό-

δεκτον ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ, must, like this latter, be understood as having reference to the divine judgment. The widow, acting as described, is *dead* while still living; *i.e.*, according to God's punitive judgment and sentence, she is destitute of that life which she might and ought to have possessed through saving grace, had she been an *ὄντως χήρα*, and she has already fallen under this sentence before her end has come. Cf. Eph. iv. 18; Luke xi. 24; Rev. iii. 1, 2; Eph. ii. 1, 5, 6. That moral deadness cannot be denoted by this verb, see *θάνατος*. Theophyl. *κὰν δοκεῖ ζῆν κατὰ τὴν αἰσθητήν, τέθνηκε κατὰ πνεῦμα*.

Θνητός, ἢ, ὄν, verbal adj. from the preceding = *mortal*; in classical Greek, in Homer, Hesiod, the Tragedians, and elsewhere, as an epithet of man in contrast with *ἀθάνατος*, *θεῖος*, *θεός*, denoting that essential distinction between men and gods which lies at the foundation of all other differences. Cf. Nägelsbach, *homer. Theol.* i. 16 seq.; *nachhomer. Theol.* i. 6 seq. The fact that the moral difference between man's nature and God's has thus been resolved into a merely physical one, is to be the more carefully observed, because it witnesses how that which Scripture describes as a punitive sentence has come to be viewed as a normal law of nature, the abnormal relationship being regarded on naturalistic grounds as normal. Accordingly, the expression *ὁ μόνος ἔχων ἀθανασίαν* (1 Tim. vi. 16) has a force and meaning altogether different from the heathen epithet for the gods, *ἀθάνατοι*; and the weakness and frailty of man expressed by them in the epithets *ἐφήμεροι*, *θνητοί*, is, according to Holy Scripture, directly punitive suffering. — In the N. T. *θνητός* always occurs in contrast with *life* as the blessing of Christianity, Rom. vi. 12, viii. 11; 2 Cor. iv. 11. *Τὸ θνητόν*, 2 Cor. v. 4, over against *ἀθανασία*, 1 Cor. xv. 53, 54.

Θάνατος, ὁ, death = (I.) *the natural* (especially forcibly caused) *end of life*; in the Attic, particularly of the punishment of death; Matt. x. 21, xv. 4, xx. 18, xxvi. 66, and often. The plural, 2 Cor. xi. 23, *ἐν θανάτοις πολλάκις*, as the same in profane Greek, not merely of *the death of many*, but either used emphatically, as in the German *Todesnöthe*, "perils of death," or as especially often in Plato, partly = *kinds of death*, e.g. *Phaed.* 88 A, *Tim.* 81 E, *ἀπονάτατος τῶν θανάτων*, partly because death is regarded as repeating itself, e.g. *Ax.* 368 D, *θανάτων μυρίων χεῖρω*; *Legg.* x. 904 E; *Rep.* x. 615 B. So in the text before us.—(II.) In order to the clear perception and understanding of the scriptural, and especially of the N. T. use of this word, we must hold fast and abide by the fact that *death as the punishment pronounced by God upon sin* (Gen. ii. 17; Eccus. xli. 2, 3, *κρίμα θανάτου* = *θάνατος*) *has a punitive significance*; Rom. i. 32, *τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπιγνόντες, ὅτι οἱ τὰ τοιαῦτα πράσσοντες ἄξιοι θανάτου εἰσὶν*; Heb. ix. 27, *ἀπόκειται τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἅπαξ ἀποθανεῖν, μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο κρίσις*; Rom. vi. 23, *ὀφώνια τῆς ἁμαρτίας, θάν.*,—all the elements of the divine judgment make themselves present and realize themselves to man in its train, and are bound up with it, cf. Ps. xlix. 15; Prov. vii. 27; and accordingly Hades appears as the necessary sequence of death, and in obvious connection therewith, Rev. vi. 8, xx. 13, 14, i. 18, 1 Cor. xv. 55; cf. *ἄδης*. Death therefore is a very compre-

hensive term, denoting all the punitive consequences of sin, Rom. v. 12, 14, 17, 21, vi. 16, Jas. v. 20; in it are concentrated all the evils that spring from sin, so that it is used as synonymous with *corruption*, Prov. xiv. 34 and elsewhere, see ἀπώλεια. Cf. θάνατος over against ἀγαθόν, Rom. vii. 13. So in the O. T., especially in Prov. ii. 18, v. 5, vii. 27, viii. 36, x. 2, xi. 4, 19, xii. 28, xiii. 14, xiv. 12, 27, xvi. 25; cf. xiv. 32. Those passages in the Psalms also may be mentioned in which *death* and Sheol are used together, *vid.* ᾄδης; also Hos. xiii. 14. The end of earthly life, which is more immediately called death, is always the point of the punitive sentence about which all the other elements in that sentence are grouped. This it is that gives the death of Christ its significance; cf. Acts ii. 24; Heb. ii. 9, v. 7; Rom. vi. 3, 4, 5, 9; 1 Cor. xi. 26; Phil. ii. 8. Hence, too, the expression, σῶμα τοῦ θαν., Rom. vii. 24. Before this end approaches, man's life, which is destined to fall a prey thereto, becomes for this very reason a state of dependence and thralldom, wherein the unhindered possession and enjoyment of life is denied him; Heb. ii. 15, φόβῳ θανάτου διὰ παντὸς τοῦ ζῆν ἔνοχοι ἦσαν δουλείας. Cf. Matt. xxvi. 38, περίλυπός ἐστιν ἡ ψυχὴ μου ἕως θανάτου; Matt. xiv. 34. The essence of death, accordingly, does not consist in the extinction of the man, but far rather in the fact of its depriving him of what he might have had in and through his life, and thus in forming a direct antithesis to life, so far as life is to the man a possession and a blessing. It is clear, if we consider man's psychological constitution (*vid.* ψυχὴ, πνεῦμα), that we must not identify the man with his life, as we do in the case of the lower animals. Man and the life of man are not identical, and hence the relationship between the πνεῦμα and death described in Rom. viii. 2; 2 Cor. iii. 7, 8. Apart from redemption, death triumphs universally over man, Rom. v. 14, ἐβασίλευσεν ὁ θάνατος ἐπὶ τοὺς κ.τ.λ., cf. vi. 9, θάνατος αὐτοῦ οὐκέτι κυριεύει; but man's relation to life is the reverse of this; *vid.* ζωή. The power of sin shows itself in death; Rom. v. 21, ἐβασίλευσεν ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ; 1 Cor. xv. 56, τὸ κέντρον τοῦ θανάτου ἡ ἁμαρτία. Man's life, forfeited to sin, encounters its results, Rom. vii. 5, τὰ παθήματα τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν . . . ἐνεργεῖτο ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν ἡμῶν εἰς τὸ καρποφορῆσαι τῷ θανάτῳ; vi. 16. In a word, it is not an isolated occurrence or fact merely, it is also a state, just as life is a state,—it is the state of man as liable to judgment. It is the antithesis of that eternal life which God had purposed for man, and which man may yet obtain through Christ; see Rom. vi. 23; 1 John iii. 14–16; the opposite of life as blessing and salvation; cf. 2 Cor. iii. 7, 8, where there is the antithesis of θάνατος and πνεῦμα. So also, *e.g.*, Matt. iv. 16 (from Isa. ix. 1, cf. Jer. ii. 6), τοῖς καθημένοις ἐν χώρα καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου φῶς ἀνέτειλεν, referring to the revelation of the gospel to the nations destitute of it, Luke i. 79. Θάνατος must be taken to denote a state, especially in the writings of St. John; 1 John iii. 14, μεταβεβήκαμεν ἐκ τοῦ θανάτου εἰς τὴν ζωὴν . . . μένει ἐν τῷ θαν. John v. 24, εἰς κρίσιν οὐκ ἔρχεται ἀλλὰ μεταβέβηκεν ἐκ τοῦ θανάτου εἰς τὴν ζωὴν. Cf. Rom. vii. 10, εὐρέθη μοι ἡ ἐντολὴ ἢ εἰς ζωὴν αὕτη εἰς θάνατον. Hence we find that, according to the context, the reference is either (a) to death as the objective sentence and punishment appointed for man, or (b) to death as the state in which man is as condemned through sin.

The former we find in John viii. 51, *θάνατον οὐ μὴ θεωρήσῃ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*; ver. 52, *οὐ μὴ γεύσῃται θανάτου*. Rom. v. 12, 14, 17, 21, vi. 21; 1 Cor. xv. 21, 26, 54–56; 2 Cor. ii. 16, iii. 7, vii. 10; 2 Tim. i. 10; Heb. ii. 14, 15; Jas. i. 15; Acts ii. 24; Rom. vi. 9; 1 John v. 16, 17, *ἁμαρτία πρὸς θάν.*, sin on account of which the person becomes amenable to judgment, and can no more, or not again, receive the saving blessing of life. Cf. John xi. 4; Rom. vi. 16, vii. 10; Num. xviii. 22, *ἁμαρτία θανατηφόρος* = *חַטָּאת מוֹת*. Jas. ii. 8. — The latter we find in John v. 24; 1 John iii. 14; Rom. vii. 10, 13, 24, viii. 2, 6. — Death being understood in this sense, the full and final realization of salvation is represented as consisting in the removal of death, 1 Cor. xv. 26, *ἔσχατος ἐχθρὸς καταργεῖται ὁ θάνατος*, cf. Rev. xxi. 4, *ὁ θάν. οὐκ ἔσται ἔτι*; and redemption consists in freedom from the sentence of death (Rom. v. 12–14, vi. 23), or from the fear of death (Heb. ii. 14, 15), cf. Rom. viii. 2. Just the same relationship is represented between death and the gospel revelation in Luke ii. 26, Matt. xvi. 28, and parallel passages. *Θάνατος* does not occur in biblical Greek with the commonly recognised meaning, “a state of moral and spiritual insensibility or deadness.” We allow that this meaning might give weight and clearness in a certain manner to some of the passages already quoted, *e.g.* Rom. vi. 16, 17, vii. 10, 11, viii. 6; 2 Cor. ii. 16, iii. 6, 7; but this seeming profundity would only be the deadening of the keenness and point of the expressions; *vid. νεκρός*. As to 1 Tim. v. 6, *vid. θνήσκω*.

(III.) *Ὁ θάνατος ὁ δεύτερος*, Rev. ii. 11, xx. 6, 14, xxi. 8 (a Rabbinical expression, see Wetstein on Rev. ii. 11), to which they are appointed whose names are not written in the book of life, and which follows the general resurrection (xx. 12–15), must be a judgment which comes as a second and final sentence, and which is something still future before the first resurrection, for the partakers of that resurrection are not affected by it (xx. 6). Their perfect freedom from all the consequences of sin and the full realization of their salvation is also expressed in ii. 11, *οὐ μὴ ἀδικηθῇ ἐκ τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ δευτέρου*.

Ἀθανασία, ἡ, *immortality*,—a word which originally belonged to the profane sphere, and used in a formal sense in the concrete meaning of the adjective *ἀθάνατος*; cf. Plato, *Deff.* 405a, *ἀθ. οὐσία ἔμψυχος καὶ αἰδῖος μονή*. The substantive occurs first in Plato. Primarily it was predicated of the gods (*vid. θνητός*), and afterwards was used to express the immortality of the soul in the sense of its abiding existence, without any definiteness or fulness in the conception. (Plato, *Phaedr.* 245 C sqq.) It occurs in Wisd. viii. 13, cf. iv. 1, as synonymous with *μνήμη αἰώνιος*. But in that same book we trace a transition to a more positive sense, viii. 17, *ἐστὶν ἀθανασία ἐν συγγενείᾳ σοφίας, καὶ ἐν φιλίᾳ αὐτῆς τέρψις ἀγαθή*; xv. 3, *εἰδέναι τὸ κράτος σου ῥίζα ἀθανασίας*. Cf. iii. 4, *ἡ ἐλπίς αὐτῶν ἀθανασίας πλήρης*, with *ἐλπίς ζωσα*, 1 Pet. i. 3. The conception is by no means adequate to express N. T. or indeed O. T. views, and is of no avail or significance beside the positive *ζωή*, for *ἀθανασία* is not life itself, but, strictly speaking, only a quality of it. In the N. T. it only occurs in 1 Tim. vi. 16 concerning God, *ὁ μόνος ἔχων ἀθανά-*

σίαν (*vid.* θνητός), and in 1 Cor. xv. 53, δεῖ γὰρ τὸ θνητὸν τοῦτο ἐνδύσασθαι ἀθανασίαν, ver. 54, where it is easy to see how different its import is from the Platonic and natural ἀθανασία of the soul.

Ἀποθνήσκω, fut. ἀποθανοῦμαι, aor. ἀπέθανον, literally = *to die away*, but usually = *to die*, and employed always as the simple verb. Like θάνατος, the word is used in N. T. Greek (I.) *of the natural end of life*, Matt. viii. 32, ix. 24, xxii. 24; Heb. ix. 27, xi. 13, 21; Rev. xiv. 13, and often.—(II.) *To suffer death as the judicial penalty attached to sin*, to be deprived of life as the distinctive divinely given blessing. Hence the apparently enigmatical expressions of our Lord in the Gospel of St. John vi. 50, ἵνα τις ἐξ αὐτοῦ φάγη καὶ μὴ ἀποθάνῃ. Cf. ver. 58, ἀπέθανον, in antithesis with ζήσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα; xi. 25, 26, ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ κἂν ἀποθάνῃ ζήσεται, καὶ πᾶς ὁ ζῶν καὶ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ οὐ μὴ ἀποθάνῃ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, viii. 21, 24, ἀποθανεῖσθε ἐν τῇ, ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις. The context shows whether or not the death of the body is included (as is usually the case in θάνατος). Rom. viii. 13, εἰ γὰρ κατὰ σάρκα ζῆτε, μέλλετε ἀποθνήσκειν; v. 15; Rev. iii. 2, στήρισον τὰ λοιπὰ ἃ ἐμελλον ἀποθανεῖν; Rom. vii. 10, ἡ ἁμαρτία ἀνέζησεν, ἐγὼ δὲ ἀπέθανον κ.τ.λ.; cf. vv. 13, 24; Jude 12, δένδρα . . . δις ἀποθανόντα. We must particularly keep in view the representation of death as a punitive sentence, when mention is made of the death of Christ (as in Rom. v. 6, 8, viii. 34, xiv. 9, 15, etc.), and in the language of St. Paul bearing upon this, e.g. 2 Cor. v. 15, εἰ εἰς ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀπέθανεν, ἄρα οἱ πάντες ἀπέθανον; Rom. vi. 7, ὁ γὰρ ἀποθανὼν δεδικαίωται ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας; ver. 8; Col. iii. 3, ἀπεθάνετε γὰρ κ.τ.λ. (Cf. the synonymous ἀπόλλυσθαι, John xi. 50; Rom. xiv. 15; 1 Cor. viii. 11.) Akin to these are the Pauline combinations of ἀποθνήσκω, e.g. Rom. vi. 2, 10, τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ; Gal. ii. 19, νόμῳ, cf. Rom. vii. 6; Col. ii. 20, ἀποθάνετε σὺν Χριστῷ ἀπὸ τῶν στοιχείων τοῦ κόσμου. Ἀποθνήσκω, when thus used (like ἀπογίνεσθαι, 1 Pet. ii. 24), does not simply, in a figurative sense, mean the dissolution of a union or relationship, but (as the σὺν Χριστῷ of Rom. vi. 8, Col. ii. 29, clearly shows) the apostle in using it has always in his mind the relation produced by faith to the death of Christ, cf. 2 Cor. v. 15. Bearing all this in mind, it is also clear how the matter stands with reference to ἀποθανεῖν ὑπὲρ (used of the death of Christ, Rom. v. 6–8, xiv. 15; 2 Cor. v. 15; 1 Thess. v. 10, cf. John xi. 50, 51, xviii. 14); if it does not actually express the substitutionary import of Christ's death (cf. διὰ, 1 Cor. viii. 11), it has meaning only upon the principle of this substitutionary import.—Συναποθνήσκειν, "to share death with," Mark xiv. 31; 2 Cor. vii. 3; 2 Tim. ii. 11.

In further proof of the vainly combated force of ὑπὲρ in this combination as denoting substitution, we may compare Isa. xliii. 3, 4, ἐποίησα ἄλλαγμα σου Αἴγυπτον καὶ Αἰθιοπίαν, καὶ Σοῦνην ὑπὲρ σοῦ. ἀφ' οὗ ἔντιμος ἐγένου ἐναντίον ἐμοῦ, ἐδοξάσθης καὶ ἐγὼ σε ἠγάπησα καὶ δώσω ἀνθρώπους ὑπὲρ σου καὶ ἄρχοντας ὑπὲρ τῆς κεφαλῆς σου. Also ὑπεραποθνήσκειν, Plat. *Conv.* 179 B = *to die for one another*, καὶ μὴν ὑπεραποθνήσκειν γε μόνοι ἐθέλουσιν οἱ ἐρώντες . . . Τούτου δὲ καὶ ἡ Πελίου θυγάτηρ Ἀλκίσις ἱκανὴν μαρτυρίαν παρέχεται

εἰς τοὺς Ἕλληνας, ἐβελήσασα μόνη ὑπὲρ τοῦ αὐτῆς ἀνδρὸς ἀποθανεῖν. Dying is represented as the person's spontaneous act in Rom. xiv. 7, 8, cf. Bengel, *eadem ars moriendi quas vivendi*.—Συναποθνήσκειν, *to die in common with*, Mark xiv. 31; 2 Cor. vii. 3; 2 Tim. ii. 11.

Θυμός, οὐ, ό, from θύω, which fundamentally denotes *violent movement*; and from this (according to Curtius, p. 233) spring three modifications: "(1) *to rush, to rouse*; (2) *to fume, to incense*; (3) *to sacrifice*. The mental import of the word comes figuratively from 1." Connected with the Sanscrit *dhû*, *to shake, to enflame*, *dhûmas*, *smoke*, and with the German *Dunst*, *vapour*, *fumes*, θυμός signifies *life in its activity and excitement*, Plat. *Crat.* 419 E, θυμός δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς θύσεως καὶ ζέσεως τῆς ψυχῆς ἔχου ἂν τοῦτο τοῦνομα. First in a physical sense = *breath of life*, e.g. Homer, *Il.* xiii. 654, τὸ μὲν λίπε θυμός. Then of every excitation of life in free action = *spirit, courage*; in repelling opponents = *wrath*; in desire = *impulse, longing*, see Lexicons. Tittm. *Syn.* p. 132, "*quum θυμός proprie ipsum animum denotet, a spiritu quem exhalamus, deinde ad omnem animi vehementiorem impetum transfertur, quasi exhalatio vehementior*." It is used in a very comprehensive sense by Homer and the tragic poets to denote thought and feeling throughout the psychical as well as the physical life; but in Plato, Thucydides, and later writers, its use is limited to the ebullition of wrath, the outgo of courage, and excitement of feeling generally. So likewise by the LXX., who render תַּחַב, תַּחַבָּ, and תַּחַב, Job xv. 13, Prov. xviii. 14 = *excited feeling*, by θυμός, cf. Ps. vi. 8; Ecclus. xxvi. 28. In the N. T. only = *wrath*, Luke iv. 28; Acts xix. 28; Heb. xi. 27. Side by side with other affections, 2 Cor. xii. 20; Gal. v. 20; Rev. xii. 12, xv. 1. With ὀργή, Rom. ii. 8, Eph. iv. 31, Col. iii. 8, Rev. xvi. 19, ό θυμός τῆς ὀργῆς, xix. 15, θυμός denotes the inward excitement, and ὀργή the outward manifestation of it, cf. Deut. xxix. 20, 24; Num. xxxii. 14; Isa. ix. 19; Josh. vii. 26; 1 Sam. xxviii. 18, etc. With οἶνος τοῦ θυμοῦ, Rev. xiv. 10, xvi. 19, xix. 15, ληνός τοῦ θ., xv. 7, xvi. 1, φιάλαι τοῦ θ., comp. Ps. lx. 5, lxxv. 9; Isa. li. 17, 22; Jer. xxv. 15, xlix. 12; Isa. lxiii. 3, 4. With Rev. xiv. 8, xviii. 3, ό οἶνος τοῦ θυμοῦ τῆς πορνείας, cf. Deut. xxxii. 33, θυμός δρακόντων ό οἶνος αὐτῶν. In this expression there are not two different representations combined, "the wine of whoredom and of the divine wrath" (Düsterdieck, with reference to Jer. li. 7), but "the wine of whoredom" is called "the wine of wrath," because it ends in the ruin of those who drink it. Cf. θυμός = *poison*, Wisd. xvi. 5; Job xx. 16; Deut. xxxii. 24.

Ἐπιθυμέω, *to have the affections directed towards anything, to desire, to long after*, with genitive following, Matt. v. 28; Acts xx. 33; 1 Tim. iii. 1; with the infinitive, Matt. xiii. 17 (synonymous with θέλειν, Luke x. 24); Luke xv. 16, xvi. 21, xvii. 22, xxii. 15; 1 Pet. i. 12; Rev. ix. 6; followed by the accusative with the infinitive, Heb. vi. 11. Ἐπιθυμεῖν κατὰ τινος, *to rise up lustfully against*, Gal. v. 17. It serves to denote an immoral and illegitimate longing or coveting in Rom. vii. 7, xiii. 9, οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις, from Ex. xx. 14, תַּחַבְתָּ אֵל, where, however, in the Hebrew and LXX. the object follows.

This extended use of the verb, which we find fully in ἐπιθυμία, may be accounted for by the fact that *desire* has for its correlative *insatiableness*, cf. Ex. xx. 14; Jas. iv. 2, ἐπιθυμεῖτε καὶ οὐκ ἔχετε. So perhaps also 1 Cor. x. 6, εἰς τὸ μὴ εἶναι ἡμῶς ἐπιθυμητὰς κακῶν, καθὼς κακέينوι ἐπεθύμησαν. Of amorous desires = *amore capi sive honesto, sive inhonesto* (Sturz, *lex. Xen.*), cf. Xen. *Anab.* iv. 1. 14, ἡ παιδὸς ἐπιθύμησας ἡ γυναικός; Matt. v. 28.

Ἐπιθυμία, ἡ, *what is directed towards anything, desire which attaches itself to (ἐπι-) its object, desire*; Luke xxii. 15; Phil. i. 23; 1 Thess. ii. 17; Rev. xviii. 14. In classical Greek, as a *vox media*, the moral character of the desire is determined according to the object named, cf. Mark iv. 19, αἱ περὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἐπ. (Luke viii. 14, ἡδοναὶ τοῦ βίου; Titus iii. 3; Col. iii. 5, ἐπ. κακῇ); 2 Pet. ii. 10, ἐπ. μiasμοῦ. In the N. T., we might say, it is determined according to the subject, cf. John viii. 44, τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν θέλετε ποιεῖν; Rom. i. 24, ἐπιθυμῖαι τῶν καρδιῶν, cf. Eccles. v. 2; Rom. vi. 12, αἱ ἐπ. τοῦ σώματος; Gal. v. 16, ἐπ. σαρκός, cf. ver. 24; Eph. ii. 3; 1 John ii. 16; 2 Pet. ii. 18.—1 John ii. 16, ἡ ἐπ. τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν, cf. Matt. v. 29; 1 Pet. iv. 2, ἀνθρώπων ἐπιθυμῖαι, in antithesis with θέλημα θεοῦ, cf. 2 Pet. iii. 3, κατὰ τὰς ιδίας αὐτῶν ἐπιθυμίας πορευόμενοι; Jude 16, 18. In these cases it denotes the *lusting of a will* which is not in conformity with God's will; cf. 1 John ii. 17, ὁ κόσμος παράγεται καὶ ἡ ἐπιθυμία αὐτοῦ· ὁ δὲ ποιῶν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ; Titus ii. 12, αἱ κοσμικαὶ ἐπ.; Jas. i. 14, ἡ ἰδία ἐπ.; 2 Tim. iv. 3; Eph. iv. 22, αἱ ἐπ. τῆς ἀπάτης. Further, ἐπιθυμία, answering to the moral nature of man everywhere presupposed, is used, when it stands alone, of the *desire of sinful lust*, a use anticipated in Wisd. iv. 12; Eccles. xviii. 30, xxi. 5. So first in the plural, Rom. xiii. 14, τῆς σαρκὸς πρόνοιαν μὴ ποιεῖσθε εἰς ἐπιθυμίας; Titus iii. 3, δουλεύοντες ἐπιθυμίαις καὶ ἡδοναῖς ποικίλαις; 1 Pet. i. 14, αἱ πρότερον ἐν τῇ ἀγνοίᾳ ὑμῶν ἐπιθυμῖαι; iv. 3, πορεύεσθαι ἐν ἀσελγείαις, ἐπιθυμίαις κ.τ.λ. Then in the singular, Rom. vii. 7, 8, ἡ ἁμαρτία κατειργάσατο ἐν ἐμοὶ πᾶσαν ἐπιθυμίαν; 1 Thess. iv. 5, ἐν πάθει ἐπιθυμίας; comp. Gal. v. 24, τὴν σάρκα ἐσταύρωσαν σὺν τοῖς παθήμασιν καὶ ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις; Col. iii. 5. Cf. πάθη ἀτιμίας, Rom. i. 26. Hofmann on Gal. v. 24, "παθήματα, *passive excitations*; ἐπιθυμῖαι, *self-stirrings of the sinful nature*;" 2 Pet. i. 4, ἡ ἐν κόσμῳ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθορά (cod. Sin. ἡ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐπιθυμία φθορᾶς); Jas. i. 14, 15, ἡ ἐπ. συλλαβοῦσα τίκτει ἁμαρτίαν.

Μακρόθυμος, ὁ, ἡ, *patient*; very seldom in profane Greek, *Anthologia Palatina*, xi. 317. 1, ἀντίσπαστον ἐμοὶ τις ὄνον μακρόθυμον ἔδωκεν. LXX. = מַלְאָכְךָ, of God, *long-suffering*, Ex. xxxiv. 6; Num. xiv. 8; Neh. ix. 17, and often. Dan. iv. 24, ἔσται μακρόθυμος τοῖς παραπτώμασί σου ὁ θεός; Wisd. xv. 1, μακρόθυμος καὶ ἐν ἐλέει διοικῶν τὰ πάντα. In Eccles. v. 4, in antithesis with ὀργή, ver. 6 with θυμός. Of human *patience or resoluteness in suffering*, Eccles. vii. 8, ἀγαθὸν μακρόθυμος ὑπὲρ ὑψηλὸν πνεύματι, וְיִשְׁמַח בְּכָבוֹד מִכָּבוֹד; Eccles. i. 23, ἕως καιροῦ ἀνθέξεται μακρόθυμος, καὶ ὕστερον αὐτῷ ἀναδώσει εὐφροσύνη, in antithesis with ver. 22, θυμὸς ἄδικος. In the N. T. the adverb only occurs, Acts xxvi. 3, μακροθύμως ἀκοῦσαί μου.

Μακροθυμία, ή, patience, likewise rare in profane Greek; Menand. *Fr.* 19, ἄνθρωπος ὦν μηδέποτε τὴν ἀλυπίαν αἰτοῦ παρὰ θεῶν, ἀλλὰ τὴν μακροθυμίαν; Plut. *Lucull.* xxxii. 3, μακροθυμίαν ἐμβαλέσθαι ταῖς ψυχαῖς; xxxiii. 1, ἀρετὴν μὲν ἐπεδείκνυτο καὶ μακροθυμίαν ἡγεμόνος ἀγαθοῦ = *steadfastness*.—(I.) In this sense = *patience* or *endurance*, Isa. lvi. 15, ὀλιγοψύχοις διδοὺς μακροθυμίαν, καὶ διδοὺς ζωὴν συντετριμμένοις τὴν καρδίαν; cf. Job vii. 16, οὐ γὰρ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ζήσομαι, ἵνα μακροθυμήσω; 1 Macc. viii. 4, κατεκράτησαν τοῦ τόπου παντὸς τῇ βουλῇ αὐτῶν καὶ τῇ μακροθυμίᾳ. So in the N. T. synonymous with ὑπομονή, Col. i. 11, δυναμούμενοι κατὰ τὸ κράτος τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ εἰς πᾶσαν ὑπομονὴν καὶ μακροθυμίαν; Heb. vi. 12, μιμηταὶ τῶν διὰ πίστεως καὶ μακροθυμίας κληρονομούντων τὰς ἐπαγγελίας; cf. x. 36, ὑπομονῆς ἔχετε χρεῖαν, ἵνα τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ ποιήσαντες κομίσησθε τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν; Jas. v. 10, ὑπόδειγμα τῆς κακοπαθείας καὶ τῆς μακροθυμίας; 2 Tim. iii. 10.—(II.) Opposed to ὀργή, θυμός, and synonymous with πραότης, *patience* in one's bearing towards others, Prov. xxv. 15, ἐν μακροθυμίᾳ εὐδοκία βασιλεύσει; Ecclus. v. 11, γίνου ταχὺς ἐν ἀκροάσει σου, καὶ ἐν μακροθυμίᾳ φθέγγου ἀπόκρισιν. So in the N. T. Gal. v. 22, μακροθυμία, χρηστότης, ἀγαθωσύνη; Eph. iv. 2, μετὰ πάσης ταπεινοφροσύνης καὶ πραύτητος, μετὰ μακροθυμίας, ἀνεχόμενοι ἀλλήλων ἐν ἀγάπῃ; Col. iii. 12; 2 Tim. iv. 2.—(III.) *Of the long-suffering of God*, which delays punishment, see μακρόθυμος and μακροθυμέω, Rom. ix. 22, ἤνεγκεν ἐν πολλῇ μ. σκευὴ ὀργῆς; ii. 4; 1 Pet. iii. 20; 2 Pet. iii. 15, τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν μακροθυμίαν σωτηρίαν ἡγεῖσθε.—Jer. xv. 15, see μακροθυμέω.

Μακροθυμέω, (I.) to be steadfast or patient, Plut. *Socr. daem.* 593 F; Job vii. 16, οὐ γὰρ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ζήσομαι, ἵνα μακροθυμήσω; Heb. vi. 15, μακροθυμήσας ἐπέτυχεν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, see μακροθυμία; Jas. v. 7, μακροθυμήσατε . . . ἕως τῆς παρουσίας τοῦ κυρίου; ver. 8, μακροθυμήσατε . . . στηρίζετε τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν κ.τ.λ.; Bar. iv. 25, μακροθυμήσατε τὴν παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπελθοῦσαν ὑμῖν ὀργήν; Ecclus. ii. 4, ἐν ἀλλάγμασι ταπεινώσεως σου μακροθύμησον.—2 Macc. viii. 26, οὐκ ἐμακροθύμησαν κατὰτρέχοντες αὐτούς.—(II.) To be patient or long-suffering towards others, Ecclus. xxix. 8, ἐπὶ ταπεινῷ μακροθύμησον καὶ ἐλεημοσύνην μὴ παρελκύης αὐτόν; Prov. xix. 11, ἐλεήμων ἀνὴρ μακροθυμεῖ = יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ. So in the N. T. 1 Cor. xiii. 4, ἡ ἀγάπη μακροθυμεῖ; 1 Thess. v. 14, μακροθυμεῖτε πρὸς πάντας; Matt. xviii. 26, 29, μακροθύμησον ἐπ' ἐμοί.—(III.) Specially of the long-suffering of God, Ecclus. xviii. 11, διὰ τοῦτο ἐμακροθύμησε κύριος ἐπ' αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐξέχεεν ἐπ' αὐτοὺς τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ; xxxii. 22, καὶ κρινεῖ δικαίως καὶ ποιήσει κρίσιν· καὶ ὁ κύριος οὐ μὴ βραδύνη οὐδὲ μὴ μακροθυμήσει ἐπ' αὐτοῖς; 2 Macc. vi. 14, οὐ γὰρ καθάπερ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἐθνῶν ἀναμένει μακροθυμῶν ὁ δεσπότης μέχρι τοῦ καταντήσαντας αὐτοὺς πρὸς ἐκπλήρωσιν ἁμαρτιῶν κολάσει. So Matt. xviii. 26, 29; 2 Pet. iii. 9.—(IV.) To tarry, to delay. For this meaning, comp. Jer. xv. 15, κύριε, μνήσθητί μου καὶ ἐπίσκεψαί με καὶ ἀθώωσόν με ἀπὸ τῶν καταδικαζόντων με, μὴ εἰς μακροθυμίαν = יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ, for which another reading has μὴ εἰς μακροθυμίαν σου λάβης με. So Luke xviii. 7, ὁ δὲ θεὸς οὐ μὴ ποιήσῃ τὴν ἐκδίκησιν τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν αὐτοῦ τῶν βοώντων αὐτῷ

ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτὸς, καὶ μακροθυμῶν (Lachm., Tisch., Cod. Sin. μακροθυμεῖ) ἐπ' αὐτοῖς; cf. ver. 4, καὶ οὐκ ἤθελεν ἐπὶ χρόνον. The explanation of ἐπ' αὐτοῖς, which refers it not to the ἐκλεκτοί, but to their ἀντίδικοι, and somewhat awkwardly borrowed from Ecclus. xxxii. 22, is too forced; the combination μακροθυμεῖν ἐπὶ τινι, moreover, does not necessarily signify *to have patience with some one*, cf. Jas. v. 7, ὁ γεωργὸς ἐκδέχεται τὸν τίμιον καρπὸν τῆς γῆς, μακροθυμῶν ἐπ' αὐτῷ, ἕως λάβῃ πρῶϊμον καὶ ὄψιμον. It is the divine μακροθυμία which seems βραδύτης with reference to the elect waiting for help, the two being placed in antithesis in 2 Pet. iii. 9, and co-ordinated together in Ecclus. xxxii. 22. As to the thing meant, see Rev. vi. 10.

Θύω, to offer, to sacrifice, see θυμός. In a ritualistic sense, primarily = *to smoke or burn incense*; as Aristarch on Homer, *Il.* ix. 219, observes, θύω in Homer is never σφάζει, but θυμιάσαι (Pape). Cf. Acts vii. 42. Thence generally = *to offer*, of bloody and unbloody offerings, and only in a derived sense it means *to slay*, Luke xv. 23, 27, 30; Acts x. 13, xi. 7; Matt. xxii. 4; *to kill*, John x. 10, cf. Eurip. *Iph. T.* 1332, ξίφει θύουσα θῆλος ἀρσέναις. The lexicographers rightly designate this signification derived and figurative; it occurs, moreover, only seldom in profane Greek. With the meaning, *to sacrifice*, LXX. = תָּבַח, also טָהַח. In the N. T. Acts xiv. 13, 18; 1 Cor. x. 20. It is doubtful whether θύειν τὸ πάσχα, Mark xiv. 12, Luke xxii. 7, 1 Cor. v. 7, is = *to slay*, or *to offer the passover*. LXX. = תָּבַח תָּבַח, Deut. xvi. 2; תָּבַח טָהַח, 2 Chron. xxx. 15, cf. Ex. xii. 48, ποιῆσαι τὸ πάσχα κυρίου. This depends upon the question whether the passover was a sacrifice in the true sense. First of all, it is undeniable that θύειν, like תָּבַח, is always, both in classical Greek and biblical, when the reference is to a performance of a religious character = *to offer*. (The combinations γάμους, γενέθλια, ἐπινίκια θύειν, rest upon the fact that no offering could be without feasting, no feast without offering.) The passover, accordingly, is already described as an *offering* or *sacrifice* when תָּבַח, טָהַח, θύειν, is applied to it. When it is said that תָּבַח, when used of the passover, does not necessarily designate it as a sacrifice, as Hofmann would prove, simply by referring to Prov. xvii. 1, 1 Sam. xxviii. 24, this objection is really met by the lexical fact that we have stated, and it is wholly invalidated by the twice repeated תָּבַח in Ex. xxxiv. 25. Comp. also תָּבַח, the only meaning of which, *altar*, whether altar of burnt-offering or altar of incense, confirms the usage as to תָּבַח. The sacrificial character of the passover is further decisively proved in St. John's writings; cf. John xix. 36 with 1 John i. 7, John i. 29, 36, *vid. ἀμνός*. 1 Cor. v. 7 also does not admit of a doubt, even though we may not read τὸ πάσχα ἡμῶν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐτύθη (cf. Xen. *An.* v. 6. 28, θύομαι μὲν . . . καὶ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν καὶ ὑπὲρ ἐμαντοῦ, *I cause to be offered*, etc.), but with Lachm., Tisch., τὸ πάσχα ἡμῶν ἐτύθη. For as St. Paul always regards Christ's death as a sacrifice, we could not omit the idea of a sacrifice here, even if the usage of θύειν were different from what it is. Further, for the sacrificial character of the passover, compare also Ex. xii. 5 with ver. 48, Lev. xxii. 20, Num. ix. 7, 13, Deut. xvi. 2-4. The sacrificial character of the first passover,

reflected as it is in the death of Christ, is, however, different from that of the yearly commemorative feast.

Θυσία, ἡ, literally, *the act of sacrificing or offering*, e.g. Xen. *Cyrop.* iii. 3. 34 (18), ἐπεὶ δὲ τέλος εἶχεν ἡ θυσία. Hence and usually = **sacrifice**; with but few exceptions used in the LXX. as the ordinary word for זָבַח and מִנְחָה, while the general expression קָרָן is = δῶρον (very seldom = προσφορά, though the LXX. have introduced προσφέρειν as a rendering of קָרָן, in a sense quite foreign to classical Greek). This transference of meaning may appear strange, for זָבַח generally occurs in the Pentateuch in conjunction with שְׁלָמִים, and therefore only of one kind of sacrifice, as distinct from עֹלָה, Ex. x. 25, xviii. 12; Lev. xvii. 8; Num. xv. 3, 5. The primary meaning of זָבַח, however, is more comprehensive, always denoting a sacrifice, and in particular a bloody sacrifice, cf. זָבַח = *to sacrifice*, Ex. xx. 24; Lev. ix. 4; and especially מִזְבֵּחַ = *altar, place of sacrifice*. Perhaps the ordinary use of זָבַח was owing to the fact that in נֶחֱמִים שְׁלָמִים prominence is given to what the sacrifice strictly was to be (see below), corresponding with the idea of sacrifice which is realized in the N. T. fellowship, Rom. xii. 1; Phil. ii. 17, iv. 18; Heb. xiii. 15, 16; 1 Pet. ii. 5. In classical Greek a sacrifice is a *tribute* due to the gods, τέλος, in the highest case payment for gifts received or prayed for, compensation or amends for crimes committed or duties neglected, in contrast with which, cf. Lev. xvii. 11, “*I have given it to you.*” No further meaning can be traced in them. Hence the terms τιμαί, χάριτες, δῶρα, δωρεαί, γέρα. Cf. Plat. *Eutyp.* 14 C, τὸ θύειν δωρεῖσθαι ἐστὶ τοῖς θεοῖς, τὸ δ’ εὐχεσθαι αἰτεῖν τοὺς θεοὺς. Even the propitiatory sacrifice is, with Greek writers generally, “*simply a gift of homage on the man’s part, which, like every other δῶρον or γέρας, he accompanies with his prayer, that is, with a prayerful statement of what he wishes to obtain from the divinity in return for his gift.*” Cf. Nägelsbach, *Homer. Theol.* v. 3, vi. 26; *Nachhomer. Theol.* v. 1, 4, vi. 18. In the Scripture view, also, a sacrifice is, in its strict form, an offering due and appropriate to God, see Rom. xii. 1; Phil. ii. 17, iv. 18; Heb. xiii. 15, 16; 1 Pet. ii. 5, cf. Heb. x. 5–8.—Comp. also the epithet δεκτόν (see δεκτός) applied to sacrifice; Ps. l. 14. But when the term appears in connection with the plan of redemption, an element enters its meaning which is foreign to the profane sphere. All O. T. sacrifices, or, to speak more correctly, all sacrifices historically connected with the scheme of grace in the Bible, have especial reference to sin, cf. Heb. v. 1, πᾶς γὰρ ἀρχιερεὺς ἐξ ἀνθρώπων λαμβανόμενος ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων καθίσταται τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν, ἵνα προσφέρῃ δῶρά τε καὶ θυσίας ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν; x. 26. From this, and from the fact of the discontinuance of the rite of sacrifice upon the revelation and realization of redemption in the N. T., it is evident that sacrifice, connected with the scheme of grace, bore the character of a **substitution**. It supplies what man himself in his natural state can neither perform nor suffer, and hence it must be presented by the hand of the priest. The sacrifice alone does not represent or stand for the man for whom it is offered; it only stands for his sin (Lev. xvi. 21), or his guilt, or the duty which he owed. The hand of the priest must first come in, and priest

and sacrifice together constitute the substitutionary presentation of what the sacrifice is intended for. Christ, as at once priest and sacrifice, is that sacrifice and that priest of whom men stood in need; with Him sacrifices as previously offered cease, and the idea of sacrifice is realized in the members of the new covenant in quite a different manner,—not by a substitutionary presentation, but by a self-presentation,—not by a surrender to death, but by life, cf. Rom. xii. 1; 1 Pet. ii. 5. When the O. T. sacrifice receives the character of a tribute paid, or of a settlement, it is distinctly rejected, Matt. ix. 13, xii. 7; Hos. vi. 6. Cf. also Heb. x. 5, 8, Ps. xl. 7.—*Θυσία* is used of heathen sacrifices in Acts vii. 41, 42; of O. T. sacrifices, Matt. ix. 13, xii. 7; Mark ix. 49, xii. 33; Luke ii. 24, xiii. 1; 1 Cor. x. 18; Heb. v. 1, vii. 27, viii. 3, ix. 9, x. 1, 5, 8, 11, xi. 4. The *κρείττονες θυσίαι* of Heb. ix. 23 are contrasted with these, the reference being to Christ's sacrifice of Himself, ix. 26, x. 12. Cf. Heb. ix. 25, 26. Concerning the Christian "sacrifices" in the N. T., Rom. xii. 1, etc., see above.

Θυσιαστήριον, τό, altar, answering to the Hebrew *מִזְבֵּחַ*, and probably formed first in Hellenistic Greek, cf. Philo, *Vit. Mos.* 3, τὸ δ' ἐν ὑπαίθρῳ βωμὸν εἴωθε καλεῖν *θυσιαστήριον*, ὡσανεὶ τηρητικὸν καὶ φυλακτικὸν ὄντα θυσιῶν. It is an extremely fine feature of biblical Greek that it has not appropriated the profane *βωμός*, and uses the word, as in Ex. xxxiv. 13, Num. xxiii. 1, Deut. vii. 5 = *מִזְבֵּחַ*; Isa. xv. 2, Jer. vii. 31, Hos. x. 8 = *מִזְבֵּחַ*, only of heathen rites, with the sacrifices of which those of Scripture have nothing in common. In the N. T. *βωμός*, Acts xvii. 23; *θυσιαστήριον*, Matt. v. 23, 24, xxiii. 18, 19, 20, 35; Luke i. 11, xi. 51; Rom. xi. 3; 1 Cor. ix. 13, x. 18; Heb. vii. 13, xiii. 10; Jas. ii. 21; Rev. vi. 9, viii. 3, 5, ix. 13, xi. 1, xiv. 18, xvi. 7.

I

Ἱερός, á, óν, holy, sacred, reverend, that which stands in any relation to God, or claims any connection with the Divine,—a designation of the outward appearance of the divine majesty. The root meaning is, according to Curtius (*Grundzüge der Griech. Etymol.* i. 369), *strong, mighty, great*, cf. the Latin *vis*. This and the Homeric combinations, *ἱερὸν φυλάκων τέλος*, *Il.* x. 56; *ἱερὸς στράτος*, *Od.* xxiv. 81; *ἱερὸς δίφρος*, *Il.* xvii. 464, and others, might suggest, as the idea bound up with *ἱερός*, the same as is expressed by the German *hehr* (*reverend, sacred, awful*). See further under *ἅγιος*, where the conception is more fully explained. The neuter τό *ἱερόν* = *sacred place* or *thing*, temple as well as sacrifice; the plural = *sacred things*, everything belonging to the sacred service, utensils and offices, but especially sacrifices, comp. 1 Cor. ix. 13.—*Ἱερός* occurs in the profane authors frequently; in biblical Greek, on the contrary, very seldom, and *ἅγιος* takes its place; for not only is *ἱερός*, in its root-meaning, not a moral conception like *ἅγιος*, but it abides even in linguistic usage so external a predicate that it is not once in the profane sphere attributed to the gods, and very rarely to men; and even this, again, in no ethical

sense whatever. As the peculiarly ritualistic word of profane Greek, it must have appeared to the LXX. much too profane by any possibility to be used in the place of the Scripture שָׁמַיִם . "The jubilee trumpets which the priests blew are called once (Josh. vi. 8), by a free translation, *ἱεραὶ σάλπιγγες*; but even in this case, where the externality of the relation is so fully preserved, it is an *ἄπαξ λεγόμενον*. Precisely where the priest is constantly called *ἱερεὺς*, we might expect the sanctuary at least to be called *τὸ ἱερόν*" (query, the priest is called *ἱερεὺς* on account of the *sacrifice*). "We find it, however, only in one passage in Chronicles (1 Chron. xxix. 4) and in one in Ezekiel (Ezek. xlix. 19), where בֵּית in the one instance, and the Aramaic בֵּית in the other, denoting 'house' and 'court' in the purely external sense, are so translated. But it is probably fine discrimination on the part of the translator of Ezekiel, when he uses *τὸ ἱερόν* in speaking of the holy places of the *heathen* Tyre (Ezek. xxvii. 6, xxviii. 18). Only the Apocrypha of the O. T. betrays here the influence of the worldly diction. There *ἱερόν* is quite the familiar term for the temple." Zetzschwitz, *Prof.-Gréc. u. bibl. Sprachgeist*, p. 15. In the N. T. *τὸ ἱερόν* in the Gospels and Acts is = *temple*, and in the same sense as in Josephus, *Antt.* xv. 11, *Bell. Jud.* v. 5, who, following the Greek usage, calls the temple buildings as a whole (Matt. xxiv. 1, *τὰς οἰκοδομὰς τοῦ ἱεροῦ*) *ἱερόν*; yet he calls the temple itself, as also the Holy of Holies, *ναός*. According to Ammon. *ἱερά* denotes *τοὺς περιβόλους τῶν ναῶν*; Thucyd. iv. 90, *τάφρον μὲν κύκλῳ περὶ τὸ ἱερόν καὶ τὸν νεὼν ἔσκαπτον*; i. 134; Herod. i. 183. Cf. Acts xix. 24, 27 (*ναός*, the part of the holy place where the image of the god stands). In no case can it be said that *τὸ ἱερόν* denotes also single parts of the temple, as, *e.g.*, the holy place, Matt. xii. 5, 6; the various courts, Matt. xxi. 12, 23, John ii. 14; but it is a name for the whole. Where in any way there is a reference to typical signification, we have, as in the Apocrypha, *ναός*, or, as in Hebrews, *τὰ ἅγια*.—1 Cor. ix. 13, *οἱ τὰ ἱερά ἐργαζόμενοι ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἐσθίουσιν*, they who perform the holy service eat of the sacrifice. The adj. only in 2 Tim. iii. 15, *τὰ ἱερά γράμματα*, cf. ver. 16, *πᾶσα γραφὴ θεόπνευστος*.

Ἱερεὺς, *έως*, *ὁ*, he who has the care of *τὰ ἱερά*, the sacrifices = *θύτης*, *θυτήρ*, Acts xiv. 13, *ὁ ἱερεὺς τοῦ Διὸς . . . ἤθελεν θύειν*. Priest, whose function among the Greeks was, according to Aesch. iii. 18, *τὰ γέρα λαμβάνειν καὶ τὰς εὐχὰς ὑπὲρ τοῦ δήμου πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς εὐχεσθαι*; Plat. *Politic.* 290 C, D; Aristot. *Polit.* vii. 8, *πρῶτον δὲ εἶναι δεῖ τὴν περὶ τοὺς θεοὺς ἐπιμέλειαν, ἣν καλοῦσιν ἱερατείαν*. The priesthood was among the Greeks only a calling, not a separate caste or order, Isocr. ii. 6, *τὴν βασιλείαν ὥσπερ ἱερωσύνην παντὸς ἀνδρὸς εἶναι νομίζουσιν*; cf. Nägelsbach, *Homer. Theol.* v. 5, *Nachhomer. Theol.* v. 1. 12.—In the history of redemption, also, the priesthood exists on account of the sacrifice, cf. Heb. x. 11, *πᾶς ἱερεὺς* (Iachm. *ἀρχιερεὺς*) *ἔστηκεν καθ' ἡμέραν λειτουργῶν καὶ τὰς αὐτὰς πολλάκις προσφέρων θυσίας*, cf. viii. 3, 4. But as with the sacrifice, in the history of saving grace, so with the priesthood, it also bears the special character of substitution; and therewith is connected the setting apart of a priestly *order*. As sacrifice in general, according to its idea, is a rendering to God what is due to him, so, too,

is the priest (ἱερεὺς) a servant of God, cf. Deut. xvii. 12; Rev. vii. 15, διὰ τοῦτό εἰσιν ἐνώπιον τοῦ θρόνου τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ λατρεύουσιν αὐτῷ ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτὸς ἐν τῷ ναῷ αὐτοῦ, see *θυσία*. But so far as sacrifice in the history of saving grace is to be distinguished from sacrifice according to its idea, so far must the same distinction be made in the conception of the priesthood. What the whole people ought to be, the priests *are*, cf. Ex. xix. 3–6, Deut. vii. 6, with Num. iii. 12, 13, 45, Ex. xxviii. 1, 29, Num. xvi. Hence Isa. lxi. 6; Rev. i. 6, v. 10, xx. 6. They undertake the offering of sacrifices which stand for what man can neither do nor suffer before God, for which Christ must and should appear; they stand for the man himself in his relation to God (τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν, Heb. ii. 17, v. 1), cf. Num. viii. 19, ἐργάζεσθαι τὰ ἔργα τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ ἐν τῇ σκηνῇ τοῦ μαρτυρίου καὶ ἐξιλάσκεσθαι περὶ τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ· καὶ τῶν οὐκ ἔσται ἐν τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραὴλ προσεγγίζων πρὸς τὰ ἅγια,—a passage which clearly and distinctly declares the substitutionary character of the priesthood. This, however, they are able to do only upon the ground of their holiness, which does not belong to them as an inner personal quality, but may be possessed by them historically only through the divine election and separation of them as God's property; Num. xvi. 5; cf. Heb. v. 4. If the מִשְׁרֵת, שָׂרֵת, Ex. xxviii. 1, Deut. xvii. 12, is the designation of the priest according to the idea of what he is, the import of his office in the history of redemption is expressed by קָרַב, קָרְבִּי, Lev. x. 3, xxi. 17, 21, 23; Ezek. xlii. 13, xliv. 13; cf. Ex. xix. 22, הַכֹּהֲנִים הַנִּשְׁאָרִים אֶל־יְהוָה. (The derivation and original meaning of the Hebrew כֹּהֵן is doubtful. According to Fürst, the root meaning is *minister, servant*; according to Hofmann, *Weissagung und Erf.* i. 103, it denotes one who wears ornaments, *i.e.* one who occupies a distinguished post, as in Job xii. 19; Isa. lxi. 10. On the contrary, it is said to be derived from the Arabic root meaning, "to come forward in the business of another, to act as his plenipotentiary or representative," cf. *Ges. Thes.* p. 661; Hupfeld on Ps. cx. Hence the word would be as appropriate to denote royal officials in 2 Sam. viii. 18, xx. 26; 1 Kings iv. 4, cf. 1 Chron. xviii. 17,—mediation from the higher to the lower,—as also to designate the priestly mediation for the people before God—from the lower to the higher.) What further belongs to the priestly calling, the bringing back grace and blessing to the community represented before God, Lev. ix. 22, 23, Num. vi. 22–27, and the expounding and guarding of the law, Lev. x. 10, 11, Mal. ii. 7, Ezek. xliv. 23, follows readily from this root meaning. The priesthood in the history of redemption, and the corresponding sacrifice, find their perfect consummation in the priesthood of Christ, which is treated of in the Epistle to the Hebrews, v. 6, vii. 1, 3, 11, 14, 15, 17, 20, 21, 23, viii. 4, ix. 6, x. 11, 21. In Rev. i. 6, v. 10, xx. 6, the realization of the idea of sacrifice in the N. T. sphere is treated of, cf. *θυσία*. Further, cf. *ιεράτευμα, priesthood*, 1 Pet. ii. 5, 9; Ex. xix. 6.—In the Gospels and Acts also, Acts v. 24, cf. 1 Macc. xv. 1, Ex. xxxv. 19, 1 Kings i. 8, the high priest is designated *ἱερεὺς*. Cf. Josephus, *Antt.* vi. 12. 1.

Ἀρχιερεὺς, ὁ, chief priest, high priest, a dignity unknown to the Greeks, intro-

duced by Plato (*de Leg.* xli. 9. 47 A) for his ideal state. Designation of the כֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל הַחֹשֶׁבֶת שְׁמֹן הַזֵּיתִים, Lev. xxi. 10; כֹּהֵן הַפִּזְזִית כֹּהֵן הַגָּדוֹל, from Deuteronomy onwards simply כֹּהֵן, in later usage כֹּהֵן הָרִאשׁ, 2 Kings xxv. 18; Ezra vii. 5; 2 Chron. xix. 11, cf. xxiv. 6. In the LXX. generally, ὁ ἱερεὺς ὁ μέγας, also ὁ ἱερεὺς ὁ χριστός (Lev. iv. 5), ὁ ἱερεὺς; only in Lev. iv. 3, ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς ὁ κεχρισμένος. Moreover, in the Apocrypha, Philo, Josephus, where also the derivatives ἀρχιερωσύνη, ἀρχιεράομαι, ἀρχιερατεύω, are found. In the plan of redemption historically unfolded the priesthood culminates in the *high priest*, inasmuch as it was his duty to represent the whole people, Lev. iv. 5, 16; Lev. xvi.; Num. xvi. 10. In the N. T. (I.) it designates the O. T. high priest, Matt. xxvi. 3, etc. Relatively to the priestly work of Christ, Heb. ii. 17, iii. 1, iv. 14, v. 10, vi. 20, vii. 26, viii. 1, ix. 11.—(II.) Perhaps a designation of the president of the Sanhedrim, John xviii. 19, 22; Acts v. 17, 21, 27, and often (Annas); while in John xviii. 13, 24, it is applied to Caiaphas the high priest proper, cf. Luke iii. 2.—(III.) Probably also a designation of those descended from the γένος ἀρχιερατικόν, cf. Acts iv. 5, 6 with Matt. ii. 4, xvi. 21, and elsewhere. According to others, a designation of the heads of the twenty-four classes of the priests, ἄρχοντες τῶν πατριῶν τῶν ἱερέων, 1 Chron. xxiv. 6; 2 Chron. xxxvi. 14. Cf. Joseph. *Antt.* xx. 7, 8, *Bell. Jud.* iv. 3. 6. According to others, again, it denotes those who had previously held the office of high priest. Joseph. *Antt.* xviii. 2. 1, *Bell. Jud.* iv. 3. 10. Cf. Wichelhaus, *Comm. zur Leidensgesch.* p. 31 ff.

Ἱεροουργέω, to do holy service, especially *sacra peragere, sacrificare*. Herodian, v. 6. 1, v. 13.—Not in the LXX.—In Rom. xv. 16, εἰς τὸ εἶναι με λειτουργὸν Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ εἰς τὰ ἔθνη, ἱεουργοῦντα τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ, it is not figurative = *to offer the gospel*,—a sense opposed by the words that follow, ἵνα γένηται ἡ προσφορά τῶν ἐθνῶν εὐπρόσδεκτος; but = *to do holy service in the gospel*, a service by means of which the sacrifice is prepared. Cf. Theoph. *in loc.*, αὕτη μοι ἱερωσύνη τὸ καταγγέλλειν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον μάχαιραν ἔχω τὸν λόγον. θυσία ἔστε ὑμεῖς. Similarly 4 Macc. vii. 8, τοὺς ἱεουργοῦντας τὸν νόμον ἰδίῳ αἵματι. Cf. Plat. *Legg.* vi. 774 E, ἄλλη περὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα ἱεουργία.—Later used of the ritual of the Lord's Supper, Zonar. *ad Can.* 12 *Sardic.*, ἱεουργεῖν καὶ προσφέρειν τὴν ἀναίμακτον θυσίαν.

Ἱεροπρεπής, *beseeming the sacred*; Sturz, *sanctitate religionis dignus*; Xen. *Conv.* viii. 40, καὶ νῦν ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ δοκεῖς ἱεροπρεπέστατος εἶναι.—Tit. ii. 3.

Ἱεροσυλέω, to commit sacrilege. The substantive, see Acts xix. 37. In Plat. *Rep.* i. 344 B, ix. 575 B, in the same category with man-stealing.—Rom. ii. 22, ὁ βδελυσσόμενος τὰ εἰδῶλα ἱεροσυλεῖς, *scil.* τὸν θεόν, cf. Phalar. *Ep.* 110, ἱεροσυλήκατε τοὺς θεούς. The lame explanation of such an apostrophe, referring it to the robbery of heathen temples, finds no support in Deut. vii. 25, for an Israelite must have thought of the robbing of his own temple, cf. 2 Macc. iv. 39, 42, xiii. 6. Rather should we refer to Jer. vii. 9–11; Matt. xxi. 13, ὁ οἶκός μου οἶκος προσευχῆς κληθήσεται, ὑμεῖς δὲ αὐτὸν

ποιεῖτε σπήλαιον ληστῶν. Paul is referring to the Decalogue (ver. 23), primarily to the so-called commandments of the second table, vv. 21, 22; then, in the above expression, to those of the first table, whereupon ver. 23 concludes. Cf. Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* iv. 4. 3, s.v. κάθαρμα.

Ἱημι, to set in quick motion towards a certain goal, to send, to throw, etc. In biblical Greek only in compounds, among which are to be noted some abnormal forms. There occur, namely, as 3 plur. pres. ἀφιοῦσιν, συνιοῦσιν, Rev. xi. 9, 2 Cor. x. 12, Matt. xiii. 13, from the theme ἹΕΩ, for συνιᾶσιν κ.τ.λ. So Tisch., while Lachm. 2 Cor. x. 12 reads συνιᾶσιν, and accentuates the form proparoxytone in other passages, therefore traces it back to ἹΩ, cf. Luke xi. 4, ἀφίμεν (Matt. vi. 12 D, E, ἀφίμεν; Rec. ἀφίμεν; Tisch. ἀφήκαμεν). Instead of the regular participle ἰείς, Rom. iii. 11, Lachm. reads συνίων, Tisch. συνιῶν. Further, for the imperf. ἤφιον for ἡφίην or ἡφίουν, Mark i. 34, xi. 16, ἀφείς, Rev. ii. 11, for ἀφίης, from the theme ἹΕΩ, cf. τιθείς for τιθῆς. Lastly, the 3 plur. perfect pass. ἀφέωνται for ἀφείνται, from a perfect ἔωκα for εἶκα, "a Doricism tolerably current, even amongst the Attics themselves."—Buttmann, *N. T. Gramm.* §§ 108, 109; Winer, § 14. 3.

Ἀφίημι, to send away, to dismiss, to set free, synonymous with ἐλευθεροῦν, Matt. iv. 11, xix. 14, and often. Herod. v. 39, γυναῖκα ἀφιέναι, to put away a wife; 1 Cor. vii. 11–13. In general, to leave anything, to free oneself therefrom, to let alone. Matt. iv. 20, τὰ δίκτυα; v. 24, ἄφες ἐκεῖ τὸ δῶρόν σου; xix. 27; Heb. vi. 1, etc. See Lexicons. The biblical phrase, ἀφιέναι τὰς ἁμαρτίας, παραπτώματα, to forgive sins, occurring also in the same sense without object, is analogous to the profane Greek idiom, but differs also in form from it. In profane Greek we find as a rule that ἀφιέναι is used in the corresponding sense with the accusative of the person, ἀφιέναι τινά, to express the discharge or acquittal of an accused; because, either with or without the judicial sentence, the charge falls to the ground, or the punishment is remitted, and the guilty person is dealt with as if he were innocent. Cf. Plat. *Rep.* v. 451 B, ἀφιέμεν σε ὥσπερ φόνου καθαρὸν εἶναι; Plut. *Alex.* 13, ἀφῆκεν αὐτὸν πάσης αἰτίας. (Ἀπολύειν τινά τινος is found as often with the same meaning, ἀπαλλάσσειν, e.g. Dem. xxxvi. 25, ἀφῆκε καὶ ἀπήλλαξε. The synonym συγγιγνώσκειν τινί τι emphasizes the change of feeling.) So in the LXX. Gen. iv. 13, μείζων ἢ αἰτία μου τοῦ ἀφεθῆναι με; Gen. xviii. 26, cf. ver. 24; 1 Macc. x. 29. On the other hand, ἀφιέναι τινί τι occurs more frequently in the LXX., and always in the N. T. It is also to be found in Herodotus, e.g. vi. 30, ἀφῆκεν ἂν αὐτῷ τὴν αἰτίην; viii. 140. 11, εἰ βασιλεύς γε ὁ μέγας μούνοισι ὑμῖν Ἑλλήνων τὰς ἁμαρτάδας ἀπίεις ἐθέλει φίλος γενέσθαι; cf. 140. 1, Ἀθηναίοισι τὰς ἁμαρτάδας τὰς ἐξ ἐκείνων ἐς ἐμὲ γενομένας πᾶσας μετίημι. This phrase not only better represents the Hebrew = שָׁחַט, Ps. xxv. 18, xxxii. 1, 5, 6, Isa. xxxiii. 24, Gen. i. 17, Ex. xxxii. 32 = חָטָא, Lev. iv. 20, v. 10, 13, Num. xiv. 19, Isa. lv. 7, but differs from the former in not leaving open the possibility of actual innocence; whence ἀφιέναι is often used in combination with propitiation or

atonement, cf. Lev. iv. 20, Isa. xxii. 14 = 𐤀𐤓𐤕. In the religious sense the expression does not occur in profane Greek, while it is used in biblical Greek almost exclusively with this signification, answering to the meaning of ἁμαρτία, and opposed to λογίζεσθαι τὰ παραπτώματα κ.τ.λ., 2 Cor. v. 19, Rom. iv. 8; to κρατεῖν τὰς ἁμ., John xx. 23. Cf. Luke xxiii. 34, ἄφες αὐτοῖς, with Acts vii. 59, μὴ στήσης αὐτοῖς ταύτην τὴν ἁμ. Synonymous with καλύπτειν τὴν ἁμ., Rom. iv. 8, Ps. xxxii. 1; λύειν τινά, Matt. xvi. 19. For the thing, cf. Mic. vii. 19; Isa. xxxviii. 17; especially Jer. l. 20. The expression denotes, then, where it does not stand for social proceedings, the abrogation of the divine legal claims upon man (cf. ὑπόδικος, also Mark xi. 25, ἀφίετε εἴ τι ἔχετε κατὰ τινος; Luke xi. 4, ἀφίμεν παντὶ ὀφείλοντι), the remission of the amends due or of the punishment due for imperfect, sinful conduct,—that is, deliverance from suffering the divine judgment; hence Mark ii. 7, τίς δύναται ἀφίεναι ἁμαρτίας εἰ μὴ εἰς ὁ θεός; ver. 10, ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἀφίεναι ἁμ., see γῆ; hence the ἄφεσις ἁμαρτιῶν is the object of the N. T. revelation and preaching. There occurs, (I.) ἀφίεναι τινί τι, and τὰ ὀφειλήματα, Matt. vi. 12; cf. ὀφειλὴν, Matt. xviii. 32; τὸ δάνειον, xviii. 27; τὰ παραπτώματα, Matt. vi. 14, 15, Mark xi. 25, 26; τὰς ἁμαρτίας, Luke v. 20, xi. 4; John xx. 23; 1 John i. 9, ii. 12. Cf. Matt. xii. 31, 32; Mark iii. 28, iv. 12; Acts viii. 22, εἰ ἄρα ἀφεθήσεται ἡ ἐπίνοια τῆς καρδίας σου.—(II.) ἀφίεναι τι, without dative of the person, Matt. vi. 15, τὰ παραπτώμα; ix. 5, ἀφέωνται σου αἱ ἁμ.; ver. 6; Mark ii. 5, 7, 9, 10; Luke v. 21, 24, vii. 47–49; John xx. 23; Rom. iv. 7.—(III.) Without accusative of the thing, ἀφίεναι τινι, *to forgive a person, to forego the legal claim against him*, Matt. vi. 12, 15, xviii. 21, 35; Luke xi. 4. Of the divine forgiveness, Matt. vi. 14; Luke xxiii. 34, ἄφες αὐτοῖς; Jas. v. 15, ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ. Without either personal or other object, Mark xi. 26, εἰ δὲ ὑμεῖς οὐκ ἀφίετε.

Ἀφεσις, ἡ, *discharge, setting free, e.g. of a prisoner, putting away of a wife* (Ex. xviii. 2), *starting a racehorse, etc.*, cf. ἄφεσις ὑδάτων, Joel i. 20; Lam. iii. 47; θαλάσσης, 2 Sam. xxii. 16. In the other passages of the LXX. and in all passages of the N. T., only (I.) = **Setting free, remission**; in LXX. mostly with reference to the year of jubilee = 𐤀𐤓𐤕, Ezek. xlvi. 17, Lev. xxv. 10, Isa. lxi. 1 = 𐤀𐤓𐤕𐤔, Deut. xv. 1, 2, 9, xxxi. 10. An explanatory rendering of the Hebrew לְרַחֵם, Lev. xxv. 28, 30, 40, 50, xxvii. 17, xviii. 21, 23, 24. In the N. T. Luke iv. 19, κηρύξαι αἰχμαλώτοις ἄφεσιν . . . ἀποστεῖλαι τεθραυσμένους ἐν ἀφέσει; cf. Lev. xvi. 26, εἰς ἄφεσιν = 𐤀𐤓𐤕𐤔.—(II.) **Remission of debt, e.g. Dem. xxiv. 45, ὀφλήματος καὶ τάξεως**; Deut. xv. 3, τὸν ἀλλότριον ἀπαιτήσεις ὅσα ἐὰν ᾖ σοι παρ' αὐτῷ, τῷ δὲ ἀδελφῷ σου ἄφεσιν ποιήσεις τοῦ χρέους σου. *Remission of the legal punishment of a crime*, Plat. Legg. ix. 869 D, ὃ δὲ περὶ τῆς ἀφέσεως εἴρηται φόνου πατρί, ταῦτόν τοῦτο ἔστω περὶ ἀπάσης τῶν τοιούτων ἀφέσεως. Corresponding to this is the N. T. ἄφεσις ἁμαρτιῶν (not in LXX.), *the forgiveness of sins on the part of God, and with reference to the future judgment*, Matt. xxvi. 28; Mark i. 4; Luke i. 77, iii. 3, xxiv. 47; Acts ii. 38, v. 31, x. 43, xiii. 38, xxvi. 18; Col. i. 14; Heb. x. 18. τῶν παραπτωμάτων, Eph. i. 7. Absolutely ἄφεσις = **forgiveness of sins**, Mark iii. 29, Heb. ix. 22.

Παρίημι, to let pass, let go, e.g. the sails. Passive, to be exhausted, e.g. Plat. Legg. xi. 931 D, γήρα παρειμένος; Plut. Consol. ad Apollon. 1, παρειμένον τό τε σῶμα καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ὑπὸ τῆς συμφορᾶς. So Heb. xii. 12, τὰς παρειμένας χεῖρας καὶ τὰ παραλελυμένα γόνατα ἀνορθώσατε. Cf. Zeph. iii. 17; Jer. xx. 9; Isa. xxxv. 3, ἰσχύσατε, χεῖρες ἀνεμῆναι καὶ γόνατα παραλελυμένα. It has also the meaning, to allow anything, or to pardon anything, to let anything pass unnoticed, that is, unpunished; synonymous with ἀφίεναι, from which it only differs in that the latter denotes chiefly judicial remission of punishment, the former a personal leniency; whose result, however, is in like manner exemption of the particular action from punishment. Herod. vii. 161, ἄλλω παρήσομεν οὐδενὶ ναυαρχεῖν = to allow; Aristoph. Ran. 699, τὴν μίαν ταύτην παρεῖναι ξυμφορὰν αἰτουμένοις; Philostr. 517. 39, ἰκέτης γίνεταί μνησικακίαν τε αὐτῷ παρεῖναι καὶ ὀργήν = to pardon. That παρίημι alone does not signify the remission of punishment, but needs some additional word or words, as in Xen. Hipparch. vii. 10, τὰ οὖν τοιαῦτα ἀμαρτήματα οὐ χρὴ παρίεναι ἀκόλαστα; Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. iii. 35, παρίεμεν οὖν αὐτοῖς τὴν ἀμαρτάδα ταύτην ἀζήμιον (Fritzsche on Rom. iii. 25), is contradicted by the above citations, also by Ecclus. xxiii. 2, ἵνα ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀγνοήμασί μου μὴ φείσονται καὶ οὐ μὴ παρῇ τὰ ἀμαρτήματα αὐτῶν. Of the remission of taxes it is used exactly like ἀφίεναι in 1 Macc. xi. 35, πάντα ἐπαρκῶς παρίεμεν αὐτοῖς. One might be tempted to say that ἀφίεναι is = to remit punishment, παρίεναι = to leave unpunished, did not the latter appear to exclude the judicial cognition; while Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. vii. 37 (see πάρεσις), favours the meaning a remission of punishment, which implies the judicial cognition of the case in point.—On the whole, however, the word cannot be used as a synonym of ἀφίεναι.

Πάρεσις, ἡ, letting pass, relaxation. The meaning, remission of punishment (see παρίημι), occurs only in Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. vii. 37, τὴν μὲν ὀλοσχερῇ πάρεσιν οὐχ εὔροντο, τὴν δ' εἰς χρόνον ὅσον ἡξίουν ἀναβολὴν ἔλαβον, where the subjoined adjective only strengthens the contrast between remission and respite. For the rest, this passage decidedly shows that the word also in Rom. iii. 25 denotes not a temporary and conditional, but actual and full, remission of punishment, διὰ τὴν πάρεσιν τῶν προγεγονότων ἀμαρτημάτων ἐν τῇ ἀνοχῇ τοῦ θεοῦ. The word appears to have been chosen here instead of the more common ἄφεσις, only because the latter represents the characteristically N. T. salvation, which differs from the corresponding O. T. and pre-N. T. remission of punishment, in that this latter is traceable solely to the divine patience, whereas every sort of collision with God's righteousness is abolished in the N. T. forgiveness of sins, cf. ver. 26; 1 John i. 9. Not πάρεσις, but the ἀνοχὴ τοῦ θεοῦ, is the characteristic of the former forgiveness; still this long-suffering of God did not at all leave open the possibility of a later punishment, as some have supposed πάρεσις to imply, but was exercised in view of the future sacrificial death of Christ. In order simply that this anticipatory forgiveness of sins might not be confounded with the final judicial remission of punishment, Paul chooses the less used word. Cf. Heb. ix. 15 with ver. 22, x. 18, Acts xvii. 30, Wisd. xi. 23.

Συνήμι, strictly, to bring together, *e.g.* in hostile sense = to set people against one another. Then and generally confined to the sphere of mental perception = to hear, notice, perceive, recognise, understand, etc. By keeping in mind the origin of this use of the word, we shall find out its root-idea. Συνήμι must strictly denote the collecting together of the single features of an object into a whole, so that συνιέναι expresses the opposite idea to the Hebrew רב, to which it answers almost universally in the LXX. (more rarely = לשב, עד, נח); רב, strictly = to separate, to divide; cf. 1 Kings iii. 9, τοῦ συνιέναι ἀνὰ μέσον ἀγαθοῦ καὶ κακοῦ. This appears, *e.g.*, from what Arist. *Eth. Nic.* vi. 11 says of the σύνεσις, that it is simply κριτική, whereas φρόνησις is ἐπιτακτική (cf. Eph. v. 17, μὴ γίνεσθε ἄφρονες, ἀλλὰ συνιέντες τί τὸ θέλημα τοῦ κυρίου). Remembering also that, according to Aristotle (*l.c.*), it is a synonym of μαρθάνειν (Wisd. vi. 1), cf. רב, Hiphil = διδάσκειν, we may say that the German *zusammenfassen*, *auffassen* (to collect, to apprehend), come nearest to the original signification; and it will be well to consider the use of the word to express mental activity in the first place, and the sensuous meaning, as being the feebler, in the second place.

(I.) = To collect, apprehend, grasp, comprehend, understand, distinguished from ἀκούειν, the sentient affection, as the corresponding mental activity, Matt. xiii. 13, 14, 15, 19, 23, xv. 10; Mark iv. 12, vii. 14; Luke viii. 10; Acts xxviii. 26; Rom. xv. 21, οἷς οὐκ ἀνγγέλη περὶ αὐτοῦ, ὄψονται, καὶ οἱ οὐκ ἀκηκόασιν, συνήσουσιν. The synonym νοεῖν is conjoined with it for the sake of emphasis, Mark viii. 17, οὐπω νοεῖτε, οὐδὲ συνιέτε; Matt. xv. 16, ἀσύνετοί ἐστε; οὐ νοεῖτε κ.τ.λ., while it is distinguished from νοεῖν, as activity from capability, cf. Luke xxiv. 45, διήνοιξεν αὐτῶν τὸν νοῦν τοῦ συνιέναι τὰς γραφάς. Further, the synonym γινώσκειν differs from it as knowledge acquired by reflection, consideration, differs from immediate knowledge, Luke viii. 9, 10, xviii. 24; cf. Prov. ix. 6, ζητήσατε φρόνησιν καὶ κατορθώσατε ἐν γνώσει σύνεσιν. The earnest occupation with the object, which the word denotes, makes it specially suitable to express *moral reflection* = to ponder, to lay to heart; cf. Eph. v. 17, whence also may be explained the application of συνιέναι to the moral-religious conduct, and its being attributed to the καρδιά, Mark vi. 52, οὐ γὰρ συνήκαν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἄρτοις· ἦν γὰρ αὐτῶν ἡ καρδιά πεπωρωμένη; viii. 17, οὐπω νοεῖτε, οὐδὲ συνιέτε; πεπωρωμένην ἔχετε τὴν καρδίαν ὑμῶν; Acts xxviii. 27, καὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ συνῶσιν, καὶ ἐπιστρέψωσιν. In profane Greek, σύνεσις alone is used with a similar moral signification; whereas, in biblical Greek, συνετός, ἀσύνετος, are also used in the same manner. Without an object only seldom, *e.g.* Theogn. 904, οἱ συνιέντες, the intelligent, cf. πᾶς ὁ γινώσκων, "every sensible man." In the N. T. Rom. iii. 11; 2 Cor. x. 12; Acts vii. 25; Mark viii. 21, cf. Wisd. vi. 1; Tob. iii. 8. Also Matt. xiii. 51, xvi. 12, xvii. 13; Luke ii. 50; Acts vii. 25.

(II.) Weakened form = to notice, heed, hear. Not thus in N. T. Cf. Neh. viii. 8, συνήκεν ὁ λαὸς ἐν τῇ ἀναγνώσει; ver. 12, συνήκεν ἐν τοῖς λόγοις οἷς ἐγνώρισεν αὐτοῖς = to listen to. — Seldom used in conjunction with other besides perceptible objects, Job xxxi. 1, οὐ συνήσω ἐπὶ πάρθενον.

Σύνεσις, ἡ, intelligence, insight into anything, Eph. iii. 4, δύνασθε νοῆσαι τὴν σύνεσιν μου ἐν τῷ μυστηρίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ; 2 Tim. ii. 7, νόει δὲ λέγων δώσει γάρ σοι ὁ κύριος σύνεσιν ἐν πάσιν. Without the sphere or object being assigned = *understanding, cleverness*, as shown, e.g., in quickness of apprehension; Luke ii. 47, ἐξίσταντο . . . ἐπὶ τῇ συνέσει καὶ ταῖς ἀποκρίσεσιν αὐτοῦ, Col. i. 9; generally = *acuteness*; 1 Cor. i. 19, ἀπολῶ τὴν σοφίαν τῶν σοφῶν, καὶ τὴν σύνεσιν τῶν συνετῶν ἀθετήσω; cf. Aristot. *Eth. Nic.* vi. 11, according to which it exactly = *εὐσυνεσία*; Ecclus. iii. 29, καρδιά συνετοῦ διανοηθήσεται παραβολὴν; Job xii. 20, σύνεσις πρεσβυτέρων = *matured insight*; according to Aristot. *l.c.* it is = *judgment*, ἡ σύνεσις ἐστίν . . . περὶ ὧν ἀπορήσειεν ἄν τις καὶ βουλευέσαιο (cf. *Eth. Nic.* iv. 4, τὸ βουλευόμενον, ὅπερ ἐστὶν συνέσεως πολιτικῆς ἔργον), the intelligent, penetrating consideration preceding decision and action; the understanding of the matter in hand; hence in profane Greek a synonym for conscience, *vid.* συνείδησις; cf. Matt. xii. 33, where ἀγαπᾶν ἐξ ὅλης τῆς συνέσεως answers to the ἐκ ψυχῆς of the original passage, *vid.* ψυχῆ. The love of a well-pondered and duly considered resolution, which determines the whole person, is meant, the love which clearly understands itself. Connected with this is the religious moral force of σύνεσις (as also of σοφία) peculiar to Holy Scripture; cf. Prov. ix. 10, ἀρχὴ σοφίας φόβος κυρίου καὶ βουλὴ ἀγίων σύνεσις; Col. i. 9, ἵνα πληρωθῇτε τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ καὶ συνέσει πνευματικῇ, περιπατῆσαι ὑμᾶς κ.τ.λ.; Col. ii. 2; cf. Deut. iv. 6, καὶ φυλάξεσθε καὶ ποιήσετε (*sc.* τὰ δικαιώματα κ.τ.λ., *ver.* 5), ὅτι αὕτη ἡ σοφία ὑμῶν καὶ ἡ σύνεσις ἐναντίον πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν κ.τ.λ. LXX. = חָכְמָה, Deut. iv. 6; 1 Chron. xxii. 12; Dan. i. 20; Job xii. 20, xxviii. 12, 20, 28; Prov. ix. 6, 10; also = חָכְמָה, and other words. — Σοφία and σύνεσις are often found conjoined in biblical Greek, though a careful separation of the two notions was not always intended or possible. So in most of the passages quoted from the O. T., and in N. T. 1 Cor. i. 19; Col. i. 9. On the whole, σύνεσις is used of reflective thinking, σοφία of productive.

Συνετός, intelligent, sagacious, penetrating. In Thucyd. in combination with βουλεῖν, ἐπιβουλεῖν, *et al.*, vi. 39, βουλεῖσαι δ' ἂν βέλτιστα τοὺς ξυνητοὺς κρίναι δ' ἂν ἀκοίσαντας ἄριστα τοὺς πολλούς. — Occurring with σοφός, it is best rendered *sensible, acute*, Matt. xi. 25; Luke x. 21; 1 Cor. i. 19; cf. Deut. i. 13. — Acts xiii. 7, where Sergius Paulus is called an ἄνθρωπος συνετός = *judicious*. Similarly Xen. *Cyrop.* ii. 1. 31, viii. 3. 5; Thucyd. i. 79, Ἀρχίδαμος, ἄνθρωπος καὶ ξυνητός δοκῶν εἶναι καὶ σώφρων, ἔλεξε κ.τ.λ. The contrast in Ecclus. x. 23 is worth notice, οὐ δίκαιον ἀτιμάσαι πτωχὸν συνετόν, καὶ οὐ καθήκει δοξάσαι ἄνδρα ἁμαρτωλόν; cf. xvi. 4 opposed to ἄνομος in the same moral and religious sense as συνιέναι, σύνεσις; cf. Ecclus. vi. 35; Col. i. 9; Ecclus. ix. 15, μετὰ συνετῶν ἔστω ὁ διαλογισμὸς σου καὶ πάντα διήγησίς σου ἐν νόμῳ ὑψίστου.

Ἀσύνητος, unintelligent, dull; Matt. xv. 16; Mark vii. 18; cf. Job xiii. 2; so ἄφρων, Ps. xcii. 7. In a moral sense = *without moral consideration, without moral judgment*, Rom. i. 21, 31; cf. Ecclus. xv. 7, ἄνθρωποι ἀσύνητοι, paralleled with ἄνδρες ἁμαρτωλοί. — Rom. x. 19 from Deut. xxxii. 21 = חָכְמָה.

Ἰλεως, ων, Attic form for Ἰλαος (cf. λεώς . . . λαός), of the same root as Ἰλαρος, cheerful, clear = cheerful, merry; cf. Plat. *Legg.* i. 649 A, πίνοντα τὸν ἄνθρωπον αὐτὸν αὐτοῦ ποιεῖ (sc. ὁ οἶνος) πρῶτον Ἰλεων εὐθὺς μᾶλλον ἢ πρότερον. Then transitive = well-disposed, friendly, gracious (cf. Döderlein, *Lat. Syn.* iii. 242, "Ἰλαος is a word which, according to Hesych., was of the same meaning as ἰλαρός, and also, as used elsewhere, attributed to the gods the same quality as ἰλαρός does to men, only with the transitive and forcible subordinate notion that this cheerfulness is the source of goodwill towards men. It is derived from the widely diffused root γελᾶν, originally *to laugh*, and by personification also *to shine*"). Frequently combined with εὐμενής, *well-wishing, kind*, e.g. Xen. *Cyrop.* i. 6. 2, ii. 1. 1, iii. 3. 21; Plat. *Phaedr.* 257 A; *Legg.* iv. 712 B; with πρᾶος, Plat. *Rep.* viii. 566 E; with εὐθυμος, etc., sometimes of men, as in Plat. *Phaedr.* l.c., but principally used of the gods, signifying that good pleasure towards men which does not originally dwell in them, but is secured by prayer and sacrifice; Plat. *Legg.* x. 910 A, τοὺς θεοὺς Ἰλεως οἰόμενοι ποιεῖν θυσίαις τε καὶ εὐχαῖς. As opposed to ὀργή, Ex. xxxii. 12, παῦσαι τῆς ὀργῆς τοῦ θυμοῦ σου καὶ Ἰλεως γενοῦ ἐπὶ τῇ κακίᾳ τοῦ λαοῦ σου. As in profane Greek it denotes a sentiment which does not originally and naturally belong to the gods,—cf. Herod. i. 32, τὸ θεῖον πᾶν ἐὼν φθονερόν; so, too, iii. 40, vii. 46. 2; cf. vii. 10. 6,—so in the Bible it is a divine sentiment which exists in God, but which does not properly pertain to man, because he is not deserving of it; opposed to the imputation of sin. Hence Ἰλεως εἶναι = ἡδὲ (ἀφίεναι, Lev. iv. 20, 26, 35; εὐιλατεύειν, Deut. xxix. 19, as εὐίλατος, Ps. xcix. 9, only in the LXX., not in profane Greek), Num. xiv. 20; 1 Kings viii. 30, 34, 36, 39, 50, xxxvi. 3; cf. Num. xiv. 19, ἄφες τὴν ἁμαρτίαν (ἡδὲ) τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ κατὰ τὸ μέγα ἐλεός σου, καθάπερ Ἰλεως αὐτοῖς ἐγένον (ἦ κνῶ). For further remarks on this distinction, see ἰλάσκεσθαι. — In the N. T. only Heb. viii. 12, Ἰλεως ἔσομαι ταῖς ἀδικίαις αὐτῶν, from Jer. xxxi. 34, רַחֵם ה' אֶת יִשְׂרָאֵל. — Also in the LXX. it oftener = ἡδὲ, μὴ γένοιτο! where, in classical Greek, we should find the μηδαμῶς or εὐφήμει of the current Attic. So, e.g., 1 Sam. xiv. 46; 2 Sam. xx. 20, xxiii. 17; 1 Chron. xi. 13. In N. T. Matt. xvi. 22, Ἰλεώς σοι, κύριε· οὐ μὴ ἔσται σοι τοῦτο! = Ἰλεώς σοι ἔστω ὁ θεός. — The opposite, ἀνίλεως, *ungracious*, a reading of the Received text, Jas. ii. 13, is unknown in profane Greek. Instead, ἀνέλεος is generally read.

Ἰλάσκομαι, to incline oneself towards anybody, forms its tenses, with the exception of the imperfect, from ἰλάω. As a formal peculiarity of biblical Greek, may be mentioned the passive ἰλάσκεσθαι = to be reconciled, to be gracious, Ps. xxv. 11, ἰλάσῃ τῇ ἁμ. μου; Ps. lxxviii. 38, ἰλάσεται ταῖς ἁμ. αὐτῶν; also ἰλάσθητι, imperative aorist passive (on the euphonic σ, cf. Buttmann, § 100, n. 2, 112. 20; Krüger, § xxxii. 2. 1–4), Ps. lxxix. 9; Dan. ix. 19; cf. ἐξίλασθεις, Plat. *Legg.* ix. 862 C; Num. xxxv. 33; Ezek. xvi. 63.

In Homer always, and in later Greek in the majority of cases, ἰλάσκεσθαι denotes a religious procedure: to make the gods propitious, to cause them to be reconciled, and generally to worship them; cf. Herod. vi. 106, καὶ αὐτὸν ἀπὸ ταῦτης τῆς ἀγγελίης θυσίῃσι ἐπετείρησι

καὶ λαμπάδι ἰλάσκονται; *Od.* iii. 419, ὅφρ' ἦτοι πρότιστα θεῶν ἰλάσσομ' Ἀθήνην, ἥ μοι ἐναργής ἦλθε θεοῦ ἐς δαῖτα θάλειαν. It is, at the bottom, a procedure by which something is to be made good; and, indeed, the ἰλ. is a synonym with ἀρέσκειν = *to appease any one, to satisfy, to make something good*; cf. the use of the word in relation to the paying of funereal honours to those who had been wronged when alive, *e.g.* cf. *Herod.* v. 47, ἐπὶ γὰρ τοῦ τάφου αὐτοῦ ἡρώιον ἰδρυσάμενοι θυσίησι αὐτὸν ἰλάσκονται. But that in general the word meant *to worship, colere Deos*, "indicates that goodwill was not conceived to be the original and natural condition of the gods, but something that must first be earned;" Nägelsbach, *Nachhomer. Theol.* i. 37; cf. *Xen. Cyrop.* vii. 2. 19, πᾶμπολλα δὲ θύων ἐξιλασάμην ποτὲ αὐτόν, namely, in order to incline Apollo to deliver an oracle. The word is also so used of men, *to do them homage, even = to bribe, e.g.* *Herod.* viii. 112. 2, Πάριοι δὲ Θεμιστοκλέα χρήμασι ἱλασάμενοι διέφυγον τὸ στράτευμα. — The general construction is *τινὰ τι*. Only later writers use it with the dative of the person, *e.g.* *Plut. Porp.* 21, ἱλασάμενος τῷ Αἰῶνι.

The construction in biblical Greek differs very remarkably. Indeed, ἰλάσκεσθαι occurs comparatively seldom; only *Ps.* lxxviii. 38, lxxix. 9 = 𐤀𐤋𐤁; *Dan.* ix. 19, 2 *Kings* v. 18, *Ps.* xxv. 12 = 𐤁𐤋𐤁; *Ex.* xxxii. 13 = 𐤁𐤋𐤁; *Luke* xviii. 13; *Heb.* ii. 17. So much the more frequently do the LXX. employ the stronger ἐξιλάσκεσθαι, *to reconcile thoroughly, entirely*, as the regular equivalent of the Hebrew 𐤀𐤁𐤁, with the exception of *Ps.* lxxv. 4, lxxviii. 38, lxxix. 9 (see above); also *Ex.* xxx. 10, xxix. 37 = καθαρίζειν; *Deut.* xxxii. 43 = ἐκκαθαρίζειν; *Isa.* vi. 7 = περικαθαρίζειν; *Prov.* xvi. 6 = ἀποκαθαίρειν; *Ex.* xxix. 33, 36 = ἀγιάζειν; *Isa.* xxviii. 18, xxvii. 9 = ἀφαιρεῖν; *Isa.* xxii. 14 = ἀφιέναι. Only *Gen.* xxxii. 21, ἐξιλάσομαι τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς δώροις; and *Zech.* vii. 2, ἐξιλάσασθαι τὸν κύριον = 𐤀𐤁𐤁 𐤁𐤋𐤁 𐤁𐤋𐤁 (appease, implore), answer to the construction in classical Greek. Elsewhere it is never joined with the accusative (or dative) of the person whose goodwill or favour is to be won, *i.e.* God is never the object of the action denoted; it never means *to conciliate God*. Only the following constructions are used: (a.) ἐξιλάσκεσθαι περὶ ἁμαρτίας περὶ τινος, *e.g.* *Lev.* v. 18; περὶ τινος ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν, *Lev.* xvi. 34. (b.) ἐξιλάσκεσθαι περὶ τινος (specification of the person), *e.g.* *Num.* xvii. 11. (c.) ἐξιλάσκεσθαι τινα (person or thing affected by the action mentioned), *Prov.* xvi. 14; *Lev.* xvi. 20; *Ezek.* xliii. 20, xlv. 20; cf. *Num.* xxxv. 33. (d.) ἐξιλάσκεσθαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας, only passive in 1 *Sam.* iii. 14; *Dan.* ix. 24,—the last two constructions are the most remarkable in comparison with profane Greek. Connected with these is (e) *Ps.* lxxv. 4, τὰς ἀσεβείας ἡμῶν σὺ (*sc.* ὁ θεός) ἰλάσῃ, instead of which we find elsewhere the dative ἱλασκ. τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, as in *Ps.* lxxviii. 38, lxxix. 9, xxv. 11; *Dan.* ix. 19.

This syntactical peculiarity is due primarily to the circumstance that ἰλ. or ἐξιλ. takes the place of the Hebrew 𐤀𐤁𐤁, and then, above all, to the fact that the biblical notion expressed by 𐤀𐤁𐤁 differs decidedly from the profane idea. Ἰλάσκ. can only have been chosen as the best equivalent, because it was the set expression for expiatory acts, though the idea lying at the foundation of heathen expiations is rejected by the Bible. The

heathen believed the Deity to be naturally alienated in feeling from man; and though the energetic manifestation of this feeling is specially excited by sin, man has *eo ipso* to suffer under it. Cf. Ἰλεως. The design of the propitiatory sacrifices and prayers that were offered was to effect a change in this feeling, whether presented after the commission of sin or without any distinct consciousness of guilt, simply for the sake of securing favour. In the Bible the relation is a different one. God is not of Himself already alienated from man. His sentiment, therefore, does not need to be changed. But in order that He may not be necessitated to comport Himself otherwise (to adopt a different course of action), that is, for righteousness' sake, an expiation of sin is necessary (a substitutionary suffering of the punishment, see *θυσία*); and, indeed, an expiation which He Himself and His love institute and give; whereas man, exposed as he is to God's wrath, could neither venture nor find an expiation. Through the institution of the expiation, God's love anticipates and meets His righteousness. Through the accomplishment of the expiation man escapes the revelation of God's wrath, and remains in the covenant of grace. Nothing happens to God, as is the case in the heathen view; therefore we never read in the Bible ἰλάσκεσθαι τὸν θεόν. Rather something happens to man, who escapes the wrath to come (cf. Matt. iii. 7, φυγεῖν ἀπὸ τῆς μελλούσης ὀργῆς; Rom. v. 9; 1 Thess. v. 9). Hence also, e.g., the passive in Num. xxxv. 33, ἐξιλασθήσεται ἡ γῆ ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος. At the same time, too much must not be made of the circumstance that God is never spoken of as the object of ἰλ., for the action in question is expressly represented as having a relation to God, e.g. in Heb. ii. 17, ἵνα ἐλεήμων γένηται καὶ πιστὸς ἀρχιερεὺς τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν, εἰς τὸ ἰλάσκεσθαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας τοῦ λαοῦ; cf. Num. xxxi. 50, הָיָה לְכַפֵּר וַיִּחַיְתוּ בְּלִבְיָם, ἐξιλάσασθαι περὶ ἡμῶν ἔναντι κυρίου; Lev. i. 4, וְלִבְיָם לֵב הַכֹּהֵן, δεκτὸν αὐτῷ ἐξιλάσασθαι περὶ αὐτοῦ; cf. under δεκτός. The purpose decidedly was to turn away the wrath of God, cf. Num. xvii. 11, ἐξίλασαι περὶ αὐτῶν ἐξῆλθε γὰρ ὀργὴ ἀπὸ προσώπου κυρίου; Num. viii. 19, ἐξιλάσκεσθαι περὶ τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ καὶ οὐκ ἔσται ἐν τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραὴλ προσεγγίζων πρὸς τὰ ἅγια. Nor is it right to define the contrast between the profane and the biblical view, as though in the former God were the object, in the latter God were the subject (Huther on 1 John ii. 2), for Jehovah is not always the subject of כָּפַר, as Bähr in his *Symbolik*, ii. 203, supposes; but, on the contrary, even apart from the passages still to be quoted, the priest; and he cannot be viewed as God's representative, but only as man's, for whom the sacrifice is offered; *vid.* ἱερεὺς, *θυσία*. The Hebrew כָּפַר denotes strictly to cover anything, to wrap up, so that it is withdrawn from sight; cf. Jer. xviii. 23, וְכִפְרוּ אֶת-פָּנֶיךָ מִכָּל-חַטָּאתָם, and like all verbs of covering, is generally construed with ל. With the exception of Gen. xxxii. 21, Prov. xvi. 14, Isa. xlvii. 11, xxviii. 18, the word is only used for the covering of sins, and it is (1) the set expression for the covering of sins by a sacrifice as a compensation for that which man himself can neither perform nor suffer; so = to expiate, to cover the sin by means of a sacrifice, with a view to forgiveness, in order to be personally freed from the imputation of the same (hence כֹּפֶר, ransom money, indemnification, Isa. xliii. 3; Ex. xxi. 30, xxx. 12). Thence only in a

is a peculiarity of idiom to be referred to the corresponding employment of *ἰλίσκεσθαι*, but which is to be here as little regarded as in Heb. ii. 17, since it is the effecting, not the communication of forgiveness, that is in question. By the use of the abstract form, it is indicated that in Christ the person and the work (priest and sacrifice) are one; cf. the abstract expressions in John xiv. 6, 1 Cor. i. 30, and others.

Ἰλαστήριον, τό, must be viewed, at least in biblical Greek, as a substantive, and not merely as a substantival neuter of *ἰλαστήριος*. For such an adjective, formed from *ἰλαστής* (like *σωτήριος*, *δραστήριος*, etc.), never occurs at all in profane Greek, and in ecclesiastical Greek only very late, and seldom. Rarely also in Josephus, e.g. *Antt.* xvi. 7. 1, *ἰλαστήριον μνήμα*; in the LXX. only in two places, see below, in which, however, it may still be construed as a substantive. Judging by the formation of the word, τὸ *ἰλαστήριον*, like *ἀκροατήριον*, *δικαστήριον*, *καθιστήριον*, *θυμιατήριον*, *θυσιαστήριον*, may be a *nomen loci* = *place of conciliation, of expiation*; hence Hesych. *θυσιαστήριον*. Cf. Curtius, *Griech. Schulgr.* § 345. From profane authors only two passages are quoted, Dio Chrys. i. 355 (2d century A.D.), and Menand. *Exc. Hist.* 352. 16 (7th century A.D.), in which it is analogous to *χαριστήριον* = *expiatory gift*; so that at all events the opinion that *ἰλ.* is in classical Greek a current term for expiatory sacrifices cannot be justified. Only once, as it seems, does it occur in this sense in Jos. Macc. 17, διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τῶν εὐσεβῶν ἐκείνων καὶ τοῦ ἰλαστηρίου τοῦ θανάτου αὐτῶν ἡ θεία πρόνοια τὸν Ἰσραὴλ προκακωθέντα διέσωσε. The LXX., on the contrary, use it always as a *nomen loci*, and, indeed, as = *הַבֶּזֶז*, Ex. xxv. 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, xxxi. 7, xxxv. 12, xxxvii. 7, 8, 9; Lev. xvi. 2, 13, 14, 15; Num. vii. 89. (In the other passages, excepting 1 Chron. xxviii. 11, the LXX. have not translated the Hebrew word at all, to say nothing of the word *καταπέτασμα* used Ex. xxvi. 34, xxx. 6, xxxix. 35, xl. 20.) = *הַבֶּזֶז*, Ezek. xliii. 14, 17, 20 (the border of the altar, which, ver. 20, was to be sprinkled with the blood of the sacrifice, as in the Mosaic ritual the Capporeth). It can only be regarded as an expansion of this expression when in two passages, Ex. xxv. 17, xxxvii. 6, *ἰλαστήριον* is used as an adjectival (? cf. Ex. xxx. 35, *ἐλαιον χρῖσμα ἅγιον*; cf. Plato, *Phaedr.* 260 B, *λόγος ἔπαινος*), τὸ *ἰλαστήριον ἐπίθεμα*, where we are told what is the material of which the mercy-seat (Capporeth) was made. (Perhaps we may say, too, that the forms, termed *nomina loci* by Curtius, ought to be traced back to adjectives denoting *belonging to and ministering to*, whose neuters then acquired a place in usage especially as *nomina loci*.) 1 Chron. xxviii. 11 also shows that τὸ *ἰλ.* is used by the LXX. as a name of place; for *הַבֶּזֶז הַזֶּה* is not translated by *οἶκος τοῦ ἰλαστηρίου*, which might appear to be a strong tautology, but by *οἶκος τοῦ ἐξίλασμοῦ*. The Capporeth (explained also by Levy, *Chald. Wörterb.*, as *place of expiation*) is the expiatory covering, not only of the ark containing the law, but, Ex. xxx. 6, of the law itself,—the covering of the ark, with the law therein,—and serves to receive the atoning blood, and to accomplish its object. Not till it is on the Capporeth is it what it is meant to be, propitiation, Lev. xvii. 11, xvi. 14, 15. — Accordingly, *ἰλαστήριον* will be

= חֲבֵצֶת not only in Heb. ix. 5, but also in Rom. iii. 25; and as regards, in particular, this latter passage, ὃν (Χριστὸν) προέθετο ὁ θεὸς ἰλαστήριον, it must be noted that, according to Ex. xxv. 22 and Lev. xvi. 2, the Cappareth is the central seat of the saving presence and gracious revelation of God; so that it need not surprise that Christ is designated ἰλαστήριον, as He can be so designated, when we consider that He, as high priest and sacrifice at the same time, comes ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ αἵματι, and not as the high priest of the O. T., ἐν αἵματι ἀλλοτρίῳ, which he must discharge himself of by sprinkling on the Cappareth. The Cappareth was so far the principal part of the Holy of Holies, that the latter is even termed "the House of the Cappareth" (1 Chron. xxviii. 11), cf. 1 Kings vi. 5, חֲבֵצֶת = חֲבֵצֶת, Targum. Philo calls the Cappareth σύμβολον τῆς ἱλῶ τοῦ θεοῦ δυνάμεως. — Προτίθεσθαι, moreover, could hardly be used of the propitiatory offering.

"Ισστημι, (I.) transitively, pres., impf., fut., aor. 1 = to place. — (II.) Intransitively, perf., pluperfect, 2d aor. = to stand. Hence—

Ἀνίστημι, (I.) transitively, and, indeed, (a.) with reference to a position to be changed = to set up, to raise from a seat, a bed, etc. Also = to wake out of sleep, synonymous with ἐγείρειν, which was usual in Attic Greek, Xen. *Cyrop.* viii. 8. 20; also to raise or to wake up the dead, e.g. Xen. *Cyneg.* i. 6, Ἀσκληπίος . . . ἔτυχεν ἀνιστάναι μὲν τεθνεώτας, νοσοῦντας δὲ ἰάσθαι; Hom. *Il.* xxiv. 551. 756, etc. So in the N. T., John vi. 39, 40, 44, 54; Acts ii. 24, 32, xiii. 33, 34, xvii. 31, ix. 41. The equally common use in the N. T. of ἐγείρειν, to denote to raise from the dead, is unknown in profane Greek. — (b.) Without reference to change of place or posture = to set up, to put in a place, to cause some one to come forward; e.g. μάρτυρα ἀναστήσασθαι, to cause a witness to come forward; τινὰ ἐπὶ τὴν κατηγορίαν τινός, to cause any one to appear as complainant, Plut. *Marcell.* 27. So corresponding with the Hebrew מִן in Acts iii. 22, vii. 37, προφήτην; iii. 26, ὅμνῳ πρῶτον ἀναστήσας ὁ θεὸς τὸν παῖδα αὐτοῦ ἀπέστειλεν αὐτὸν κ.τ.λ. The synonymous ἐγείρειν is not used in profane Greek with a personal object. Matt. xxii. 24, σπέρμα ἀνιστ. = to call forth, cf. Deut. xxv. 5; Ezra ii. 63; Neh. vii. 65.

(II.) Intransitively = to stand up, and that, too, (a.) with reference to a change of position, Matt. ix. 9, Luke iv. 16, etc.; from sleep, Mark i. 35; of convalescents, Luke iv. 39, vi. 8. Cf. Plat. *Lach.* 195 C, ἐκ τῆς νόσου ἀναστήναι. Of the dead = to rise again, to return to life, Herod. iii. 62. 4, εἰ οἱ τεθνεώτες ἀνεστήσασιν; *Il.* xxi. 56. So in the N. T., and, indeed, ἐκ νεκρῶν, Matt. xvii. 9; Mark vi. 14, ix. 9, 10, xii. 25; Luke xvi. 31, xxiv. 46; John xx. 9; Acts x. 41, xvii. 3; Eph. v. 14. (Cf. Plat. *Phaed.* 72, ἔστι τῷ ὄντι καὶ τὸ ἀναβιώσκεισθαι καὶ ἐκ τῶν τεθνεώτων τοὺς ζῶντας γίγνεσθαι καὶ τὰς τῶν τεθνεώτων ψυχὰς εἶναι, καὶ ταῖς μὲν γ' ἀγαθαῖς ἄμεινον, ταῖς δὲ κακαῖς κάκιον . . . where, however, Plato's meaning is not far from the ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστήναι in Mark ix. 9, 10; cf. *Conn.* 179 C, εὐαριθμήτοις δὴ τισιν ἔδοσαν τοῦτο τὸ γέρας οἱ θεοί, ἐξ Αἴδου ἀνείναι πάλιν τὴν ψυχὴν.) Without such addition = to rise from death, Mark v. 42, viii. 31, xvi. 9; Luke viii. 55, ἐπέστρεψεν τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτῆς καὶ ἀνέστη παραχρῆμα; cf. of the death of

Christ, John xix. 30, παρέδωκεν τὸ πνεῦμα (1 Pet. iii. 18, ζῶσποιηθεὶς τῷ πνεύματι). Luke ix. 8, xix. 22, xxiv. 7; Acts ix. 40; 1 Thess. iv. 14, Ἰησοῦς ἀπέθανε καὶ ἀνέστη,—by which antithesis every sort of spiritualistic volatilizing of the expression is shown to be inconsistent with the view of the biblical writer; Matt. xx. 19; Mark ix. 31, x. 34; Luke xviii. 33; John xi. 23, 24. Cf. of the apparently dead, Mark ix. 27; Acts xiv. 20. With Eph. v. 14, cf. ii. 1. With οἱ νεκροί as subject, 1 Cor. xv. 52; 1 Thess. iv. 16. — (b.) Without reference to change of position = *to appear, to come forward*, Heb. vii. 11, 15, ἀνίσταται ἱερεὺς ἕτερος; Matt. xii. 41; Luke xi. 32; Acts xx. 30, v. 34, 36, 37; Rom. xv. 12, etc. With Mark iii. 26, εἰ ὁ σατανᾶς ἀνέστη ἐφ' ἑαυτόν, cf. Herod. v. 29, χώρη ἀνεστηκνῖα, *a district risen in rebellion*. Il. xxiii. 635, ὅς μοι ἀνέστη, *he who rose up against me*; Gen. iv. 8.

Ἀνάστασις, ἡ, in biblical Greek only used intransitively = *rising up*, e.g. after a fall, Luke ii. 34, οὗτος κείται εἰς πτώσιν καὶ ἀνάστασιν πολλῶν, cf. Rom. xi. 11. Specially of the resurrection from the dead, of the return to life conditioned by the abolition of death, see ἀνίστημι, which return, considered qualitatively, is the entrance on a life freed from death and from the judicial sentence centralized therein; cf. the connection between resurrection and eternal life in John vi. 40, 54, 39 (xi. 25), as also Luke xx. 35, οἱ δὲ καταξιοθέντες τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐκείνου τυχεῖν καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως κ.τ.λ. The last day, as the closing day, on which the judicial sentence will be finally and completely executed, is also the time of resurrection, *vid.* John vi. 39, 40, 44, 54. (Cf. my treatise, *Die Auferstehung der Todten; ein Beitrag zum Schriftverständniss*, Barmen 1870.) We find also (a.) ἀν. νεκρῶν (the opposite of θάνατος, 1 Cor. xv. 21), Matt. xxii. 31; Acts xvii. 32, xxiii. 6, xxiv. 21, xxvi. 23; Rom. i. 4; 1 Cor. xv. 12, 13, 42; Heb. vi. 2. — (b.) ἀν. ἐκ νεκρῶν, which refers to a single case what is generally expressed in ἀνάστ. νεκρῶν. *Vid.* Luke xx. 35, οἱ δὲ καταξιοθέντες . . . τυχεῖν . . . τῆς ἀν. τῆς ἐκ νεκρῶν; cf. ver. 36, τῆς ἀναστάσεως υἱοὶ ὄντες. Besides, only in Acts iv. 2, καταγγέλλειν ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ τὴν ἀνάστασιν τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν; cf. 1 Pet. i. 3, δι' ἀναστάσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐκ νεκρῶν; Acts xxvi. 23, πρῶτος ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν. In this expression is taken for granted what John v. 29 distinguishes by ἀν. ζωῆς, κρίσεως (cf. Dan. xii. 2); cf. ἀν. δικαίων τε καὶ ἀδίκων, Acts xxiv. 15; ἀν. δικαίων, Luke xiv. 14, what is particularly expressed in ἡ ἀν. ἡ πρώτη, Rev. xx. 5, 6, in distinction from ὁ δεύτερος θάνατος, Rev. xx. 6, 14, namely, that resurrection, as the final abolition of the judicial sentence, will not be the lot of all; that, on the contrary, for many the resurrection will be only the transition to the final execution of the sentence; and that these latter, after having learnt the possibility of redemption by rising from the dead, must return to death for ever; *vid.* θάνατος (III.). Cf. 1 Cor. xv. 23; 1 Thess. iv. 16. — (c.) Without addition, ἀνάστασις, resurrection from the dead, Matt. xxii. 23, 28, 30; Mark xii. 18, 23; Luke xx. 27, 33, 36; John xi. 24; Acts xvii. 18, xxiii. 8; 2 Tim. ii. 18. With John xi. 25, cf. Acts iv. 2, xvii. 18. — Of the resurrection of Christ, Acts i. 22, ii. 31, iv. 33; Rom. vi. 5; Phil. iii. 10; 1 Pet.

iii. 21, cf. i. 3, Acts xxvi. 23. — We must remark further, that in Heb. xi. 35 the resurrection, which is a fact of redemption, is contrasted as the *κρείσσω ἀνάστασις* with a resurrection like that of the son of the Shunammite, 2 Kings iv. 36, or that of the son of the woman of Zarephath, 1 Kings xvii. 17, *ἐλαβον γυναῖκες ἐξ ἀναστάσεως* = in consequence of resurrection.

Ἐξανάστασις, ἡ, the rising up again. Ἐξανίστημι emphasizes the change of situation stronger than ἀνίστημι. The verb is used *transitively* in Mark xii. 19, Luke xx. 28, *ἐξαν. σπέρμα*; in Matt. ἀνιστ.; *intransitively*, in Acts xv. 5 = *to come forward*. The subst. only in Phil. iii. 11, and that, too, *intransitively*, εἴ πως καταντήσω εἰς τὴν ἐξανάστασιν τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν, as in Hippocrates of the recovery of the sick; whereas elsewhere in profane Greek it is often used *transitively* = *driving away, expulsion*. With Phil. iii. 11 cf. *ἐξανιστάναι τοὺς θανόντας*, Soph. *El.* 927 = *to awake the dead*.

Ἀφίστημι, (I.) *transitive, to put away, to remove*. Acts v. 37, ἀπέστησε λαόν = *to seduce, make disloyal*; so frequently in Herodotus, Xenophon, etc.—(II.) *Intransitive, to withdraw, to remove oneself, to retire, to cease from something*; ἀπό τινος, Luke iv. 13, xiii. 27; Acts v. 38, xii. 10, xv. 38, xix. 9, xxii. 29; 2 Cor. xii. 8; 1 Tim. vi. 5 (cf. Ecclus. vii. 2). Also with the simple genitive, Luke ii. 37 (Herod. iii. 15). Of rebellious subjects, faithless friends, treacherous allies = *to revolt* (Herod. i. 130, ii. 30, ix. 126, and frequently). Transferred to moral conduct in 2 Tim. ii. 19, ἀπὸ ἀδικίας, and specially to the sphere of religion in Heb. iii. 12, καρδία πονηρὰ ἀπιστίας ἐν τῷ ἀποστήναι ἀπὸ θεοῦ ζῶντος, cf. Wisd. iii. 10, οἱ ἀμελήσαντες τοῦ δικαίου καὶ τοῦ κυρίου ἀποστάντες; Ezek. xx. 8, ἀπέστησαν ἀπ' ἐμοῦ καὶ οὐκ ἠθέλησαν εἰσακοῦσαί μου; 2 Chron. xxvi. 18, xxviii. 19.—1 Tim. iv. 1, ἀποστήσονται τινες τῆς πίστεως, cf. Heb. iii. 12. It is then used, standing alone, to denote religious apostasy, in contrast to πιστεύειν, Luke viii. 13, οἱ πρὸς καιρὸν πιστεύουσιν καὶ ἐν καιρῷ πειρασμοῦ ἀφίστανται, cf. Dan. ix. 9, ὅτι ἀπέστημεν καὶ οὐκ εἰσηκούσαμεν τῆς φωνῆς κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν πορεύεσθαι ἐν τοῖς νόμοις αὐτοῦ. Thus = *to dissolve the union formed with God by faith and obedience*. Hebrew = נס, נשׁב, etc. In profane Greek we find neither ἀποστήναι in this sense, nor any other single word corresponding to it; cf. Xen. *Mem.* i. 1. 1, ἀδικεῖ Σωκράτης, οὐς μὲν ἡ πόλις νομίζει θεοὺς οὐ νομίζων. One could also say ἄθεον γίγνεσθαι, cf. ἀθεώτερον γίγνεσθαι, Lys. vi. 32. Cf. also Socr. *Hist. Eccl.* iii. 12. 222 (in Suicer, *Thes.*), where Julian is called ὁ ἀσεβής, ὁ ἀποστάτης καὶ ἄθεος.

Ἀποστασία, ἡ, *falling away, e.g. of rebellious subjects*, Plut. *Galb.* 1. In the N. T. used like ἀποστήναι in a religious sense, and, indeed, ἀποστ. ἀπὸ Μωϋσέως, Acts xxi. 21. Used absolutely, to denote the *passing over to unbelief*, the dissolution of the union with God subsisting through faith in Christ, in 2 Thess. ii. 3, ἐὰν μὴ ἔλθῃ ἡ ἀποστασία, as ἀποστήναι, Luke viii. 13; Dan. ix. 9, cf. 1 Tim. iv. 1; Dan. xi. 32; Matt. xxiv. 10 sqq.—For a corresponding use, see 1 Macc. ii. 15; Jer. ii. 19 (xxix. 32, the best mss. read ἔκκλισις). Further, cf. ἀποστάτης, Isa. xxx. 1, τέκνα ἀποστάται; 2 Macc.

v. 8 (Jas. ii. 11, cod. A, instead of παραβάτης); 3 Macc. vii. 3. — ἀποστατεῖν, 1^η exix. 118; 2 Chron. xxxiii. 19, πᾶσαι αἱ ἁμαρτίαι αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀποστάσεις αὐτοῦ κ.τ.λ. = לַמַּדָּבָר, of Manasseh's fall into idolatry.

Ἐνίστημι, (I.) transitive, to place in, to place by, etc. Usually (II.) intransitive. Middle with perf. and 2d aor. act. (a.) In a local sense = to tread somewhither, to enter on, e.g. εἰς τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐνίστασθαι, Herod. iii. 67; to present oneself, to come forward, Herod. vi. 59, ἄλλος ἐνίσταται βασιλεύς; correspondingly, to stand upon something, to be there, e.g. Herod. ii. 179, πύλαι ἐνεστᾶσι ἑκατόν. (b.) In a temporal sense = to present oneself, to enter, perf. = to be present. Thus very frequently in profane Greek, e.g. Xen. Hell. ii. 1. 6, περὶ τῶν ἐνεστηκότων πραγμάτων, relatively to the present state of affairs. Especially in Polyb., τὰ ἐνεστηκότα, πόλεμος ἐνεστώς, the present war. In the Grammarians ὁ ἐνεστὼς χρόνος = the present tense. The meaning impending, assigned to the word in this latter use, is partly traceable to the import of the present middle, present oneself, to enter, to begin, and needs correcting accordingly, e.g. ἐνισταμένου θέρους, with the commencement of summer, and partly to the mistaken use of the word in the sense of hostile appearance = to put oneself in a threatening attitude, to come forward, to threaten, and correspondingly, to stand opposed, e.g. in Polyb. and Plutarch, with regard to the intercession of the tribunes of the people. Plat. Phaedr. 77 B, ἔτι ἐνέστηκεν τὸ τῶν πολλῶν, ὅπως μὴ ἅμα ἀποθνήσκοντος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου διασκεδάννυνται ἡ ψυχὴ καὶ αὐτῇ τοῦ εἶναι τοῦτο τέλος ἦ. In reality, this meaning does not belong to the word. The meaning adopted by Meyer on Gal. i. 4, to be in the act of entering, is due to his not distinguishing the present middle from the perf. and 2d aor. act. Hence 2 Tim. iii. 1, ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις ἐνστήσονται καιροὶ χαλεποί = will come. The perf. part. ἐνεστώς = present, Rom. viii. 38 and 1 Cor. iii. 22, ἐνεστῶτα opposed to μέλλοντα; 1 Cor. vii. 26, δι' ἐνεστῶσαν ἀνάγκην, cf. 2 Macc. vi. 9; 3 Macc. i. 17; Gal. i. 4, ὅπως ἐξέλθαι ἡμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ ἐνεστῶτος αἰῶνος πονηροῦ, — ὁ ἐνεστὼς αἰὼν is thus equivalent to αἰὼν οὗτος, only that the change in the form of expression is designed to make the matter more urgent, to give prominence to the personal interest. 2 Thess. ii. 2, ἐνέστηκεν ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ κυρίου, is easily explained by Matt. xxiv. 23–36; Heb. ix. 9, ὁ καιρὸς ὁ ἐνεστηκώς, is the present, which is also in ver. 10 characterized as καιρὸς διορθώσεως.

Ἐξίστημι, (I.) transitive, to change from one condition to another, e.g. Aristot. Eth. iii. 12, ἡ μὲν λύπη ἐξίστησι καὶ φθείρει τὴν τοῦ ἔχοντος φύσιν. Especially, ἐξιστάναι τινα, to drive any one out of his mind, to confuse, often occurs, and more completely with τοῦ φρονεῖν, ἑαυτοῦ, et al. Luke xxiv. 22; Acts viii. 9, 11 (cf. Buttm. § 107. 21, on ἔστηκα, I have placed). Stob. Floril. xviii. 20, νῦν δ' οἶνος ἐξέστησε μ'; Polyb. xi. 27. 7, ἐξέστησε ταῖς διανοαῖς πάντας, synonymous with following κατεπλάγησαν. — (II.) Intransitive, especially the middle, also the perf. and 2d aor. act., to step aside, to go away, to yield. Especially, ἐξιστ. φρένων, to be out of mind, confused, also without subordinate clause, e.g. Aristot. H. A. vi. 22, ἐξίσταται καὶ μαίνεται; Polyb. xxxii. 25. 8, θυμοῖ λυτ-

τῶντος ἔργα καὶ ψυχῆς ἐξεστηκυίας τῶν λογισμῶν; Isocr. *ad Phil.* (Raphel on Mark iii. 21), μὴ διὰ τὸ γῆρας ἐξέστηκα τοῦ φρονεῖν. In the stronger sense of being out of one's mind, it is seldom found in biblical Greek. In N. T. only Mark iii. 21, with which cf. John x. 20. On the contrary, the word is used in biblical Greek in a weakened sense = to be confused, perplexed, synonymous with θαυμάζειν, Acts ii. 7, etc., denoting the state of mind caused by miraculous, inexplicable occurrences, cf. Mark vi. 51, 52, ἐξίσταντο· οὐ γὰρ συνήκαν κ.τ.λ.; Acts ii. 12, ἐξίσταντο δὲ πάντες καὶ διηποροῦντο κ.τ.λ. So also Luke ii. 47, viii. 56; Matt. xii. 23; Mark ii. 12, v. 42; Acts viii. 13, ix. 21, x. 45, xii. 16. So frequently in the LXX. of the emotions of fear, astonishment, etc. Ex. xviii. 9, xix. 18; Gen. xxvii. 33, xliii. 34; Hos. iii. 5. The word denotes ecstatic conditions neither in profane nor in biblical Greek. The passage, 2 Cor. v. 13, εἴτε γὰρ ἐξέστημεν, θεῶ· εἴτε σωφρονοῦμεν ὑμῶν (cf. ver. 12 with ii. 14 sqq.), speaks as little for the same as Mark iii. 21; we should rather compare 2 Cor. xi. 17, 18.

Ἑκστασις, ἡ, (I.) transitively, *removal*; (II.) intransitively, (a.) *remoteness*; then, (b.) the state of a man out of his senses, synonymous with μανία = *lunacy*, Aret. *de caus. diut. pass.* i. 6. 31, ἑκστασις γὰρ ἐστὶ μανία χρόνιος ἀνευθεν πυρετοῦ; Aristot. *Categ.* 8, ἡ μανικὴ ἑκστασις. In biblical Greek not in this strong sense, but, like the verb, weakened = *confusion, bewilderment*, cf. Zech. xii. 4, parallel with παραφρόνησις. Comp. also Aristot. *Physiogn.* i. 4, κοινὰ μὲν οὖν ἔστιν ὕβρις τε καὶ ἡ περὶ τὰ ἀφροδίσια ἑκστασις; Ps. xxx. 23. Often = *ἡρᾶ, fear, fright, amazement*, 1 Sam. xi. 7; 2 Chron. xiv. 14, xvii. 10; Ps. cxvi. 11, ἐγὼ εἶπα ἐν τῇ ἐκστάσει μου· πᾶς ἄνθρωπος ψεύστης = *ἡρᾶ*. So in N. T. Mark v. 42, xvi. 8, Luke v. 26, Acts iii. 10, the state caused by the perception of unusual things, things alien from the ideas of daily life, so that a man does not know what to say. Luke v. 26, ἑκστασις ἔλαβεν πάντας . . . καὶ ἐπλήσθησαν φόβου λέγοντες ὅτι εἶδομεν παράδοξα σήμερον. Cf. Stob. *Floril.* civ. 7 (Menand.), πάντα δὲ τὰ μηδὲ προσδοκώμεν ἑκστασιν φέρει. Lastly, (c.) the state of *rapture, ecstasy* (Verzückung). First used in this sense in profane Greek by the Neo-Platonists. The term occurs in this sense, first in Philo, who explains it in connection with Gen. ii. 21, xv. 12, where the LXX. translate *הִנָּחֵם* by ἑκστασις. (Isa. xxix. 10 = πνεῦμα κατανύξεως.) Without reference to these passages, Philo explains *ecstasy* as ἡ ἡρεμία καὶ ἡσυχία τοῦ νοῦ, as ἐνθουσιῶντος καὶ θεοφορήτου τὸ πάθος (*quies rer. div. Haer.* 510 sqq., ed. Mang.); *ibid.* 511, τῷ δὲ προφητικῷ γένει φιλεῖ τοῦτο συμβαίνειν; ἐξοικίζεται μὲν γὰρ ἐν ἡμῖν ὁ νοῦς κατὰ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ πνεύματος ἄφιξιν, κατὰ δὲ τὴν μετανάστασιν αὐτοῦ πάλιν εἰσοικίζεται. Θέμις γὰρ οὐκ ἔστι θνητὸν ἀθανάτῳ συνοικῆσαι διὰ τοῦτο ἡ δύσις τοῦ λογισμοῦ καὶ τὸ περὶ αὐτὸν σκοτός ἑκστασιν καὶ θεοφόρητον μανίαν ἐγέννησε. For Philo, then, ecstatic states are those in which man receives supersensuous, divine revelations, in which, on the one hand, the limits of ordinary powers of receptivity are broken down, whilst, on the other hand, they are contracted; therefore, as *e.g.* in the case of Balaam, Num. xxiv. 3, 4, xxii. 31, of the servant of Elisha, 2 Kings vi. 17; Jer. i. 11, 13. The biblical expression for this is, *to*

have the eyes opened, to see visions. Cf. Luke xxiv. 16. Comparing herewith the N. T. passages, Acts x. 10, xi. 5, xxii. 17, we find that ecstasy is that condition in which men, who are naturally unfit for the apprehension of supersensuous things, receive supersensuous revelations, whether in the form of symbols shown to them,—like the cloth containing animals in Peter's case, Acts x. 10, xi. 5, the almond branch and the boiling pot, with Jeremiah, i. 11, 13, or realities, as in the case of Balaam, of the servant of Elisha,—the state in which a man is either transported out of the sensible bounds which previously limited his perception, cf. Rev. i. 10, ἐγενόμην ἐν πνεύματι, 2 Cor. xii. 1 sqq., or in which these bounds momentarily disappear, as in the case of Zacharias, Luke i. 11 sqq. We might apply this term to all the states, of various degrees of strength, in which men have received divine communications, cf. Delitzsch, *Bibl. Psychol.* v. 5.

Καθίστημι, (I.) transitive, (a.) to set down, to bring to, Acts xvii. 15 (Tisch. καθιστάνοντες); (b.) to place anywhere in an office, in a condition, etc., e.g. εἰς ἀρχὴν, εἰς ἀπορίαν, etc. So Matt. xxiv. 45, 47; Luke xii. 42, 44; Acts vi. 3; Matt. xxv. 21, 23 (Heb. ii. 7, Received text). (c.) With double accusative = to make somebody something, to put in a situation or position. This primarily in reference to an office or business which is assigned = to appoint any one as something, e.g. βασιλέα, ἄρχοντα, ἐπίτροπον. So Luke xii. 14; Acts vii. 10, 27, 35; Tit. i. 5; Heb. vii. 28, v. 1, viii. 3. Then of the most various conditions or situations, e.g. Plut. *Phileb.* 16 B, οὐ μὲν ἔστι καλλίων ὁδὸς οὐδ' ἂν γένοιτο, ἧς ἐγὼ ἐραστὴς εἰμὶ αἰεὶ, πολλάκις δέ με ἤδη διαφυγούσα ἔρημον καὶ ἄπορον κατέστησεν; Eurip. *Androm.* 636, κλαίοντά σε καταστήσει. So is Rom. v. 19 to be understood, ὥσπερ γὰρ διὰ τῆς παρακοῆς τοῦ ἐνὸς ἀνθρώπου ἁμαρτωλοὶ κατεστάθησαν οἱ πολλοί, οὕτως καὶ διὰ τῆς ὑπακοῆς τοῦ ἐνὸς δίκαιοι κατασταθήσονται οἱ πολλοί. The choice of the somewhat peculiar term instead of the more simple γίγνεσθαι, is not to be explained on the supposition that the word in these connections means to present, to cause to appear, —a false supposition, since καθιστάναι, unlike συνιστάναι, denotes an actual appointment or setting down in a definite place, whereas the reference to others has to be indicated by the context or by the peculiarity of the situation, e.g. Thuc. ii. 42, τὴν εὐλογίαν φανεράν σημείους καθιστάναι; Soph. *Ant.* 653, ψευδῇ γ' ἐμᾶντὸν οὐ καταστήσω πόλει. Further, such a supposition leaves unexplained phrases like Isocr. 211 C, ἐπίπονον τὸν βίον καθιστάναι = to make one's life miserable, as also the use of the passive as synonymous with γίγνεσθαι, e.g. Eurip. *Androm.* 385 sq., καὶ λαχοῦσά τ' ἀθλία καὶ μὴ λαχοῦσα δυστυχὴς καθίσταμαι (which is not to be confounded with the present middle). Compare, too, the corresponding use of the intransitive senses, e.g. Soph. *Oed. Col.* 356, φύλαξ δέ μου πιστὴ κατέστη. The choice of the expression in Rom. v. 19 rather arose, partly from its not being simply the moral quality that is referred to, but, above all, the thence resulting situation of those who are sinners (cf. ver. 18, which serves as foundation for ver. 19), partly from regard to the influence exercised from another quarter, especially to the idea of δικαίωσις, inasmuch as it is a μετάρθεσις.—2 Pet. i. 8, οὐκ ἀργοὺς οὐδὲ ἀκίρπους (ὑμᾶς)

καθίστησιν.—(II.) Intransitive, *to exist as something*, cf. above cited, *Oed. Col.* 356. The present middle = *to take a character or position, to come forward, to appear*. So Jas. iii. 6, iv. 4, ὃς ἂν οὖν βουληθῇ φίλος εἶναι τοῦ κόσμου, ἐχθρὸς τοῦ θεοῦ καθίσταται. To understand this as present passive = γίνεσθαι, increases the obscurity of the passage, and is itself rendered awkward by the relation of this sentence (οὖν) to the previous one.

Ἀποκαθίστημι, Acts i. 6, -άνω; Mark ix. 12, -στάω; cf. Winer, § 14. 1; = *to set again in a place, to bring back*. (I.) ἅ. τί, *to reinstate anything, e.g. τοὺς νόμους*, Dem. xviii. 90, etc. So in N. T. Matt. xvii. 11, cf. Mark ix. 12, of Elias, Ἡλίας μὲν ἔρχεται καὶ ἀποκαταστήσει πάντα. It depends mainly on understanding rightly the object πάντα, which is rendered indistinct by its generality. The expression refers primarily back to Mal. iii. 22 (iv. 4), ἀποκαταστήσει καρδίαν πατρὸς πρὸς υἱὸν κ.τ.λ. In what breadth of meaning the passage must be taken, we learn from Luke i. 17, cf. ver. 16. This consideration, alone, however, does not render it intelligible. Equally impossible is it to explain the ἀποκαταστήσει πάντα in its biblical connection by means of Ecclus. xlviii. 10, ἐπιστρέψαι καρδίαν πατρὸς πρὸς υἱὸν καὶ καταστήσαι φυλὰς Ἰακώβ, or by the notions of the Talmud; cf. Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr.* Matt. xvii. 11, "*Purificabit nothos eosque restituet congregationi, Tr. Kiddusch. lxxi. 1; Israeli reddet urnam Mannae, phialam sacri olei, phialam aquae, et sunt qui dicunt virgam Aaronis, Tanchum in Exod. i.*" Rather do the words of Elijah in 1 Kings xix. 10, 14, suggest the correct interpretation,—the interpretation, too, which answers to the character of the sacred history,—namely, that the passage treats of the restoration of the covenant that had been deserted by the people. Thus is explained, also, the expansion of the prophecy in question, Luke i. 16, 17, as well as the connection with Moses in which Elias appears on the mount of transfiguration, cf. Mal. iii. 24 (iv. 6). The context in Matthew and Mark thus also receives its due emphasis. (II.) ἀποκαθ. τί τινι, *to bring something back to somebody, to return*. Heb. xiii. 19, ἵνα τάχιον ἀποκατασταθῶ ὑμῖν; cf. Polyb. iii. 98, ἐὰν ἐξαγαγὼν τοὺς ὁμήρους ἀποκαταστήσῃ τοῖς γονεῦσι καὶ ταῖς πόλεσιν. With Acts i. 6, εἰ ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ τούτῳ ἀποκαθιστάνεις τὴν βασιλείαν τῷ Ἰσραήλ, Raphel compares Polyb. ix. 30, καὶ τοὺς νόμους καὶ τὸ πάτριον ὑμῖν ἀποκατέστησε πολίτευμα. As to the thing meant, compare, besides, the prophetic passages, Mic. iv. 7, 8, v. 3, Amos ix. 11, especially Mark xi. 10, εὐλογημένη ἡ ἐρχομένη βασιλεία τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Δαβὶδ; Matt. xxi. 43, ἀρθήσεται ἀφ' ὑμῶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ κ.τ.λ. (III.) The passive = *to be recovered*, of sick persons, diseased members. Matt. xii. 13; Mark iii. 5, viii. 25; Luke vi. 10.

Ἀποκατάστασις, ἡ, *restitution of a thing to its former condition, rerum ex turbis in priorem ordinem restitutio* (Bengel). Polyb. iv. 23, ἕως ἂν ἐκ τοῦ γεγονότος κινήματος εἰς τὴν ἀποκατάστασιν ἔλθῃ τὰ κατὰ τὴν πόλιν.—Acts iii. 21, ὃν δεῖ οὐρανὸν μὲν δέξασθαι ἄχρι χρόνων ἀποκαταστάσεως πάντων ὧν ἐλάλησεν ὁ θεὸς διὰ στόματος τῶν ἁγίων ἀπ' αἰῶνος αὐτοῦ προφητῶν. The relative ὧν cannot refer to πάντων, because, in that case, the assimilated relative clause would be a limitation, instead of the addition, of

a new attribute (cf. Krüger, § 51. 10). It must therefore be taken as an attribute of χρόνων ἀποκ., of which times, as object of ἐλάλησεν, cf. Col. iv. 3 ; 1 Cor. xiv. 2, 3 ; Heb. ii. 3. (The masculine construing of πάντων does not correspond with the combinations cited under ἀποκαθίστημι.) We then see that the contents and goal of the prophecy are the same in ἀποκ. πάντ. as in παλιγγενεσία (which see), Matt. xix. 28 ; cf. Joseph. Antt. xi. 3. 8, 9, where παλιγγ. is used interchangeably with ἀποκ., Rev. xxi. 5 ; Rom. viii. 19 sqq. The promise of salvation, so long as it has existed (cf. ἀπ. αἰῶνος), has treated of the doing away with the condition brought about by sin, and the restoration of the paradisiacal state willed by God. Cf. Isa. xi. 3, 5, etc.

Συνίστημι, secondary form συνιστάνω, 2 Cor. iii. 1, v. 12, x. 12, 18 ; Gal. ii. 18.—(I.) Transitive, to place together, to bring together, to produce, to arrange. (a.) With a thing as object, to restore or represent, to produce or set forth, the latter with a certain emphasis corresponding with the strictly complex act denoted by the word. In profane Greek, the IXX., and Apocrypha, often also in the middle ; in the N. T., only in the present and 1st aorist active. The meaning becomes more defined according to the object whose setting forth or production involves different kinds of procedure, and requires varied complications, e.g. πράγμα = to accomplish ; πόλεμον = to set on foot ; συμπόσιον = to prepare ; πόλιν = to found ; πολιτεῖαν = to establish, and others. Philo and Josephus use it of the creation of the world ; Philo, de opif. Mund. 4, Θεὸς δὲ μεγαλόπολιν κτίζειν διανοηθεὶς ἐνενόησε πρότερον τοὺς τύπους αὐτῆς, ἐξ ὧν κόσμον νοητὸν συστησάμενος ἀποτελεῖ τὸν αἰσθητὸν ; Joseph. Antt. xii. 2. 2, τὸν ἅπαντα συστησάμενον θεὸν καὶ οὗτοι καὶ ἡμεῖς σεβόμεθα = to create as an ordered and substantial whole. In mathematics = to describe or make. Also = to prove, to lay before, to fix ; in the middle = to stand fast ; cf. Polyb. iii. 108. 4, διόπερ ἐπειρᾶτο συνιστάνειν ὅτι κ.τ.λ. ; v. 67. 9, οἱ δὲ . . . τὰναντία τούτων ἐπειρῶντο συνιστάνειν ; Aristot. de Plant. i. 1, συνίσταται πρότερον ἔχουσιν ἢ οὐχὶ τὰ φυτὰ ψυχρὴν ; i. 2, κἀντεῦθεν συνίσταται ἵνα τὸ φυτὸν ἔχῃ τι κρεῖττον παρὰ τὸ ζῆον. Also of actual proof, Polyb. iv. 5. 6, ἐπὶ δὲ πᾶσι τούτοις συνίστανε τὴν ἐξακολουθήσουσαν εὐνοίαν σφίσι. See under (b.) Rom. iii. 5, εἰ δὲ ἡ ἀδικία ἡμῶν θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην συνίστησιν ; v. 8, συνίστησιν δὲ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἀγάπην ὃ θεὸς εἰς ἡμᾶς ὅτι κ.τ.λ. These are the only two places in the N. T. in which it is joined with a thing as object. Still it is clear that the simple meaning, to show, to represent, does not satisfy the context, which demands an import such as is found elsewhere in the Pauline writings (in which alone the word occurs), and indeed usually (b.) with personal object, either with two accusatives, Gal. ii. 18, παραβάτην ἑμαυτὸν συνιστάνω ; 2 Cor. vii. 11, συνεστήσατε ἑαυτοὺς ἀγνοῦς εἶναι ; cf. Phil. quis rer. div. haer. 517, συνίστησιν αὐτὸν προφήτην ; Joseph. Antt. vii. 2. 1, συνιστῶν ἑαυτοὺς ὡς εὖνους, where the second object has the emphasis ; or the perfect with simple accusative = to exhibit, to represent one rightly, to commend, to praise ; so often in Xenophon, Plato, Demosthenes, Plutarch ; Hesych. συνιστάνειν ἐπαινεῖν ; Rom. xvi. 1, συνίστημι ὑμῖν Φοίβην ; 2 Cor. iii. 1, ἀρχόμεθα πάλιν ἑαυτοὺς συνιστάνειν ; ἢ μὴ χρήζομεν ὥς τινες συστατικῶν

ἐπιστολῶν πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἢ ἐξ ὑμῶν; iv. 2, τῇ φανερώσει τῆς ἀληθείας συνιστάντες ἑαυτοὺς πρὸς πᾶσαν συνειδήσιν ἀνθρώπων ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ; v. 12, vi. 4, συνιστάντες ἑαυτοὺς ὡς θεοῦ διῶκοντες; x. 12, 18, οὐ γὰρ ὁ ἑαυτὸν συνιστάνων, ἐκεῖνός ἐστιν δόκιμος, ἀλλὰ ὃν ὁ κύριος συνίστησιν. In like manner the passive, 2 Cor. xii. 11.

(II.) Intransitive, 2d aorist and perfect, in the N. T. only the perfect = *to stand together*; *τινί*, either with or against one, in a friendly or hostile sense, never, however, to denote mere juxtaposition; accordingly, in Luke xi. 32, καὶ τοὺς δύο ἄνδρας τοὺς συνεστῶτας αὐτῷ, the choice of the word refers back to ver. 31. Then = *to stand together*, *to subsist*, answering to the transitive *to restore*, *to put down*, *to arrange*. Thus ἐκ τινός, *to consist of something*, Xen. Mem. iii. 6. 14, ἡ πόλις ἐξ οἰκιῶν συνέστηκε, *to have stability*, e.g. Aristot. Eth. Eud. vii. 9, τὸ κοινὸν πᾶν διὰ τοῦ δικαίου συνέστηκεν (cf. συνεστηκός, synonym with πεπηγός, Id. Meteor. iv. 5). So 2 Pet. iii. 5, γῇ ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ δι' ὕδατος συνεστῶσα, τῷ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγῳ (Gen. i. 2; 1 Pet. iii. 20); Col. i. 17, τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκεν; cf. Heb. i. 3, φέρων τὰ πάντα τῷ ῥήματι τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ.

Ἑπιστάσις, ἡ, not proved to exist in profane Greek till Sextus Empiricus (the 2d century A.D.), which has probably occasioned the reading ἐπίστασις (cf. 2 Macc. vi. 3) in both places in the LXX. On the other hand, in the LXX. and Josephus. — Num. xxvi. 9, οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἐπισυνιστάντες ἐπὶ Μωυσῆν καὶ Ἀαρὼν ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ Κορὲ ἐν τῇ ἐπισυστάσει κυρίου; xvi. 40, ὥσπερ Κορὲ καὶ ἡ ἐπισύστασις αὐτοῦ = *insurrection*, *rebellion*, from ἐπισυνίστημι, intransitive, and in a hostile sense, *to stand together against*, *to rebel*, Num. xiv. 35, xxvi. 9; in a friendly sense, *to stand by or together with*, *to unite together*, in Sext. Emp. The substantive occurs only in a hostile sense, so also in Josephus, C. Apion. i. 20, ὡν ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς ἐπισυστάσεως; Sext. Emp. adv. Eth. 127, πλείονων κακῶν ἐπισύστασιν. It has the same sense in Acts xxiv. 12, ἐπισύστασιν ὄχλου, and will also have the same in 2 Cor. xi. 28, χωρὶς τῶν παρεκτός ἡ ἐπισύστασις μου (genitive of the object, as in Num. xxvi. 9), ἡ καθ' ἡμέραν κ.τ.λ.,—conclusively in relation to that which πολλάκις (ver. 26 sqq.) the apostle had to encounter, which presented itself in opposition to him.

Ἑπόστασις, ἡ, (I.) transitively, *setting under*, *laying the foundation*.—(II.) Intransitively, (a.) *stay*, *support*, *foundation*, *substructure*, Diod. Sic. i. 66, xiii. 82; cf. Ezek. xliii. 11; (b.) figuratively, *that which lies at the foundation of a matter*, e.g. the subject on which one writes, speaks, etc., the matter treated of ("sujet"); Polyb. iv. 2. 1, καλλίστην ὑπόστασιν ὑπολαμβάνοντες εἶναι ταύτην (if this example of the usage, which is apparently the only one adducible, ought not to be referred to the other, namely, *design*, *project*). We have an analogous use in 2 Cor. ix. 4, μὴ πᾶς . . . καταισχυνθῶμεν . . . ἐν τῇ ὑποστάσει ταύτῃ, and xi. 17, ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ ὑποστάσει τῆς καυχήσεως, which is explained after the example of Theophyl., ὑπόστασιν τὴν ὑπόθεσιν, τὸ αὐτὸ τὸ πρῶγμα, ἧ-οι τὴν οὐσίαν τῆς καυχήσεως νόει. But it is not perceived why the apostle, without apparent reason, those so striking an expression instead of the commoner πρῶγμα, 2 Cor. vii. 11; 1 Thess.

iv. 6; cf. also 2 Cor. ix. 3, ἐν τῷ μέρει τούτῳ, to which must be added, that if this meaning is accepted for 2 Cor. ix. 4, the word would seem to be redundant, cf. 2 Cor. x. 8; on the other hand, as in 2 Cor. xi. 17, the simple expression ἐν τῷ καυχᾶσθαι με, cf. xii. 1, 6, or ἐν τῇ καυχῇσει ταύτῃ, xi. 10, must have readily suggested itself. When we attempt to substitute the correspondent καύχημα for ὑπόστασις τῆς καυχήσεως, the unsuitableness of this explanation becomes plain at once. The expression in 2 Cor. xi. 17 clearly denotes something special, something characterizing the kind and manner of boasting; as also in ix. 4 (where τῆς καυχήσεως is a false reading) the word answers to τὸ καύχημα ἡμῶν τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐν τῷ μέρει τούτῳ. See under (d.) (e.) **The real nature of a thing**, in contrast to its appearance or outward show, e.g. Diog. Laert. *Pyrrhon.* ix. 91, ζητεῖται δὲ οὐκ εἰ φαίνεται τοιαῦτα, ἀλλ' εἰ καθ' ὑπόστασιν οὕτως ἔχει; Artemidor. *Oneirocr.* iii. 14, φαντασίαν μὲν ἔχειν πλούτου, ὑπόστασιν δὲ μῆ; Plut. *Mor.* 894 B (*de iride*), τῶν μεταρσίων παθῶν τὰ μὲν καθ' ὑπόστασιν γίνεται, οἷον ὄμβρος, χάλαζα; τὰ δὲ κατ' ἔμφασιν, ἰδίαν οὐκ ἔχοντα ὑπόστασιν; Aristot. *de Mund.* 4. In patristic Greek opposed to σχῆμα, δόκησις, et al., vid. Suic. *Thes. s.v.* So in Heb. i. 3, ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτήρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ, where δόξα denotes the revealed glory, ὑπόστασις the divine essence underlying the divine self-revelation. (d.) Answering to ὑφίστασθαι, to undertake, take upon oneself, hold out, endure, offer resistance, e.g. opposed to φεύγειν; Xen. *Cyrop.* iv. 2. 31, ὑπόστασις denotes also courage, steadfastness; e.g. Polyb. iv. 50. 10, οἱ δὲ Ῥόδιοι, θεωροῦντες τὴν τῶν Βυζαντίων ὑπόστασιν; vi. 55. 2, οὐχ' οὕτω τὴν δύναμιν, ὥς τὴν ὑπόστασιν αὐτοῦ καὶ τόλμαν καταπεπληγμένων ὑπεναντίων. Diod. Sic., Josephus, see Wetstein on 2 Cor. ix. 4. Cf. ὑποστατικός, -ὼς = *steadfast*, Stob. *Floril.* i. 64, δεινῶν ὑποστατικά ἔξις. Diod. Sic. xx. 78 opposed to δειλιάσας. Similarly the LXX. have translated הָיָה, Ps. xxxix. 8, and הָיָה, in Ruth i. 12, Ezek. xix. 5, by ὑπόστασις, as elsewhere by ὑπομονή (cf. Ps. xxxix. 8a); because the Greek word ἐλπίς lacked the psychological definiteness of the Hebrew word; see ἐλπίς. It must therefore, as a synonym of ἐλπίς, ὑπομονή, be translated by **confidence, assurance**, Heb. iii. 14, ἐάνπερ τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς ὑποστάσεως μέχρι τέλους βεβαίαν κατάσχωμεν, cf. ver. 6, ἐὰν τὴν παρρησίαν καὶ τὸ καύχημα τῆς ἐλπίδος κατάσχωμεν; xi. 1, ἔστι δὲ πίστις ἐλπιζομένων ὑπόστασις; cf. under ἔλεγχος. This meaning, therefore, is appropriate also in 2 Cor. ix. 4, xi. 17.

Κ

Καθαρός, ἄ, ὄν, connected with the Latin *castus* and the German "heiter" = pure, clean, without stain, without spot, synonymous with ἀμίαντος; free from mixture, synonymous with ἄκρατος = clear; cf. Xen. *Cyrop.* viii. 7. 20, ἄκρατος καὶ καθαρὸς ὁ νοῦς; Jas. i. 27, θρησκεία καθαρὰ καὶ ἀμίαντος.—(I.) In a physical sense, of vessels, clothes, etc., Matt. xxiii. 36, xxvii. 59; Rev. xv. 6, xix. 8, 14, xxi. 18, 21.—(II.) Transferred to the sphere of morals, e.g. Pind. *Pyth.* v. 2, καθαρὰ ἀρετή; Plat. *Rep.* vi. 496 D, καθαρὸς ἀδικίας τε καὶ ἀνοσιῶν ἔργων; *Crat.* 403 E, ψυχὴ καθαρὰ πάντων τῶν περὶ τὸ σῶμα κυκλῶν καὶ ἐπιθυμῶν. In later Greek, ἀπό τινος instead of the simple genitive, e.g. Dio

Cass. xxxvii. 24, καθαρὰν ἀπὸ πάντων αὐτῶν ἡμέραν ἀκριβῶς τηρῆσαι. We meet more frequently the phrase καθαραὶ χεῖρες in Herod., Aesch., Plut., etc. Plut. *Pericl.* 8, οὐ μόνον τὰς χεῖρας δεῖ καθαρὰς ἔχειν τὸν στρατηγόν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς ὄψεις; cf. Job ix. 30, xxii. 30; Xen. *Cyrop.* viii. 7, ἔργα καθαρὰ καὶ ἔξω τῶν ἀδίκων; cf. *μίασμα*, of a crime. See under καθαρίζω. Καθαρός denotes both *moral pureness and innocence*; (a.) the former in Matt. v. 8, οἱ καθαροὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ; 1 Tim. i. 5, ἀγάπη ἐκ καθαρᾶς καρδίας (cf. 1 Pet. i. 22, ἐκ καρδίας ἀλλήλους ἀγαπήσατε, where the Received text has ἐκ καρδ. καθαρᾶς) καὶ συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς καὶ πίστεως ἀνυποκρίτου; 2 Tim. ii. 22, ἐπικαλεῖσθαι τὸν κύριον ἐκ καθαρ. καρδ. Jas. i. 27, see above. The phrase καθαρὸς τῇ καρδίᾳ, καθ. καρδία, answers both to the Heb. כָּל־לֵב, Ps. xxiv. 4 (Ps. lxxiii. 1 = εὐθὺς τῇ καρδίᾳ; Acts viii. 21, ἡ καρδία σου οὐκ ἔστιν εὐθεία ἔναντι τοῦ θεοῦ, cf. Job ix. 30, xxii. 30; xxxiii. 9, καθαρὸς [יָשָׁר] εἰμι οὐχ ἁμαρτῶν, ἄμεμπτός εἰμι, οὐ γὰρ ἠνόμησα; viii. 6, εἰ καθαρὸς εἰ καὶ ἀληθινός), and to כָּל־לֵב, Prov. xxii. 11 (ὅσαι καρδίαι); יָשָׁר לֵב, Ps. li. 12. In the N. T. passages and in most of the O. T., the meaning, which lies on the surface, is *pure*, ἀπλότης, cf. Gen. viii. 21.—Then (b.) = *guiltless*, Acts xx. 26, καθαρὸς ἐγὼ ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος, and without such an addition in Acts xviii. 6. Also equivalent to *purified*, John xv. 3, καθαροὶ ἐστε διὰ τὸν λόγον ὃν λελάληκα ὑμῖν; cf. ver. 2, καθαίρει τὸ κλῆμα; xiii. 10, ὁ λελουμένος ἐστὶν καθαρὸς ὅλος; cf. the combination of καθαρίζειν with ἄψεις, Heb. ix. 22. The phrase καθαρὰ συνειδήσεις, 1 Tim. iii. 9, ἔχοντας τὸ μυστήριον τῆς πίστεως ἐν καθ. συνειδ.; 2 Tim. i. 3, τῷ θεῷ λατρεύω ἐν καθ. σ., cf. 1 Tim. i. 15, μεμίανται αὐτῶν ὁ νοῦς καὶ ἡ συνειδήσις, opposed to πάντα καθαρὰ τοῖς καθαροῖς, denotes a conscience *troubled with no guilt*, as well as a conscience *freed from guilt*; cf. with 2 Tim. i. 3, Heb. ix. 14, τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ καθαριεῖ τὴν συνειδ. ὑμῶν ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἔργων εἰς τὸ λατρεύειν θεῷ ζῶντι. It is finally to be remarked that καθ. is applied (c.) to so-called *Levitical, ritual, or theocratic cleanness* (see καθαρίζειν), as opposed to κοινός or ἀκάθαρτος; cf. Heb. ix. 13, ἀγιάζει τοὺς κεκοινωμένους πρὸς τὴν τῆς σαρκὸς καθαρότητα; Acts x. 15, xi. 19; Rom. xiv. 20, πάντα μὲν καθαρὰ; cf. ver. 14, οὐδὲν κοινὸν δι' αὐτοῦ εἰ μὴ τῷ λογισμένῳ τι κοινὸν εἶναι, ἐκείνῳ κοινόν. Κοινόν is *common* in the sense of *unclean*, i.e. connected with sin, inasmuch as that in which the whole world shares cannot be admitted into the sphere of the fellowship of God until it is taken out of connection with the world (cf. ἀγιάζειν πρὸς καθαρότητα), until in some way or other, by washing, etc., or prayer (on Rom. xiv. 14, Tit. i. 15, cf. 1 Tim. iv. 4, 5), really or symbolically, that is removed, which indicates a connection with the world estranged from fellowship with God; Mark vii. 2, κοιναῖς χερσὶν τοῦτ' ἔστιν ἀνίπτοις; Matt. xxiii. 26; Luke xi. 41. See under καθαρίζειν.

Καθαίρω, fut. -αρῶ, to cleanse, to purify; John xv. 2, καθαίρει τὸ κλῆμα ἵνα καρπὸν πλείονα φέρῃ = κλᾶν, later κλαδᾶν, κλαδεύειν; cf. Phil. *de Somn.* ii. 667, ed. Mang., καθάπερ τοῖς δένδρεσιν ἐπιφύονται βλάσται περισσαί, μεγάλαί τῶν γνησίων λῶβαι, ἃς καθαίρουσι καὶ ἀποτέμνουσι προνοία τῶν ἀναγκαίων οἱ γεωργοῦντες· οὕτω τῷ ἀληθεῖ καὶ ἀτύφῳ βίῳ παρανέβλαψεν ὁ κατεψευσμένος καὶ τετυφωμένος, οὐ μέχρι ταύτης τῆς ἡμέρας

οὐδείς εὐρηται γεωργός, ὃς τὴν βλαβερὰν ἐπίφυσιν αὐταῖς ῥίζαις ἀπέκοψε. Plat. *Eut.* iii. A, ἡμᾶς ἐκκαθαίρει τοὺς τῶν νέων τὰς βλάστας διαφθείροντας. On the use of the word in a religious sense = *lustrare, expiare*, Heb. x. 2, διὰ τὸ μηδεμίαν ἔχειν συνείδησιν ἁμαρτιῶν τοὺς λατρεύοντας ἅπαξ κεκαθαρισμένους (D E K, κεκαθαρισμένους, Lachm. κεκαθερισμ). See καθαρίζω.

Καθαρίζω, καθαριῶ, ἐκαθάρισα, ἐκαθαρίσθην = καθαίρω, only in biblical and (though rarely) in ecclesiastical Greek = to cleanse, to free from dirt or uncleanness; Matt. xxiii. 25; Luke xi. 39; Mark vii. 19. Used of Levitical or ritual cleansing in opposition to κοινῶν, cf. Acts x. 15, xi. 9, ἃ ὁ θεὸς ἐκαθάρισε, σὺ μὴ κοίνου. See under καθαρός. Used of the removal or healing of leprosy, which excluded the person affected from the community of the people of God because he was ἀκάθαρτος; cf. the remarks of Bähr, *Mos. Cult.* ii. 460, who, in view of Num. xii. 12, 2 Kings v. 7, aptly designates leprosy *living death*; so Matt. viii. 2, 3, x. 8, xi. 5; Mark i. 40, 41, 42; Luke iv. 27, v. 12, 13, vii. 22, xvii. 14 = 𐤒𐤓; Lev. xiii. 13, etc. Against the explanation formerly in vogue of Matt. viii. 2, 3 = to declare clean, it is aptly remarked by Kypke, *Observ. Scr.*, “*sic Christo aliquid tribueretur, quod ipse tamen, sec. v. 4, a sacerdotibus fieri debere jussit.*” In a moral sense, 2 Cor. vii. 1, καθαρίσωμεν ἑαυτοὺς ἀπὸ παντὸς μολυσμοῦ κ.τ.λ.; Jas. iv. 8, καθαρίσατε χεῖρας, ἁμάρτωλοι, καὶ ἠγνίστατε καρδίας; cf. Prov. xx. 8.

Transferred to the religious sphere, it is used by the LXX. and in the N. T. like καθαίρειν in profane Greek = to purify by propitiating, *expiare, lustrare*. So, in particular, Herod., Xen., Thucyd. Herod. i. 43, ὁ καθαρθεὶς τὸν φόνον; 44, τὸν αὐτὸς φόνον ἐκάθηρε; 35, ἀπικνέεται ἐς τὰς Σάρδεις ἀνὴρ συμφορῇ ἐχόμενος καὶ οὐ καθαρὸς χεῖρας . . . παρελθὼν δὲ οὗτος ἐς τὰ Κροΐσου οἰκία κατὰ νόμους τοὺς ἐπιχωρίους καθαρσίου ἐδέετο κυρῆσαι. Κροΐσος δὲ μιν ἐκάθηρε. ἔστι δὲ παραπλησίη ἡ κάθαρσις τοῖσι Λυδοῖσι καὶ τοῖσι Ἑλλήσι. Xen. *Anab.* v. 7. 35, ἔδοξε καὶ καθᾶραι τὸ στράτευμα, καὶ ἐγένετο καθαρμός; Thuc. iii. 104; Plat. *Legg.* ix. 868 A, the middle opposed to τὸ βλάβος, τὴν βλάβην ἐκτίειν; *Phaedr.* 113 D, καθαιρόμενοι τῶν τε ἀδικημάτων δίδόντες δίκας; cf. *Legg.* 872 E, τοῦ γὰρ κοινοῦ μιανθέντος αἵματος οὐκ εἶναι κάθαρσιν ἄλλην, οὐδὲ ἐκπλυτον ἐθέλειν γίγνεσθαι τὸ μιανθέν, πρὶν φόνον φόνῳ ὁμοίῳ ὅμοιον ἢ δράσασα ψυχὴ τίση καὶ πάσης τῆς ξυγγενείας τὸν θυμὸν ἀφιλασμένη κοιμίσῃ. Cf. Nägelsbach, *Nachhomer. Theol.* p. 536, “Ἰλασμός requires κάθαρσις as its supplement, the washing away of the μῖασμα of guilt cleaving to the sinner.”—This usage enables us to explain why the LXX. render not only 𐤒𐤓, but in Ex. xxix. 37, xxx. 10, 𐤒𐤓 also, by καθαρίζειν, as 𐤒𐤓 in Ex. xxix. 36, xxx. 10 = καθαρισμός. 𐤒𐤓, indeed, is mostly applied to Levitical purifications; but it is also used of the purification from sin effected by means of propitiation. It occurs conjoined with 𐤒𐤓 in Lev. xvi. 30, ἐξιλάσεται περὶ ὑμῶν, καθαρῖσαι ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ πασῶν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ὑμῶν ἔναντι κυρίου καὶ καθαρισθήσεσθε; cf. vv. 32–34. Further, cf. xvi. 19, 20, ῥανεῖ ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος . . . καὶ καθαριεῖ αὐτὸ καὶ ἁγιάσει αὐτὸ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀκαθαρσιῶν τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ, καὶ συντελέσαι ἐξιλασκόμενος τὸ ἅγιον κ.τ.λ. Further, Num. viii. 21, in the account of the consecration of the Levites, where the purification was not merely ritual, cf. viii. 7.

12, 21, where ver. 21, ἐξιλάσατο περὶ αὐτῶν ἀφαγνίσασθαι αὐτούς; Ps. li. 4, 9; Jer. xxxiii. 8. In general, we must abide by the position that the idea of a seriously-meant purification from sin lies at the basis of כִּפּוּר, even where it is used of Levitical purifications (cf. the sin-offerings in the laws relating to purification), even though the impurity is to be regarded less as the result of misconduct than as the suffering of what community of nature infected with sin brings in connection with such processes as generation, birth, death, etc. The not quite rightly so-called Levitical, or better, theocratic uncleanness, is the consequence rather of the bearing than of the committal of sin. For this reason the purification connected with propitiation does not materially differ from that which was prescribed for Levitical impurity. One might say, on the one hand, it is the personal appropriation of propitiation; on the other, where there was no personal guilt requiring propitiation, it was deliverance from the suffering of sin. *Καθαρίζειν* accordingly holds a middle position between *ἱλάσκεσθαι* and *ἀγιάζειν*; see the passages quoted, as also Ex. xxix. 37, καθαριεὶς τὸ θυσιαστήριον καὶ ἀγιάσεις αὐτὸ καὶ ἔσται τὸ θυσιαστήριον ἅγιον τοῦ ἁγίου; Lev. viii. 15, ἐκαθάρισεν τὸ θυσιαστήριον καὶ ἡγίασεν αὐτὸ τοῦ ἐξιλάσασθαι ἐπ' αὐτοῦ, where καθ. = כִּפּוּ. So also in the N. T., especially in the Epistle to the Hebrews, which, above all other N. T. books, is closely related to the O. T., and shows the influence of the Greek literature. There the word *καθαρίζειν* holds the same position as a *term. techn.* that is held by *δικαιοῦν* in Paul's writings, with the difference that what in *δικαιοῦν* (also holding a midway position between *ἱλάσκεσθαι* and *ἀγιάζειν*) appears as a judicial act, in *καθαρίζειν* is represented as an effect produced in the object itself; *δικαιοῦν*, on the contrary, refers to an effect produced on the relation of the object to God. This corresponds with the point of view from which the Epistle to the Hebrews speaks of the law; see νόμος. In the Epistle to the Hebrews *καθαρίζειν* has various objects. (1) The person and the conscience, Heb. ix. 14, τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ καθαριεὶ τὴν συνείδησιν ἡμῶν ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἔργων εἰς τὸ λατρεύειν θεῷ ζῶντι; cf. x. 2, διὰ τὸ μηδεμίαν ἔχειν συνείδησιν ἁμαρτιῶν τοὺς λατρεύοντας ἅπαξ κεκαθαρισμένους. According to this, purification is the removal of our consciousness of guilt by the appropriation of the atoning sacrifice of Christ (*vid. αἷμα*). (2) With impersonal objects, such as the sanctuary and its vessels, Heb. ix. 22, ἐν αἵματι πάντα καθαρίζεται, καὶ χωρὶς αἱματεκχυσίας οὐ γίνεται ἄφεσις; ver. 23, ἀνάγκη οὖν τὰ ὑποδείγματα τῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς τούτοις καθαρίζεσθαι, αὐτὰ δὲ τὰ ἐπουράνια κρείττοσι θυσίαις παρὰ ταύτας. According to this, purification is a removal of our sins out of the consciousness of God (cf. x. 17; Lev. xvi. 16) as the condition of ἄφεσις, and therewith of the purification of the conscience. *Καθαρίζειν*, therefore, in itself is equivalent to ἀφαιρῆν ἁμαρτίας, Heb. x. 4; περιελῆν ἁμαρτίας, x. 11; it puts it, however, that our guilt is removed both from God's consciousness and also from our own by virtue of the appropriation or acceptance of the atoning sacrifice. The sanctuary for purification, as the place of divine intercourse with men, is made impure by the intervention of sin, Lev. xvi. 16. Hence the purification thereof may be explained as the removal of our sin from the consciousness of God, cf. Jer. xxxi. 34.

In the remaining passages of the N. T., *καθαρίζειν*, likewise synonymous with *ἀφαιρεῖν ἁμαρτίας*, is conjoined with *ἀγιάζειν*, but without the dogmatic precision of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Eph. v. 26, *ἵνα αὐτὴν ἀγιάσῃ καθαρίσας τῷ λούτρῳ τοῦ ὕδατος κ.τ.λ.*; Tit. ii. 14, *ἵνα λυτρώσῃται ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης ἀνομίας καὶ καθάρσιν ἑαυτῷ λαὸν περιούσιον*. In closer approximation to the usage of the Epistle to the Hebrews, is 1 John i. 7, *τὸ αἷμα Ἰησοῦ καθαρίζει ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης ἁμαρτίας*, the result of the atoning sacrifice; 1 John i. 9, *ἵνα ἀφῇ ἡμῖν τὰς ἁμαρτίας καὶ καθάρσιν ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης ἀδικίας*, where the explanation of E. Haupt, that the former refers to the *actus forensis*, and *καθ. ἀπὸ κ.τ.λ.* to the renewal of the man by virtue of the indwelling *δικαιοσύνη*, contradicts alike the conception of *δικαιοσύνη* and the conception of *ἀδικία*, which describes the nature of the *ἁμαρτίας* and the condition of the subject brought about by them, apart from the fact that it is an error to confound the conception of purifying with that of renewal, cf. 1 John iii. 3–9. Worthy of note is, further, Acts xv. 9, *οὐδὲν διέκρινεν μεταξὺ ἡμῶν τε καὶ αὐτῶν, τῇ πίστει καθαρίσας τὰς καρδίας αὐτῶν*, where the expression is defined by what is related in Acts x. 15, 34, xi. 2 ff.

Καθαρισμός, ὁ, purification, for which in profane Greek is used *καθαρμός* = *purification, process of purification, sacrifice of purification*, Plat., Plut. LXX. = *טהרה*, Lev. xiv. 32, xv. 13; 1 Chron. xxiii. 28; *טהרה*, Ex. xxix. 36, xxx. 10. Of the purification of women (Aristot. *h. a.* vii. 10), Luke ii. 22. Of ritual purification, in Mark i. 44; Luke v. 14; John ii. 6. The baptism both of John and Jesus is designated *καθαρισμός* in John iii. 25, by which the connection between it and the ritual process of purification (cf. Ezek. xxxvi. 25) and its combination with propitiation (*vid.* *καθαρίζειν*), is made evident; hence *βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν*, Luke iii. 3; Mark i. 4; Acts ii. 38. Heb. i. 3, *καθαρισμὸν ποιησάμενος τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν*, denotes the objective removal of our sins, cf. Heb. ix. 22, 23; Plat. *Rep.* ii. 364 E, *καθαρμοὶ ἀδικημάτων*. Job vii. 21, *טהרתני* = *ποιεῖν καθαρισμὸν τῆς ἁμαρτίας*. In 2 Pet. i. 9, *λήθην λαβὼν τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ τῶν πάλαι αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτημάτων*, on the contrary, it denotes the purification accomplished in the subject, the propitiation appropriated by the subject; see *καθαρίζω*.

Καθαρότης, ἡ, purity, freedom from the *μίασμα* of guilt. Heb. ix. 13, *τοὺς κεκοινωμένους ἀγιάζει πρὸς τὴν τῆς σαρκὸς καθαρότητα*. See under *κοινόω*, *σάβξ*.

Κάθαρμα, τό, the defilement swept away by cleansing. Employed in connection with the process of purification, it denotes the sacrificial victim laden with guilt, and therefore defiled. Figuratively, *offscouring* of mankind, Luc. *dial. mort.* ii. 1, *ἐξονειδίζει ἀνδράποδα καὶ καθάρματα ἡμᾶς ἀποκαλῶν*. In 1 Cor. iv. 13, according to Cod. B, *ὥσπερ καθάρματα τοῦ κόσμου ἐγενήθημεν*, where *ὡς περικαθάρματα* is generally read. Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* iv. 4. 3, *τὰ ἀθύρματα καὶ καθάρματα τῆς χώρας ὅλης . . . λεληθότως παρεισέρρευσαν εἰς τὴν ἱερὰν πόλιν λησται δι' ὑπερβολὴν ἀσεβημάτων μαινόντες καὶ τὸ ἀβέβηλον ἔδαφος, οὗς ὁρᾷν νῦν ἐμμεθυσκομένους τοῖς ἀγίοις κ.τ.λ.*

Περικάθαρμα, τό, *offscouring, refuse*. Not used in profane Greek. In the LXX. Prov. xxi. 18, περικάθαρμα δικαίου ἄνομος, Hebrew רָפָה. *Anon. Cat. in Psalm. i. 600. 32* (Steph. *Thes.*), περικ. ἑαυτοὺς ἀποκαλοῦντες καὶ πάντων ἐσχάτους. 1 Cor. iv. 13, see κάθαρμα. Synonymous with περίψημα, *what is swept away by wiping*.

Ἀκάθαρτος, ον, (I.) Strictly *unpurified*; thus only still as equivalent to *unatoned* (*vid. καθαίρω, καθαρίζω*), *e.g.* Plat. *Legg.* ix. 868 A, ὅστις ἂν ἀκάθαρτος ὦν τὰ ἄλλα ἱερὰ μαινῇ; 854 B, ἐκ παλαιῶν καὶ ἀκαθάρτων ἀδικημάτων. With this is connected the use of the word in 2 Cor. vi. 17, ἀκαθάρτου μὴ ἄπτεσθε (*cf.* vii. 1, καθαρίσωμεν ἑαυτοὺς ἀπὸ παντὸς μολυσμοῦ σαρκὸς καὶ πνεύματος, ἐπιτελοῦντες ἁγιοσύνην), and 1 Cor. vii. 14, ἐπεὶ ἄρα τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν ἀκάθαρτά ἐστιν, νῦν δὲ ἅγιά ἐστιν, of Levitical, or, as we ought certainly here to say, theocratic impurity, Acts x. 4, 28, xi. 8; Rev. xviii. 2. On 2 Cor. vi. 17, *cf.* the fundamental passage Isa. lvi. 11. Κοινός, and with it ἀκάθαρτος, is that which does not belong to the sphere of the fellowship of God; see under καθάρσις, hence the antithesis ἅγιος. On the relation of impurity to sin, *vid. καθαρίζω*. Then (II.) = *impure*, usually transferred to the moral sphere. Plat. *Legg.* iv. 716 E, ἀκάθαρτος γὰρ τὴν ψυχὴν ὃ γε κακός, καθάρσις δὲ ὁ ἐνάντιος. *Cf.* Tim. 92, τὴν ψυχὴν ὑπὸ πλημμελείας πάσης ἀκαθάρτως ἐχόντων. Demosthenes, Lucian, Plutarch = *libidine impurus*; Cicero, *animus impurus* = *vicious, infamous*; Sallust, *Cat.* 15, Suidas, ἀκάθαρτος ἁμαρτητικός, *inclined to sin*. It would appear that we must take it in this general sense in the combination πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον, *cf.* Rev. xvi. 13, 14; Mark iii. 30, 22. So Matt. x. 1, xii. 43; Mark i. 23, 26, 27, iii. 11, 30, v. 2, 8, 13, vi. 7, vii. 25, ix. 25; Luke iv. 36, vi. 18, viii. 29, ix. 42, xi. 24; Acts v. 16, viii. 7; Rev. xviii. 2. Parallel with δαιμόνιον, *cf.* Mark vii. 25, 26; Rev. xvi. 13, 14, *et al.* Luke iv. 33, πνεῦμα δαιμονίου ἀκαθάρτον. To adduce here Josephus' idea (*vid.* under δαίμων) for the explanation of this expression and of the thing, is both unnecessary and inappropriate.

(III.) The word is used more specially in Eph. v. 5, πᾶς πόρνος ἢ ἀκάθαρτος ἢ πλεονέκτης; *cf.* ἀκαθαρσία, Col. iii. 5; Eph. iv. 19, *etc.* It is more comprehensive than πόρνος, *licentious* = *libidinosus, lustful*. *Cf.* Plut. *Oth.* 2, ἀνόσιοι καὶ ἄρρητοι ἐν γυναιξὶ πόρναις καὶ ἀκαθάρτοις ἐγκυλινθήσονται.

Ἀκαθαρσία, ἡ, *uncleanness*.—(I.) In the ritual sense, in Matt. xxiii. 27, of whited sepulchres, ἔσωθεν γέμουσιν ὀστέων νεκρῶν καὶ πάσης ἀκαθαρσίας, *cf.* Num. xix. 16.—(II.) In an ethical sense, (a.) in general = *impurity*, as opposed to ἁγιασμός, 1 Thess. ii. 3, ἡ παράκλησις ἡμῶν οὐκ ἐκ πλάνης οὐδὲ ἐξ ἀκαθαρσίας, οὔτε ἐν δόλῳ; Rom. vi. 19, παρεστήσατε τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν δοῦλα τῇ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ. The same contrast is in 1 Thess. iv. 7, where it denotes more specially (b.) *lasciviousness, unchastity*. So also wherever it is conjoined with πορνεία (*whoredom*); ἀσελγεία (*dissoluteness*). Ἀκαθαρσία is the genus of which πορνεία is a species; Eph. v. 3, πορνεία δὲ καὶ ἀκαθαρσία πάντα; iv. 19, ἑαυτοὺς παρέδωκαν τῇ ἀσελγείᾳ εἰς ἐργασίαν ἀκαθαρσίας πάσης. 2 Cor. xii. 21; Gal. v. 19; Col. iii. 5; Rom. i. 24.

Ἀκαθάρτης, ἡ, uncleanness, rare, perhaps only in the Received text, Rev. xvii. 4, ποτήριον . . . γέμον . . . ἀκαθάρτητος πορνείας αὐτῆς. Tisch. τὰ ἀκάθαρτα τῆς κ.τ.λ.

Καινός, ἡ, ὄν, new, and that, too, in opposition to what has already existed, is known, has been used and consumed; καινός therefore looks backwards, whereas its synonym νέος looks forwards = young, fresh; καινός = not yet having been; νέος = not having long been. The former answers to the Latin novus, the latter to the Latin recens. Tittmann, *Synon. N. T.* 59, "Est enim καινόν quod succedit in locum rei, quae antea adfuit, quod nondum usu tritum est, novum; νέος autem est, quod non diu ortum est, recens." Cf. Döderlein, *Lat. Syn.* iv. 95, according to whom Manutius on Cic. *Famm.* xi. 21 thus rightly describes the distinction, "Novum est non quod nuper, sed quod nunc primum habemus; recens vero non quod nunc primum, sed quod nuper. Et novum ad rem, recens ad tempus refertur. Propterea ut simul utrumque significetur, conjunguntur, ut in Cic. Flac. 6, *Lege hac recenti ac nova.*" For its relation to νέος, cf. in the N. T. Matt. ix. 17, οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς καινοὺς βάλλειν; Luke v. 38, Matt. xxvi. 29, on the contrary, γέννημα τῆς ἀμπέλου πίνω μεθ' ὑμῶν καινόν (cf. Rev. xix. 9); Mark xiv. 25. Ps. ciii. 5, ἀνακαινισθήσεται ὡς αἵτου ἡ νεότης σου. For the force of καινός, cf. in classical Greek, Xen. *Cyrop.* iii. 1. 30, καινῆς ἀρχομένης ἀρχῆς, ἡ τῆς εἰωθυίας καταμενούσης; *Mem.* iv. 4. 6, πειρώμαι καινόν τι λέγειν αἰεί, opposed to περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν τὰ αὐτὰ λέγειν (. . . ἃ ἐγὼ πάλαι πότε σου ἤκουσα); Plat. *Rep.* iii. 405 D, καινὰ ταῦτα καὶ ἄτοπα νοσημάτων ὀνόματα. From the N. T. cf. Mark ii. 21, τὸ πλήρωμα τὸ καινόν, in contrast with ἱμάτιον παλαιόν answering to ἐπίβλημα ῥάκους ἀγνάφου; Luke v. 36. Also cf. Matt. xxvii. 60, καινὸν μνημεῖον, with John xix. 41, ἐν ᾧ οὐδέπω οὐδεὶς ἐτέθη; Heb. viii. 13, ἐν τῷ λέγειν Καινήν πεπαλαίωκεν τὴν πρώτην. The same antithesis to πρῶτος occurs in Rev. xxi. 1; Isa. xliii. 18, 19.—1 John ii. 7, οὐκ ἐντολὴν καινὴν γράφω ὑμῖν, ἀλλ' ἐντολὴν παλαιάν, ἣν εἶχετε ἀπ' ἀρχῆς; ver. 8; 2 John 5; John xiii. 34. Thus καινός denotes what is new, inasmuch as it has not previously existed, or as, in contrast with what has previously existed, it takes the place thereof; and, indeed, primarily, (I.) with predominant reference to time. It is so used in the passages quoted, and in Matt. xiii. 52, καινὰ καὶ παλαιά. From the relation of the new to what preceded there results, (II.) in particular, a qualitative difference,—the difference of the new, as the better, from the old, as the worse, as that which is spoiled, etc., which is supplanted by the new. The καινόν corresponds also to the ἕτερον, to the qualitatively different, whereas νέον may stand side by side with the ἄλλο, the numerically different, because it does not express opposition to what already exists (though it does not of itself denote the numerically new.) Cf. Plat. *Apol.* 24 C, ἕτερα δαιμόνια καινά; Xen. *Cyrop.* i. 6. 38, οἱ μουσικοὶ οὐχ οἷς ἂν μάθωσι, τούτοις μόνον χρῶνται, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἄλλα νέα πειρῶνται ποιεῖν.—ἐν τοῖς μουσικοῖς τὰ νέα καὶ ἀνθηρα εὐδοκιμεῖ. From the N. T. cf. καινὴ διδαχὴ, Mark i. 27, Acts xvii. 19, with ἕτερον εὐαγγέλιον δ' οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλο, Gal. i. 6, 7. According to this, one might have expected in Acts xvii. 21, ἡ λέγειν ἢ ἀκούειν τι καινότερον, rather νεώτερον, just as Demosthenes, in

Phil. 1, says of the Athenians, οὐδὲν ποιοῦντες ἐνθάδε καθήμεθα, μέλλοντες αἰεὶ, καὶ ψηφίζομενοι καὶ πυνθανόμενοι κατὰ τὴν ἀγοράν, εἴ τι λέγεται νεώτερον. This gives greater prominence to the love of mere change; whereas the other, and, in profane writers, far more common expression, directs attention at the same time to what is attractive in such change, namely, the novelty. Cf. *Thuc.* iii. 38. 4, μετὰ καινότητος μὲν λόγου ἀπατᾶσθαι ἄριστοι. (It is that *blasé* state, in which men need ever fresh impressions and sensations, without being able to be permanently affected. *Theophr. Char. Eth.* 9, characterizes by this term the *λογοποιία*, and *Plut. Mor.* 519 A, the *πολυπραγμοσύνη*, of the Athenians.)

Inasmuch, now, as *καινός* distinguishes that which takes the place of what had previously existed (or is altogether new), as an *ἕτερον*, as something qualitatively different, it is specially fitted to characterize the blessings contained or expected in the final revelation of redemption, *e.g.* καινοὶ οὐρανοὶ καὶ γῆ καινή, *Isa.* lxxv. 17; *Rev.* xxi. 1; 2 *Pet.* iii. 13, ἐν οἷς δικαιοσύνη κατοικεῖ.—Καινή Ἱερουσαλήμ, *Rev.* iii. 12, xxi. 2. Ὅνομα καινόν, *Rev.* ii. 17, cf. *Isa.* xxvi. 2, 4, lxxv. 15; *Rev.* iii. 12, cf. xix. 12. (Ὡδὴ καινή, *Rev.* v. 9, xiv. 3. "The word new is a thoroughly apocalyptic word,—new name, new song, new heavens, new earth, new Jerusalem, everything new," Bengel on *Rev.* ii. 17.) *Rev.* xxi. 5, καινὰ ποιῶ πάντα. This is true of the blessings of redemption, still future, yet within the N. T. time of grace. Through the presence of the redemption given in Christ, the economy of salvation is also new, καινὴ διαθήκη, *Matt.* xxvi. 28; *Mark* xiv. 24; *Luke* xxii. 20; 1 *Cor.* xi. 25; 2 *Cor.* iii. 6; *Heb.* viii. 8, 13, ix. 15; cf. *Jer.* xxxi. 31, הַיְיָ הַנֶּחֱדָשׁ, in qualitative contrast with the old, cf. *Heb.* viii. 13; 2 *Cor.* iii. 6, ἰκάνωσεν ἡμᾶς διακόνους καινῆς διαθήκης, οὐ γράμματος ἀλλὰ πνεύματος; hence κρείττων διαθήκη, *Heb.* viii. 6, 7, vii. 22; cf. vii. 19, οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐτελείωσεν ὁ νόμος; ver. 18 (*Heb.* xii. 24, διαθ. νέα). The effect of salvation is termed a καινὴ κτίσις, *Gal.* vi. 15; 2 *Cor.* v. 17, εἴ τις ἐν Χριστῷ, καινὴ κτίσις· τὰ ἀρχαῖα παρῆλθεν, ἰδοὺ γέγονεν καινὰ τὰ πάντα. Also καινὸς ἄνθρωπος, *Eph.* ii. 15, iv. 24, see ἄνθρωπος. Cf. *Col.* iii. 10, τὸν νέον ἄνθρωπον τὸν ἀνακαινούμενον. In all these connections the design is to exclude that which was specially characteristic of the past, to wit, the connection with sin and its consequences, which rendered all hitherto unsatisfactory and unendurable. (*Ign. ad Eph.* 20, ὁ καινὸς ἄνθρωπος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός.)

Καινότης, newness, often in *Plutarch*, with the subordinate idea of the *unusual*, cf. *Ign. ad Eph.* 19. In biblical Greek only in *Rom.* vi. 4, vii. 6, where prominence is given to the qualitative difference between the blessings of the N. T. salvation and the previous state of things; *vid.* καινός. *Rom.* vi. 4, ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς περιπατεῖν; vii. 6, δουλεῖν ἐν καινότητι πνεύματος καὶ οὐ παλαιότητι γράμματος.

Καινίζω, to make or do something afresh or something new; repeatedly in *Soph.* and *Aeschylus*. In the *LXX.* 1 *Macc.* x. 10, τὴν πόλιν; *Isa.* lxi. 4, πόλεις ἐρήμους; 2 *Macc.* iv. 11, τὰς μὲν νομίμους καταλύων πολιτείας, παρανόμους ἐθισμοὺς ἐκαίειν;

Eur. *Tro.* 889. With subordinate *moral* import, in Wisd. vii. 27, ἡ σοφία . . . τὰ πάντα καινίζει. Hence—

Ἀνακαινίζω, to renew, to give a new beginning to what already exists, to re-establish, e.g. ἔχθραν, πόλεμον, νόμους; 1 Macc. vi. 9, λύπην. In the LXX. = עָנַן, Piel and Hithpaël, Ps. ciii. 5, ἀνακαινισθήσεται ὡς ἀετοῦ ἡ νεότης σου; civ. 30, καὶ κτισθήσονται, καὶ ἀνακαινιεῖς τὸ πρόσωπον τῆς γῆς. In a moral sense with personal object, only in Heb. vi. 6, τοὺς ἅπαξ φωτισθέντας κ.τ.λ. . . . πάλιν ἀνακαινίζουσιν εἰς μετάνοιαν, where it must be viewed as a synonym with ἐπιστρέφειν; cf. Lam. v. 21, ἐπιστρέψον ἡμᾶς κύριε πρὸς σέ, καὶ ἐπιστραφήσομεθα· καὶ ἀνακαινίσον ἡμέρας ἡμῶν καθὼς ἔμπροσθεν. As Delitzsch remarks on the passage, it appears as the active of ἀνακαινοῦσθαι, 2 Cor. iv. 16, Col. iii. 10; but it does not therefore refer to the action of the teacher and pastor, but to divine action; cf. the foregoing participles and vv. 7, 8.

Ἐγκαινίζω, besides in the LXX. and N. T., only in Poll. *Onom.* i. 11, ἄγαλμα ἐγκαίνισαι τῷ θεῷ (about 180 A.D.). As used in the LXX., it corresponds (I.) to עָנַן, to renew, 1 Sam. xi. 14, τὴν βασιλείαν; 2 Chron. xv. 8, τὸ θυσιαστήριον; Ps. li. 12, πνεῦμα εὐθὲς ἐγκαίνισον ἐν τοῖς ἐγκάτοις μου.—(II.) To עָנַן, to consecrate (properly, to make fast, complete), Deut. xx. 5, οἰκοδομεῖν οἰκίαν καὶνὴν καὶ ἐγκαίνιζεν αὐτήν; 1 Kings viii. 64; 2 Chron. vii. 5. With this are connected the derivatives ἐγκαίνισις, Num. vii. 88; ἐγκαίνισμός, vii. 10; 2 Chron. vii. 9; τὰ ἐγκαίνια, John x. 22 (the feast of the Consecration of the renovated temple, 2 Macc. i. 9, 18, x. 1 sq.; 1 Macc. iv. 41 sq.). In classical Greek καινός (Herodotus), and later καινίζω, are used for it. It is difficult to render the precise force of the preposition = to do something new with something new. Delitzsch on Heb. ix. 18 (οὐδὲ ἡ πρώτη χωρὶς αἵματος ἐγκεκαίνισται), “solemnly to set forth something new as such, and to give it over to use, to cause it to enter upon its work;” Heb. x. 20, ἦν ἐνεκαίνισεν ἡμῖν ὁδὸν πρόσφατον κ.τ.λ.

Καινός, to make new, to form anew, to alter. Not used in biblical Greek. Hence—

Ἀνακαινός, only in the passive and in Paul's writings. Not, it seems, used either in profane or patristic Greek; the latter employs ἀνακαινίζειν instead, cf. Barnab. 6, ἐπεὶ οὖν ἀνακαινίσας ἡμᾶς ἐν τῇ ἀφέσει τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν, ἐποίησεν ἡμᾶς ἄλλον τύπον, ὡς παιδίων ἔχειν τὴν ψυχὴν, ὡς ἂν δὲ ἀναπλασσομένους αὐτοὺς ἡμᾶς. The new form of the word was just what the Apostle Paul would introduce, for his language in its ring bears most traces of his endeavours to find right expressions for the new truths,—and in the present case, not only the combination of a personal object with the thought expressed, but also the thought itself, was something completely new and strange. Col. iii. 10, ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἀνακαινούμενος κ.τ.λ.; 2 Cor. iv. 16, ὁ ἔσωθεν ἄνθρωπος ἀνακαινοῦται ἡμέρα καὶ ἡμέρα. The preposition ἀνα points to a former state or activity (cf. Lam. v. 21, καθὼς ἔμπροσθεν, under ἀνακαινίζειν); and, indeed, here to the creation, cf. Col. iii. 10, τὸν ἀνακαινούμενον . . . κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτόν; Ps. civ. 30 (under ἀνακαινίζω).

The word denotes *the redemptive activity of God, corresponding to the creation of man, which, by putting an end to man's existing corrupt state, establishes a new beginning* (cf. Col. iii. 10, ἐνδυσάμενοι τὸν νέον τὸν ἀνακ.). Cf. Basil. M. (Suic. *Theos.*), εἰς τὴν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ζωὴν τὰς ψυχὰς ἀνακαινίζειν.

Ἀνακαίνωσις, ἡ *renewal*, also used by Paul alone, and that in Tit. iii. 5, corresponding exactly to the verb, ἔσωσεν ἡμᾶς διὰ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας καὶ ἀνακαινώσεως πνεύματος ἁγίου, while in Rom. xii. 2 the νοῦς is the object of a renewal to be accomplished on the part of the Christian, a renewal standing in connection with the saving influences on the ground of which the admonition is given, μεταμορφούσθε τῇ ἀνακαινώσει τοῦ νοός.—Gregor. Naz. *Or. X.* (Suic. *Theos.*), ἀναμένω τοῦ οὐρανοῦ μετασχηματισμόν, τῆς γῆς μεταποίησιν, τὴν τῶν στοιχείων ἐλευθερίαν, τοῦ κόσμου παντὸς ἀνακαίνισιν.

Καιρός, ὁ, *the right measure and relation, especially as regards time and place.* Most frequently of time. Ammon. p. 80, ὁ μὲν καιρὸς δηλοῖ ποιότητα χρόνου . . . χρόνος δὲ ποσότης. In the LXX. = 𐤒𐤍𐤏, Gen. i. 14, Jer. viii. 7, and especially = 𐤒𐤍, while χρόνος is variously = 𐤒𐤏, 𐤒𐤍, 𐤒𐤏. It denotes accordingly (I.) *the right time, suitable, convenient time or point of time.* This is its force in the combinations ἐξαγοράζεσθαι τὸν καιρόν, Eph. v. 16; Col. iv. 5 (Dan. ii. 8); cf. καιρὸν τηρεῖν, *to perceive the right point of time*, Aristot. *Rhet.* ii. 6. 4; καιροῦ τυχεῖν, καιρὸν λαβεῖν, ἀρπάζειν, καιρῷ χρῆσθαι, see Passow, *Wörterb.*; καιρὸν μεταλαμβάνειν, Acts xxiv. 25; καιρ. ἔχειν, *to have a suitable, convenient time*, Gal. vi. 10; Heb. xi. 15, cf. Plut. *Lucull.* 16. The words καιρῷ δουλεύειν, Rom. xii. 11 (where Received text, Lachm. Tisch. read κυρίῳ), taken in this sense, are unobjectionable.—Specially frequent are the adverbial expressions ἐν καιρῷ, *at the right time*, Xen. *Anab.* iii. 1. 39, and often. Matt. xxiv. 45; Luke xii. 42, xx. 10; 1 Pet. v. 6, cf. Job xxxix. 18; Ps. i. 3; also simply καιρῷ (as in Thucyd. iv. 59, and often), Matt. xii. 1 (Luke xx. 10, Tisch.). Cf. 2 Thess. ii. 6, ἐν τῷ ἐαυτοῦ καιρῷ. Also πρὸς καιρόν, *at the right, the convenient time, when it is convenient, as it suits*; Luke viii. 13, πρὸς καιρὸν πιστεύουσιν (1 Cor. vii. 5?). Cf. Soph. *Aj.* 38, πρὸς καιρὸν πονῶ; Plat. *Legg.* iv. 708 E, πρὸς κ. λέγειν; Herod. i. 30, ὡς οἱ κατὰ καιρὸν ἦν; Plut. *Lucull.* 16, κατὰ καιρὸν ἤκειν; Job xxxix. 18; Rom. v. 6, ἔτι γὰρ Χριστὸς ὄντων ἡμῶν ἀσθενῶν κατὰ καιρὸν ὑπὲρ ἀσεβῶν ἀπέθανεν; the conjunction of κατὰ καιρόν with the foregoing genitive absolute would give rise to a tautology with ἔτι; it must therefore be referred to what follows, and finds its explanation in ver. 9.—On the other hand, παρὰ καιρόν means *inopportunately*, Plut. *Polit.* 277a, cf. Heb. xi. 11, π. κ. ἡλικίας.—ἄχρι καιροῦ, *until the right time*, Acts xiii. 11; Luke iv. 13, cf. xxii. 53, John xiv. 30; πρὸ καιροῦ, *before it is time*, Matt. viii. 29; 1 Cor. iv. 5.—Also in John vii. 6, ὁ καιρὸς ὁ ἐμὸς οὐπω πάρεστιν, ὁ δὲ καιρὸς ὑμέτερος πάντοτε ἔστιν ἔτοιμος. In ver. 8 it must be taken in the sense of *right, suitable time.*

(II.) More generally, *a time in some way limited or defined*, χεῖμῶνος καιρός, Plat. *Legg.* iv. 709 C, Moer. p. 424, ὥρα ἔτους Ἀττικοί· καιρὸς ἔτους Ἑλληνες. Cf. ὥρα in John; Rom. xiii. 11, εἰδότες τὸν καιρὸν ὅτι ὥρα κ.τ.λ.; 1 Thess. ii. 17, πρὸς καιρὸν ὥρας. So

κ. τοῦ θερισμοῦ, τῶν καρπῶν, συγκῶν, ἡλικίας, etc.; Matt. xiii. 30, xxi. 34, 41; Mark xi. 13; Luke i. 20; Heb. ix. 9, 10; Gal. iv. 10; 2 Tim. iv. 6; Heb. xi. 11; Luke xix. 44; 2 Tim. iv. 3, ἔσται γὰρ καιρὸς ὅτε κ.τ.λ. Cf. the passages where it is conjoined with χρόνος, Acts i. 7, γινῶναι χρόνους ἢ καιροὺς; 1 Thess. v. 1; Mark xiii. 33, πότε ὁ καιρὸς ἐστίν; frequently ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ κ.; Matt. xi. 25, xii. 1, xiv. 1, etc., ὁ νῦν καιρὸς, Rom. iii. 26, viii. 18, xi. 5; 2 Cor. viii. 13; πρὸς καιρόν, *for a time*, 1 Cor. vii. 5; 1 Thess. ii. 17; κατὰ καιρόν, *from time to time* (Plut.), John v. 4.—Rev. xii. 12, ὀλίγον κ. ἔχει. With these may be classed expressions such as ὁ καιρὸς μου ἐγγὺς ἐστίν, Matt. xxvi. 18, cf. ὥρα, John vii. 30, viii. 20, and other places. With this expression, cf. 2 Thess. ii. 6, εἰς τὸ ἀποκαλυφθῆναι αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ ἑαυτοῦ καιρῷ. For the thing meant, cf. Luke xxii. 15, πρὸ τοῦ με παθεῖν. Further, in Luke xxi. 8, ὁ καιρὸς ἤγγικεν, of the time, toward which all yearning and hope were directed, which alone can come under consideration; so also Rev. i. 3, xxii. 10, ὁ καιρὸς ἐγγὺς ἐστίν,—that is, the time of the second coming of the Lord. Cf. 2 Chron. xxi. 19, where καιρὸς is used to denote the close of a period of time. Then κ. δεκτός, εὐπρόσδεκτος, 2 Cor. vi. 2, of the N. T. time of grace, *vid.* δεκτός. κ. ἔσχατος, 1 Pet. i. 5; ὁ κ. οὗτος, opposed to αἰὼν ἐρχόμενος, Mark x. 30; Luke xviii. 30.—Gal. vi. 9, καιρῷ γὰρ ἰδίῳ θερίσομεν, special time, distinguished from other times, as ἔθνος ἰδιον, καὶ οὐδαμῶς Σκυθικόν, Herod. iv. 18 (cf. 2 Thess. ii. 6).

Finally, also the plural occurs not seldom, as, indeed, sometimes in profane Greek, *e.g.* Xen. *Hell.* vi. 5. 33, ἐν μεγίστοις καιροῖς παρίσταντο; Plut. *Fab. Comp.* 1, ἐν αἰσχίστοις καὶ δυσποτμοτάτοις καιροῖς = *periods*. The idea is not, however, predominantly that of bad times, cf. καιροὶ ἀναψύξεως, Acts iii. 20; τὰ σημεῖα τῶν καιρῶν, Matt. xvi. 3; χαλεποί, 2 Tim. iii. 1; καρποφόροι, Acts xiv. 17; Eph. i. 10; 1 Tim. iv. 1, ii. 6, vi. 15; Acts xvii. 26.—Rev. xii. 14, ὅπου τρέφεται ἐκεῖ καιρὸν, καὶ καιροὺς, καὶ ἡμισυ καιροῦ, after Dan. vii. 25 = 17½, cf. Dan. xii. 7, 8. Καιρός here would seem to denote the space of a year, cf. Rev. xiii. 5 with Dan. vii. 25, since the same space, which, upon simple reckoning, appears as a succession of forty-two months, according to the feeling of those who suffer during it, and often expect its close, is figuratively described thus, “*a year passes*; instead of the finally hoped for end, *twice the time* elapses, and does not yet bring the end, then it unexpectedly comes.” On the plural instead of the dual, see Winer, p. 160.

Κακός, ἡ, ὄν, forms the general antithesis to ἀγαθός; and as the latter denotes, primarily, *useful of its kind*, so κακός denotes *that which is not such*, as, according to its nature, destination, and idea, it might be or ought to be, *incapable, useless, bad*. It expresses the lack of those qualities which constitute a person or thing what it should be, or what it claims to be. So, *e.g.*, in Homer, and also later, κακὸς ἡνίοχος, ἀλήτης, ἱατρός, ναύτης, of persons who do not or cannot perform that for which they are engaged. Cf. Matt. xxiv. 48, κακὸς δούλος, opposed to πιστὸς καὶ φρόνιμος; Phil. iii. 2, κακοὶ ἐργάται. Especially is κακός used by Homer, Herodotus, Xenophon, and others, in contrast to ἐσθλός, of incapacity in war; as κακία, synonymously with ἀνανδρία, in

opposed to ἀρετή. Hesych. κακοί· ἄνδρoι, δειλοί. It differs from ἄδικος, on the one hand, as *state* differs from *conduct* (cf. ἄδικοι οἰκέται, *qui suo munere non funguntur*, Xen. *Cyrop.* ii. 2. 26, with Matt. xxiv. 48); on the other hand, as claims raised by oneself differ from the requirements of the law; cf. 1 Pet. iii. 12. Its principal synonym is πονηρός. Whilst κακός forms the antithesis to ἀγαθός and καλός, πονηρός is especially and primarily opposed to χρηστός (*vid.* πονηρός). Πονηρός is positive = *dangerous, destructive, injurious, evil*; κακός = *useless, unsuitable, bad*. The former word describes the quality according to its effects, the latter according to its nature. Pillon, *Syn. Gr.*, “κακός qui manque de tel ou tel avantage physique ou moral, d’où, généralement, il est opposé à ἀγαθός dans tous ses sens, au propre et au figuré; mauvais, mechant, dans le sens d’inutile, d’impropre, qui n’est pas bon. πονηρός, qui cause ou donne du mal, de la peine, dans le sens de nuisible, dangereux.” Cf. Rev. xvi. 2, ἔλκος κακὸν καὶ πονηρόν; Ammon. πονηρός· ὁ δραστικὸς κακοῦ.

Starting from this fundamental meaning, κακός is usually employed in a double sense—(I.) Unfitted, unfavourable, ill (*vid.* ἀγαθός, II. a), Plat. *Rep.* x. 608 E, τὸ μὲν ἀπολλύν καὶ διαφθεῖρον πᾶν τὸ κακὸν εἶναι, τὸ δὲ σῶζον καὶ ὠφελοῦν τὸ ἀγαθόν.—(II.) In a moral sense, *bad*; already in Homer. In biblical Greek it does not, comparatively speaking, occur at all so often as in profane Greek; nor is it the usual word for its proper equivalent נָרָה, נָרָה, but one among many others. Indeed, no definite rule can be discovered for the application of this most general expression in the LXX., unless it be that κακός is rarely employed at all, especially not in a moral sense, because the notion of evil is far more concrete in the O. T. than in the profane sphere. Far more frequently does πονηρός occur, even in general contrasts, as, *e.g.*, in Ps. xcvi. 10, οἱ ἀγαπῶντες τὸν κύριον μισοῦτε πονηρόν; Gen. ii. 9, 17, καλὸν καὶ πονηρόν (cf. 2 Cor. xiii. 7; Heb. v. 14, καλόν . . . κακόν). Also ἄδικος, ἀμάρτωλος, παράνομος, ἀσεβής. Κακός never = נָרָה, *vid.* under ἄδικος.

(I.) Unfitted, useless, bad, ill, Matt. xxiv. 48; Phil. iii. 2; Rev. xvi. 2. Τὸ κακόν, κακά, *what is unfavourable or bad for any one, evil*, Rom. xiii. 10, ἡ ἀγάπη τῷ πλησίον κακὸν οὐκ ἐργάζεται; 1 Cor. xiii. 5; Rom. xiv. 20; Acts xvi. 28, xxviii. 5; Rom. xii. 17, 21; 1 Thess. v. 15; 1 Pet. iii. 9; Jas. iii. 8; the plural, 2 Tim. iv. 14; Luke xvi. 25; Acts ix. 13. There is frequently, however, connected therewith a reference to the moral objectionableness of the harm which is done to any one; cf. 1 Pet. iii. 9–12; Phil. iii. 2, etc.

(II.) In a moral sense = *evil, improper*; that which in its nature and purpose ought to be different. Plat. *Legg.* iv. 716 E, ἀκάθαρτος γὰρ τὴν ψυχὴν ὁ κακός; 1 Cor. xv. 33, ὁμιλίας κακαί; Mark vii. 21, οἱ διαλογισμοὶ οἱ κακοί (Matt. xv. 19, πονηροί); Col. iii. 5, ἐπιθυμία κακή. The substantive ὁ κακός, Matt. xxi. 41, κακοὺς κακῶς ἀπολέσει, cf. Ar. *Pl.* 65, ἀπὸ σ’ ὀλῶ κακὸν κακῶς; Soph. *Phil.* 1369, κακῶς ἀπόλλυσθαι κακοὺς; Rev. ii. 2. Τὸ κακόν, *the bad, the evil*, Matt. xxvii. 23; Mark xv. 14; Luke xxiii. 22; John xviii. 23; Acts xxiii. 9. Opposed to τὸ ἀγαθόν, Rom. ii. 9, vii. 19, ix. 11, xiii. 3, xvi. 19; 1 Pet.

iii. 11; 3 John 11; 2 Cor. v. 10; to καλόν, Rom. vii. 21; 2 Cor. xiii. 7; Heb. v. 14, cf. Gen. xxiv. 50.—Rom. xiii. 4, vii. 21; 1 Pet. iii. 10; the plural, Rom. i. 30, iii. 8; 1 Cor. x. 6; 1 Tim. vi. 10; Jas. i. 13; 1 Pet. iii. 12, ποιοῦντες κακά, opposed to δίκαιοι.

The adverb κακῶς, Matt. iv. 24, viii. 16, ix. 12, xiv. 35, xv. 22, xvii. 15, xxi. 41; Mark i. 32, 34, ii. 17, vi. 55; Luke v. 31, vii. 2, of *evil in a physical sense*. In a *moral sense*, John xviii. 23; Acts xxiii. 5; Jas. iv. 3.

Ἄκακος, *ον*, not evil, guileless, innocent. According to the explanation of an old lexicographer, ἀκ. is ὁ κακοῦ μὴ πεπειραμένος, οὐχ ὁ χρηστοθήτης· οὕτω Σαπφώ; according to others, ἄκακοι are οἱ μὴ προεγνωσύντες τὰ κακά. With this cf. *e.g.* Plut. *mulier. virt.* 256 D, where it is applied to a woman who, driven by love, and not from opposition, transgressed a command of Mithridates, νέας παντάπασι καὶ ἀκάκου τῆς παιδείκης φανείσης; *de util. ex host. cap.* 90 B, ἡ δὲ οὔσα σώφρων καὶ ἄκακος = *without guile*; Dem. c. *Everg.* 1153, προσποιούμενος ἄκακος εἶναι, ἐξηπάτησε τοὺς δικαστάς; *Id.* 1164, ἀκάκους . . . καὶ ἀπράγμονας; Polyb. iii. 98. 5, πρὸς τοῦτον ἄκακον ὄντα τὸν ἄνδρα καὶ πρᾶον τῇ φύσει. According to this, ἄκακος, in Heb. vii. 26, ἀρχιερεὺς ὁσιος, ἄκακος, ἀμίαντος κ.τ.λ., would be equivalent to ἀπείραστος κακῶν, Jas. i. 13; ὁ μὴ γνοὺς ἁμαρτίαν, 2 Cor. v. 21, more than ἀπεχόμενος ἀπὸ παντὸς κακοῦ, cf. Job ii. 3, ἄνθρωπος ἄκακος, ἀληθινός, ἄμεμπτος, θεοσεβής, ἀπεχόμενος κ.τ.λ., usually, perhaps = *one who can mean no evil*. In Heb. vii. 26, it is perhaps a shorter expression for what is otherwise rendered in iv. 15, πεπειραμένος δὲ κατὰ πάντα καθ' ὁμοιότητα χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας. In this sense it corresponds, as used by the LXX., to the Hebrew $\square\eta$, opposed to ἀσεβής in Job viii. 20; Prov. xiii. 6; synonymous with εὐθύς, Ps. xxv. 21, cf. Ps. xxxvii. 37; ἀκακία = $\square\eta$, Ps. vii. 9, xxvi. 1, 11, xli. 13, lxxviii. 72; $\eta\eta$, Job ii. 3, xxvii. 5, xxxi. 6, cf. Ps. lxxxiv. 12.

Then, however, ἄκακος is used in the less definite sense of *unsuspecting*, cf. Plut. *de aud.* 41 A, οἱ μὲν καταφρονητικοὶ καὶ θράσεις ἦττον ὠφελοῦνται ὑπὸ τῶν λεγόντων, οἱ δὲ θαυμαστικοὶ καὶ ἄκακοι μᾶλλον βλάπτονται; Plat. *Alciib.* ii. 140 C, ἀκάκους καὶ ἀπείρους καὶ ἐνεούς, euphemistic designations of those whom others call ἡλιθίους τε καὶ ἐμβροντήτους. Cf. in particular, the profane use of the substantive ἀκακία, Plut. *Demetr.* 1, τὴν ἀπειρίαν τῶν κακῶν καλλωπιζομένην ἀκακίαν οὐκ ἐπαινοῦσιν, ἀλλ' ἀβελτερίαν ἡγοῦνται καὶ ἄγνοιαν ὧν μάλιστα γινώσκειν προσήκει τοὺς ὀρθῶς βιωσομένους; Dem. c. *Neaer.* 1372, καὶ διὰ τὴν ἀπειρίαν τῶν πραγμάτων καὶ τὴν ἀκακίαν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ τοῦτον παρέδρον ποιήσαιο. Thus Philo sometimes (see Lösner on Rom. xii. 8) conjoins ἀπλότης καὶ ἀκακία. Cf. Diod. Sic. xiii. 76, ἄκακος καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ἄπλους. It is = *innocent*, but in a looser sense than above, as Philo terms childhood ἄκακος ἡλικία. In this sense it corresponds in the LXX. to the Hebrew $\eta\eta$, as opposed to πανούργος, Prov. viii. 5, i. 4, xiv. 15, xxi. 11. Cf. also Jer. xi. 19, ὡς ἄρνιον ἄκακον ἀγόμενον τοῦ θύεσθαι (wrongly translated). So in Rom. xvi. 18, διὰ τῆς χρηστολογίας καὶ εὐλογίας ἐξαπατῶσι τὰς καρδίας τῶν ἀκάκων; Theodoret, ἀπλούστεροι.

Κακία ἡ, inefficiency, badness, in opposition to ἀρετή in the natural and moral sense, cf. Plat. *Conv.* 181 E, τὸ γὰρ τῶν παίδων τέλος ἄδελον οἱ τελευτᾷ κακίας καὶ ἀρετῆς ψυχῆς τε πέρι καὶ σώματος; *Rep.* i. 348 C, ix. 580 B; *Crat.* 386 D; Aristot. *Eth. Nicom.* vii. 1, ὥσπερ οὐδὲ θηρίου ἐστὶ κακία οὐδ' ἀρετή, οὕτως οὐδὲ θεοῦ; *Wisd.* v. 13, 14. Synonymous with ἀνανδρία = cowardice. Whilst ἀρετή indicates the ample possession of the qualities which are characteristic of the subject in question, κακία denotes the lack thereof,—a lack which leads to the opposite of these qualities, cf. above, Aristotle. Hence = (I.) **Defectiveness, perversity**, cf. Cic. *Tusc.* iv. 15, *Hujus igitur virtutis contraria est vitiositas; sic enim malo quam Malitiam appellare eam, quam Graeci κακίαν appellant; nam malitia certi cujusdam vitii nomen est, vitiositas omnium*; Xen. *Mem.* i. 2. 28, εἰ μὲν αὐτὸς ἐποίει τι φαῦλον, εἰκότως ἂν ἐδόκει πονηρὸς εἶναι, εἰ δὲ αὐτὸς σωφρονῶν διετέλει, πῶς ἂν δικαίως τῆς οὐκ ἐνούσης αὐτῷ κακίας αἰτίαν ἔχοι. In this general sense, also, it is not exactly rare in the LXX, cf. 1 Kings xiii. 33 = נַפְלָה נִפְלָה; Jer. ii. 19 = נַפְשִׁי; 1 Chron. xxi. 8, Jer. xvi. 18 = נִפְלָה; Ps. xxxvi. 5, lii. 3 = נַפְלָה, cf. Gen. vi. 5, ἐπληθύνθησαν αἱ κακίαι τῶν ἀνθρώπων. So in Acts viii. 22, μετανόησον ἀπὸ τῆς κακίας σου ταύτης; 1 Cor. xiv. 20, μὴ παιδία γίνεσθε ταῖς φρεσίν, ἀλλὰ τῇ κακίᾳ νηπιιάζετε; v. 8; 1 Pet. ii. 16, μὴ ὡς ἐπικάλυμμα ἔχοντες τῆς κακίας τὴν ἐλευθερίαν, ἀλλ' ὡς θεοῦ δοῦλοι; Jas. i. 21.

(II.) The combination in Tit. iii. 3, ἐν κακίᾳ καὶ φθόνῳ διάγειν; Col. iii. 8, ὀργή, θυμός, κακία; Eph. iv. 31, πᾶσα πικρία καὶ θυμὸς καὶ ὀργή καὶ κραυγὴ καὶ βλασφημία ἀρθήτω ἀφ' ὑμῶν σὺν πάσῃ κακίᾳ, suggests the meaning, **malevolence**, which would also be suitable in Rom. i. 29 and 1 Pet. ii. 1; but there is no example whatever of the usage in profane Greek; cf. Ps. lii. 3. Compare, however, κακία, as a special degree of wickedness, in Aristotle, *Rhet.* i. 9; see under ἐκουσίως. It is *perversity* as *social vice*, *Wisd.* ii. 21; *Ecclus.* xxv. 19. Cf. κακός = *ill-disposed*; in κακόω, Acts xiv. 2.

(III.) **Evil, misfortune, plague**, Amos iii. 6; *Ecclus.* xix. 6; 1 Macc. vii. 23, x. 46; 2 Macc. iv. 47, vi. 3, vii. 31. In profane Greek only in later writers; = κακότης in Homer, who is unacquainted with κακία. In the N. T. Matt. vi. 34.

Κακόω, to do harm or evil to any one, to ill-treat, to plague, to injure. Acts vii. 6, 19, xii. 1, xviii. 10; 1 Pet. iii. 13. In the sense, *to put one into a bad humour against any one*, to irritate, as in Acts xiv. 2, ἐκάκωσαν τὰς ψυχὰς τῶν ἐθνῶν κατὰ τῶν ἀδελφῶν. It cannot be shown to occur in profane Greek. Cf., however, Joseph. *Antt.* xvi. 1. 2, κακοῦν καὶ τῆς εὐνοίας ἧς εἶχεν εἰς τοὺς παῖδας ἀφαιρεῖν. The passive, Ps. cvi. 32, ἐκακώθη Μωυσῆς δι' αὐτούς, ὅτι παρεπύκρναν τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ (הַמִּצְחָרַם), cannot be compared, for it means here, as also frequently in profane Greek, *to be plagued, to be in evil case*.—**Κάκωσις** = *distress*, Acts vii. 34.

Κακοῦργος, ὁ, **evil-doer**; Luke xxiii. 32, 33, 39; 2 Tim. ii. 9; properly an adjective = *deceitful, treacherous*. "In the style of the Attic courts, the name embraces the λωποδύται, ἀνδραποδισταί, κλεπταί, in general robbers and murderers, against whom the ἀπαγωγή was applied," Passow. Döderlein (*Lat. Syn.* ii. 141) calls attention to the cir-

cumstance that the accentuation suggests the derivation *κακὸς ὀργήν*, and not *κακὸς ἔργα*, in which latter case *κακούργος* ought to be accentuated like *ἀγαθουργός*, *εὐεργός*, *λιθουργός*. Herewith would harmonize the strong meaning of the word, *malicious, cunning, treacherous*. Compare, however, *πανούργος*.—Ecclus. xi. 31, xxx. 35; Prov. xxi. 15.

Κακοήθεια, ἡ, *bad character*; "according to Aristot. *Rhet.* ii. 13, τὸ ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖρον ὑπολαμβάνειν πάντα; according to Ammon. *κακία κεκρυμμένη*," Passow. As the adjective *κακοήθης* is = *malicious, cunning, crafty*, so *κακοήθεια* = *malice, craftiness*, along with *δόλος*, Rom. i. 29; 3 Macc. iii. 22, τῇ συμφύτῳ κακοηθείᾳ τὸ καλὸν ἀπωσάμενοι, διηνεκῶς δὲ εἰς τὸ φαῦλον ἐκνεύοντες; vii. 3, τῶν φίλων τινὲς κακοηθείᾳ πυκνότερον ἡμῖν παρακείμενοι συνέπεισαν ἡμᾶς κ.τ.λ. Cf. Plut. *de Herodoti malignitate*.

Κακοποιέω, to do evil, and that, too, in the moral sense, 3 John 11; cf. 1 John iii. 6, ἀμαρτάνων; 1 Pet. iii. 17. Equivalent to, *to do mischief, to do evil*, with a reference, at the same time, to the moral objectionableness of that which for another is evil, Mark iii. 4; Luke vi. 9; see *ἀγαθοποιεῖν*. That the moral character of the mode of action is here primarily to be considered, is clear from the absence of the object, which must be specified if the reference were solely to the harm done. The word occurs in both senses in profane Greek. In the LXX. only in the latter = עָוָה, עָוָה הָעָוָה.

Κακοποιός, *pernicious, injurious*, in the moral sense = *evil-doing, behaving ill*; it is rarely used in profane Greek, cf. Aristot. *Eth. Nicom.* iv. 9, οὐ κακοὶ μὲν οὖν δοκοῦσιν εἶναι οὐδὲ οὗτοι· οὐ γὰρ κακοποιοὶ εἰσιν, ἡμαρτημένοι δέ. On the contrary, in the single passages of the LXX. Prov. xii. 4, γυνὴ κακοποιός, opposed to ἀνδρεία; xxiv. 19, μὴ χαίρει ἐπὶ κακοποιοῖς, μηδὲ ζήλου ἀμαρτωλούς, as also in the N. T. John xviii. 30, 1 Pet. ii. 12, 14, iii. 16, in a moral sense, corresponding to κακοποιεῖν. Only in 1 Pet. iv. 15, μὴ γάρ τις ὑμῶν πασχέτω ὡς φονεὺς, ἢ κλέπτης, ἢ κακοποιός, ἢ ὡς ἀλλοτριοεπίσκοπος, does it appear in the sense of *generally injurious*, denoting *one who is injurious to the community* (as in John xviii. 30 (?). Tisch. reads in John xviii. 30, κακὸν ποιῶν, cod. Sin. κακὸν ποιήσας); or, like *κακία*, Aristot. *Rhet.* i. 9, it denotes a special degree of wickedness, cf. Aristot. *Eth. Nicom.* iv. 9, *Rhet. ad Alex.* 16, τοιγαροῦν ὅταν μὲν ἡμῖν συμφέρει κλέπτειν τὴν μαρτυρίαν, οὕτως αὐτῇ χρησόμεθα· ἐὰν δὲ οἱ ἐναντίοι τοιοῦτόν τι ποιήσωσιν, ἐμφανιοῦμεν τὴν κακοποιᾶν αὐτῶν.

Ἐγκακέω, is read by Lachm. and Tisch. in all the passages instead of the Received reading, ἐκκακεῖν, Luke xviii. 1; 2 Cor. iv. 1, 16; Gal. vi. 9; 2 Thess. iii. 13; Eph. iii. 13. In profane Greek very rare (Polyb. iv. 19. 10, τὸ πέμπειν τὰς βοηθείας ἐνεκακήσαν, *they were too bad or too cowardly to*, etc.; here also others read ἐξεκάκησαν); it occurs in the translation of Theodotion, Prov. iii. 11, μηδὲ ἐγκακήσης; LXX. μηδὲ ἐκλύου; of Symmach. Gen. xxvii. 46, LXX. προσώχθικα τῇ ζωῇ μου; Num. xxi. 5, LXX. ἡ ψυχὴ ἡμῶν προσώχθισεν ἐν τῷ ἄρτῳ; Isa. vii. 16, ἀφ' ἧς σὺ ἐγκακήης; LXX. ἡν σὺ φοβῇ. In the passage from Polybius it denotes *moral behaviour*; in the other passages quoted it is

= to be pained by a thing, not to be able to endure it (*κακός*, *useless*, *without courage*, *faint-hearted*), which may be either a physical, a psychical, or a moral weakness.

Ἐκακέω, Received text, instead of ἐγκακεῖν, which see. Only in the N. T. and in ecclesiastical Greek. According to Hesych. = ὑπερκακεῖν, which also cannot be proved. According to Suidas = περικακεῖν, which Polybius used in the sense of, *to be in the midst of misfortune, to be unfortunate, to be desperate*. Oecum. on 2 Cor. iv. 1, οὐκ ἐγκακοῦμεν τουτέστιν οὐκ ἀπαγορευόμεν πρὸς τὰς θλίψεις καὶ τοὺς πειρασμοὺς καὶ τοὺς κινδύνους; LXX. ἀποκακεῖν = ΠΒ; Jer. xv. 9, ἀπεκάκησεν ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτῆς, on which Hesych., ἐπεκράνθη.

Ἀνεξίκακος, ὁ, ἡ, from ἀνέχειν, *to endure, to bear*, and κακόν = *one who bears evil, sorrow, ill; patient, one who submits to much*; Lucian, *Judic. Vocal.* 9, ἀνεξίκακον γράμμα, *a patient letter*. Rarely in profane Greek. In the N. T. 2 Tim. ii. 24, side by side with ἐν πραύτητι παιδεύων, as required in a δοῦλος κυρίου. Cf. Chryst. in *Ep. ad Hebr.* 2, αὐτὸν δὲ μάλιστα θαυμάζομεν, ὅταν φιλανθρωπεύηται ὅταν ἀνεξίκακῃ.

Καλέω, to call = κλη; (I.) with personal object, *to call any one*; Matt. xx. 8, xxv. 14; Mark iii. 31; Luke xix. 13; Acts iv. 18. Passive, Acts xxiv. 2; Heb. v. 4. The design of the call indicated by εἰς, εἰς τοὺς γάμους, Matt. xxii. 3, 9; Luke xiv. 8; εἰς δεῖπνον, Rev. xix. 9 = *to invite*, as it occurs without addition in Matt. xxii. 4, 8; Luke vii. 39, xiv. 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 16, 17, 24; 1 Cor. x. 27, we find εἰς δεῖπνον in some codices and in the oldest versions; οἱ κεκλημένοι, Matt. xxii. 4, *the invited* = Δ'ΑΡΡΗ, 1 Sam. ix. 13. LXX. ξένοι, on the contrary, ver. 22, κεκλημένοι; cf. 1 Kings i. 9. — The use of the word in the parables in Matt. xxii. and Luke xiv. (cf. Rev. xix. 9, οἱ εἰς τὸ δεῖπνον τοῦ γάμου ἀρνίου κεκλημένοι) led on to the specifically Christian application of the word, *to summon, to call, and to invite to participate in the kingdom of God*; cf. οἱ κεκλημένοι, Luke xiv. 17 and Heb. ix. 15 (κλητοί, Matt. xxii. 14 and Rom. i. 6, 7, generally in Paul). The beginnings of this usage lie in Luke v. 32, καλέσαι ἁμαρτωλοὺς εἰς μετάνοιαν, for which Matt. ix. 13, Mark ii. 17, have merely καλέσαι ἁμαρτωλοὺς. — (a.) The goal added with εἰς, Luke v. 32, εἰς μετάνοιαν; 1 Cor. i. 9, εἰς κοινωνίαν τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ κ.τ.λ.; 1 Thess. ii. 12, εἰς τὴν ἐαυτοῦ βασιλείαν καὶ δόξαν; 2 Thess. ii. 14, εἰς δ (sc. σωτηρίαν ἐν ἁγιασμῷ πνεύματος καὶ πίστει ἀληθείας) ἐκάλεσεν ὑμᾶς . . . εἰς περιποίησιν δόξης . . . Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ; 1 Tim. vi. 12, εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον; 1 Pet. ii. 9, τοῦ ἐκ σκότους ὑμᾶς καλέσαντος εἰς τὸ θαυμαστὸν αὐτοῦ φῶς; ver. 21, εἰς τοῦτο, namely, to exercise patience by well-doing and suffering; iii. 9, εἰς τοῦτο ἐκλήθητε, ἵνα εὐλογίαν κληρονομήσητε; v. 10, ὁ καλέσας ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον αὐτοῦ δόξαν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. The combination with ἐπὶ is synonymous, only that thus both *condition* and *aim* are indicated at the same time; Gal. v. 13, ἐπ' ἐλευθερίᾳ ἐκλήθητε; 1 Thess. iv. 7, οὐ γὰρ ἐκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς ὁ θεὸς ἐπὶ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ; cf. Krüger, lxviii. 41. 7; Bernhardt, 250. In 1 Thess. iv. 7, ἀλλ' ἐν ἁγιασμῷ is opposed to ἐπ' ἀκαθ., in that ἀγ. is conceived as the actual or required result of the

calling. Accordingly we find ἐν in 1 Cor. vii. 15, ἐν εἰρήνῃ κέκληκεν ὑμᾶς ὁ θεός; Eph. iv. 4, ἐκλήθητε ἐν μία ἐλπίδι τῆς κλήσεως ὑμῶν. (In Eph. i. 11, only Lachm. reads ἐκλήθημεν instead of ἐκληρώθημεν.) This appears most clearly in Col. iii. 15, εἰς εἰρήνην ἐκλήθητε ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι; cf. 1 Cor. vii. 22, ὁ ἐν κυρίῳ κληθεὶς δοῦλος. (With εἰς εἰρήνην, Col. iii. 15, compare Deut. xx. 10, ^{וְלֹא} ^{לְבָרְכְּךָ} ^{וְלִפְנֵי} ^{הַיְּהוָה}; LXX. ἐκκαλέσαι αὐτοὺς μετ' εἰρήνης.) Nowhere do we find the conjunction with εἰς or ἐν, which would give καλεῖν the meaning of *effectual* calling, or which would involve the call having been already accepted. In fact this is foreign to the word, which always points exclusively to the origin of one's *status* as a Christian. Ἐν is differently used in Gal. i. 6, ἀπὸ τοῦ καλέσαντος ὑμᾶς ἐν χάριτι Χριστοῦ.—(b.) Without mention of the goal, Rom. viii. 30, ix. 11, 24; 1 Cor. vii. 17, 18, 20, 21, 24; Gal. v. 8; Eph. iv. 1; 1 Thess. v. 24; 1 Pet. i. 15; cf. Heb. xi. 8, ix. 15. (In Col. i. 12, Lachm. adds, after B, τῷ [καλέσαντι καὶ] ἰκ.) With specification of the means, ἐν χάριτι Χριστοῦ, Gal. i. 6; διὰ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ, i. 15; διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγ. ἡμῶν, 2 Thess. ii. 14; διὰ δόξης καὶ ἀρετῆς, 2 Pet. i. 3; where Tisch. ἰδία δόξη καὶ ἀρετῇ; 2 Tim. i. 9, κλήσει ἁγία. Twice we find κλήσιν καλεῖν, 1 Cor. vii. 20; Eph. iv. 1. The subject is everywhere God, who is also termed ὁ καλῶν, Rom. ix. 11; Gal. v. 8; 1 Thess. ii. 12, v. 24; ὁ καλέσας, 1 Pet. i. 15, cf. v. 10; Gal. i. 6.—To this corresponds κη in Isa. li. 2, cf. Heb. xi. 8.—To the divine καλεῖν corresponds, on the part of the called, ὑπακούειν, Heb. xi. 8.

(II.) With *impersonal* object, Rom. iv. 17, καλοῦντος τὰ μὴ ὄντα ὡς ὄντα. Further, τὸ ὄνομά τινος καλεῖν, *to call the name, to name*, Matt. i. 21, 23, 25; Luke i. 13, 31. Passive, καλεῖται τὸ ὄν., Rev. xix. 13; ἐκλήθη τὸ ὄν., Luke ii. 21. As ὄνομα is omitted, *the person* is again put in the accusative, e.g. Luke i. 59, ἐκάλουν αὐτὸ Ζαχαρίαν, for which elsewhere τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ. Hence the meaning, *to name*, Matt. x. 25, xxii. 43, 45; Luke xx. 44; Matt. xxiii. 9; Luke vi. 46; Acts xiv. 12; Rom. ix. 25; Heb. ii. 11; 1 Pet. iii. 6. Passive, *to be called*, Matt. xxiii. 7, xxvii. 8; Luke i. 61, ii. 21, xxii. 25; Acts i. 19; Jas. ii. 23; *to be called*, as equivalent to, *to bear the name*, Matt. ii. 23, v. 9, 19, xxiii. 8, 10; Mark xi. 17; Luke i. 32, 35, 60, 62, 76, ii. 4, 23, xv. 19, 21; Acts xxviii. 1; John i. 43; Rom. ix. 26; 1 Cor. xv. 9; Heb. iii. 13; 1 John iii. 1; Rev. xi. 8. The addition of the present participle passive to names is a peculiarity of the writings of Luke and of the Revelation, and arises from the special design of these books. It is used (a.) to introduce an unknown name, Luke vii. 11, ix. 10, x. 39, xix. 2, xxiii. 33; Acts vii. 58, xxvii. 8, 14, 16; Rev. i. 9, xvi. 16. (b.) For the addition of a distinctive or characteristic surname, Luke i. 36, vi. 15, viii. 2, xix. 29, xxi. 37, xxii. 25; Acts i. 12, 23, iii. 11, viii. 10, ix. 11, x. 1, xiii. 1, xv. 22, 37; Rev. xii. 9, xix. 11.—The significance of the name, as a designation of the inner being, must be emphasized in passages like Matt. i. 21, 23, v. 9, 19, x. 25, xxi. 13; Rom. ix. 25, 26; Jas. ii. 23, etc.; cf. Isa. xlix. 6, μέγα σοι ἐστὶ τοῦ κληθῆναι σε παῖδά μου, for ^{וְעַתָּה} ^{לְקָרְאָךָ} ^{בְּשֵׁם} ^{יְהוָה}.—Rom. ix. 7 and Heb. xi. 18, ἐν Ἰσαὰκ κληθήσεται σοι σπέρμα, should be classed under (I.) and not under (II.), and probably should be explained, *shall be called, will be invited*, with reference not so

much to Rom. iv. 17 as to Rom. ix. 11, which, with 9, 7, may be said to decide the matter. For the connection between *to invite* and *to name*, compare Rom. ix. 25, 26.

Κ λ ῆ σ ι ς, ἡ, *call, summons, invitation, vocation*; in the LXX. Jer. xxxi. (xxxviii.) 6, ἔστιν ἡμέρα κλήσεως ἀπολογουμένων, for מִיָּמִינוּ אֶרְבָּרָה מִיָּשָׁר. Whereas it denotes in classical Greek specially *a summons before the court*, or *an invitation to a banquet*, or, as seems to be implied in Phil. iii. 14, *a call to strive for a prize*; in the N. T. it is applied exclusively to that act of God by which He invites men to His kingdom, and offers it to them as a gift and possession (cf. Rom. xi. 29). The κλήσις is the first act towards the realization of the divine election (cf. 1 Cor. i. 26, 27; 2 Pet. i. 10, and ἐκλέγειν, ἐκλογή), and the called must make it secure; 2 Pet. i. 10, σπουδάσατε βεβαίαν ὑμῶν τὴν κλήσιν καὶ ἐκλογὴν ποιεῖσθαι. Partly on account of the subject, ἡ κλήσις τοῦ θεοῦ, Rom. xi. 29, and partly on account of end and aim, ἐλπίς τῆς κλήσεως, Eph. i. 18, iv. 4 (*vid.* ἐλπίς), it is termed in Phil. iii. 14, ἡ ἄνω κλήσις, the vocation which bears the character of the world above, of the supramundane and heavenly; cf. Heb. iii. 1, κλήσεως ἐπουρανίου μέτοχοι, “the calling whose origin, nature, and goal are heavenly” (Delitzsch on Heb. iii. 1). In 2 Tim. i. 9 it is termed ἀγία, because it proceeds from God, and is opposed to the sinful *habitus* of man; hence those who are called are required ἀξίως περιπατεῖν τῆς κλήσεως, Eph. iv. 1; cf. 2 Thess. i. 11. — For 1 Cor. vii. 20, ἕκαστος ἐν τῇ κλήσει ἣ ἐκλήθη, ἐν ταύτῃ μενέτω, the meaning “calling” (occupation), *externa conditio*, has been unnecessarily proposed,—a meaning which cannot be supported by Dion. Hal. iv. 18, κλήσεις = *classes*, that is, Roman civic regulations. He who on earth is a servant *is called* in Christ to liberty, and *vice versâ*. Thus only is the attraction ἣ ἐκλήθη to be explained. See ἀπελευθερος.

Κ λ η τ ό ς, ό ν, verbal adj. = *called, invited, welcomed, appointed*; LXX. = מְקֻבָּל, 2 Sam. xv. 11, 1 Kings i. 41, 49 = *those as guests invited*. For מְקֻבָּל, Isa. xlviii. 12, ό ν ἐγώ καλώ, which would correspond to κλητός, Rom. viii. 28; 1 Cor. i. 24.—(I.) *One who is called to an office*, Rom. i. 1. — 1 Cor. i. 1, κλητός ἀπόστολος. This call proceeded from Christ, κλ. ἀπ. Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, 1 Cor. i. 1 (cf. Matt. iv. 21). Cf. מְקֻבָּל, Isa. xlii. 6, xlix. 1.—(II.) *κλητοί*, of those who have received the divine κλήσις (which see) conformably to God's saving purpose, τοῖς κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλ. οὖσιν, Rom. viii. 28; Rom. i. 6, 7; 1 Cor. i. 2, 24, without its implying immediate obedience to the call, Matt. xx. 16, xxii. 14; cf. Rev. xvii. 14, and see ἐκλεκτός. The fact of the acceptance of the call lies, Rom. i. 7, 1 Cor. i. 2, in ἀγίοις; in Jude 1, in τετηρημένοις; and both in 1 Cor. i. 24 and Rom. viii. 28 the calling is referred to only as the last element determining the certainty and realization of salvation. The κλητοὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ in Rom. i. 6 are those who are *called*, not *by* Christ, but *to* Him and as His; Philippi, “Those called by God, who belong to Christ.”

Ἐ κ κ λ η σ ί α, ἡ; (I.) The common term for a *congregation* of the ἔκκλητοι assembled in the public affairs of a free state; the body of free citizens summoned together by a herald (κῆρυξ); cf. οἱ ἔκκλητοι = ἔκκλησία, Eurip. *Or.* 949; Xen. *Hell.* ii. 4. 28, and often. Hence = *assembly of the people*, Acts xix. 39, ἐν τῇ ἐννόμῳ ἔκκλησίᾳ ἐπιλυθήσεται. The

additional word *ἐννομος* (as in *Luc. Deor. conc.* 14), elsewhere *κυρία*, denotes the regular in opposition to an extraordinary assembly (*σύγκλητος*), Acts xix. 32, 41, cf. vv. 29, 35; cf. Wetstein on Acts xix. 39, *Dem. pro cor. συγκλήτου ἐκκλησίας ὑπὸ τῶν στρατηγῶν γενομένης*; Schol. *τρεῖς ἐκκλησίαι τοῦ μηνὸς ἐγίνοντο ὠρισμέναι· ἡ δὲ σύγκλητος οὐχ ὠρισμένη. σύγκλητος δὲ ἐκλήθη, ἐπειδὴ ἐν μὲν τοῖς νομίμοις καὶ συνηθέσιν ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ ὁ δῆμος συνέτρεχεν, ὅταν δὲ ἐξ ἀνάγκης τινὸς σύλλογος γένηται, συνεκάλουν τινὲς περιμόντες.* Cf. Neh. v. 7 = *חֲבִירָא*. Matt. xviii. 17.

(II.) The LXX. transfers the designation to the **congregation** of the people of Israel, whether summoned or met for a definite purpose (*e.g.* 1 Kings viii. 65, and often), or the community of Israel collectively regarded as a congregation; Hebrew *קָהָל*; whereas the expression *עֲדָתָא קְרָבָא*, which, considered in its derivation, better corresponds to the word in question, is always = *κλητὴ ἀγία, ἐπίκλητος ἀγία*. It answers to the Hebrew *קָהָל*, constantly in Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah; in Deuteronomy also, though there the Hebrew word is once rendered *συναγωγή*. On the contrary, in Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, *קָהָל* is always rendered *συναγωγή* (elsewhere *קָהָל*); cf. Num. xx. 10, *ἐξεκκλησίασε τὴν συναγωγὴν*; moreover, in these books *קָהָל* denotes, not an assembly called for a definite purpose, but *the people of Israel collectively*, as, *e.g.*, in Gen. xxviii. 3, xxxv. 11, xlvi. 4, of other peoples (with the exception of xlix. 6, where we have *σύστασις*, the only passages in Genesis). This may be in keeping with the fact that in the books in question, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, *קָהָל* is chiefly used to denote the people collectively, *קָהָל* more rarely; but *קָהָל* is = *συναγωγή*, and occurs also in Joshua and Judges far oftener than the *קָהָל*; whereas, in the following historical books, *קָהָל* almost disappears (being used only in 1 Kings viii. 5, xii. 20; 2 Chron. v. 6; see also Ps. xxii. 17, lxviii. 31, vii. 8, lxxxvi. 14, i. 5, lxxxii. 1, lxxiv. 2, cvi. 18; Prov. v. 14; Job xv. 34; Jer. vi. 18, xxx. 20; Hos. vii. 12), and gives place to *קָהָל*. Nowhere in the Psalms, except in xl. 11, does *קָהָל* = *συναγωγή*; on the contrary, xxii. 23, 26, xxxv. 18, xl. 10, lxxxix. 6, cvii. 32, cxlix. 1, Job xxx. 28, Lam. i. 10, Prov. v. 14, Joel ii. 16, it is = *ἐκκλησία*; in Ps. xxvi. 5, Prov. xxvi. 26 = *συνέδριον*. In the few passages of Jeremiah (xlv. 15, l. 9), on the contrary, where it is translated, it = *συναγωγή*; in Ezekiel, too, wherever it relates to a particular people, as Israel or Assyria, it is rendered *συναγωγή*, elsewhere = *ὄχλος*; Ex. xii. 6, *לְכָל־בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל קָהָל, τὸ πλῆθος συναγωγῆς υἱῶν Ἰσρ.*, cf. Lev. xvi. 27. — In the place of *συναγωγὴ κυρίου*, Num. xx. 5, xxvii. 17, xxxi. 16, Ps. lxxiv. 2, we find the designation *ἐκκλησία κυρίου*, Deut. xxiii. 2, 3, 4, 9; 1 Chron. xxviii. 8; Neh. xiii. 1; Mic. ii. 5; cf. Ezra x. 8, *ἐκκλησία τῆς ἀποικίας* = *הַקָּהָל קָהָל*. In the O. T. Apocrypha, *ἐκκλησία* = *assembly of the community, popular assembly, meeting*, *e.g.* Judith vi. 16, xiv. 6; Ecclus. xv. 5, and often; more rarely = *the nation as a whole*, 1 Macc. iv. 59. Except in Ecclus. xxiv. 22, *συναγωγή* is not employed as *term. techn.*

In the N. T. we find *ἐκκλησία* applied to the **congregation** of the people of Israel, Acts vii. 38. On the other hand, of the two terms used in the O. T., *συναγωγή* seems then to have been adopted, and perhaps even in this passage to designate the people of Israel in

distinction from all other nations. At all events, this supposition seems to be favoured by its application to the assemblies (Acts xiii. 43; cf. Jas. ii. 2) and to the meeting-places of the Jews (Matt. iv. 23, vi. 2, and often); cf. Rev. ii. 9, iii. 9, as also the designation of the Christian community by ἐπισυναγωγή in the Epistle to the Hebrews x. 25 (cf. 2 Chron. v. 6, LXX. *πάσα συναγωγή Ἰσραὴλ καὶ οἱ φοβούμενοι καὶ οἱ ἐπισυνηγμένοι αὐτῶν*). Further, compare the notice of Epiphanius with reference to the Ebionites, *Haeres.* xxx. 18, *συναγωγὴν δὲ οὗτοι καλοῦσιν τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ οὐχὶ ἐκκλησίαν*.—In this case, the word used by our Lord in Matt. xvi. 18, *οἰκοδομήσω μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν*, would acquire special emphasis on the one hand from its connection with the O. T. expression, on the other hand from the opposition implied in it to the synagogue. We can thus understand also how the Christian community in the midst of Israel could be simply designated ἐκκλησία, without being confounded with the Jewish community, the *συναγωγή* (Acts ii. 47, etc.).

We may add further in the way of explanation, that both the Hebrew designations of the community of Israel plainly expressed something more than their collective unity springing from natural causes,—they implied that the Israelitish community, as an ἐκκλησία, was based on a special idea, that it was established in a special way and for a special end. Cf. what is said by Gousset, *Lexic. Ling. Heb.* 1743, “*לָקָח spectat compositionem coetus ex materia sua, quae consistit in hominibus prius distributive conceptis et nunc collectivis; וָקָח spectat formam conventus hominum tempore indicto ad locum indictum ex officio et ex voluntate ad rem aliquam agendam coeuntium, ac comitia legitima habentium*.” The use of these words, therefore, was determined by something else than the mere thought of national unity; and it is self-evident that the underlying thought is the function of the people in the plan of salvation,—of a religious position which is confirmed, especially in the case of לָקָח, by its application to festive and Sabbath assemblies. The same thought lies at the root of the word as used by Christ, so far as it was suggested by the O. T. It is, however, a beautiful and noteworthy feature, that the means by which this ἐκκλησία is constituted is described as *καλεῖν* and *κηρύσσειν*,—terms employed in profane Greek to express the summoning of an assembly, but here in the N. T. inspired with a new force. When Christ says, *οἰκοδομήσω μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν*, we are scarcely reminded that ἐκκλ. denoted in profane Greek the place of assembly as well as the assembly, but rather that the O. T. community was the *house* of Israel; cf. *οἰκοδομεῖν*.

Accordingly, ἐκκλησία denotes the N. T. community of the redeemed, in its twofold aspect.—(I.) The entire congregation of all who are called by and to Christ, who are in the fellowship of His salvation—the church. That the application of the word to the church universal is primary, and that to an individual church secondary, is clear from the O. T. use of the word, and from the fundamental statement of Christ in Matt. xvi. 18. So Acts ii. 47, *ὁ δὲ κύριος προσετίθει τοὺς σωζόμενους . . . τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ* (cf. ver. 44, *πάντες δὲ οἱ πιστεύοντες κ.τ.λ.*), v. 11; Acts ix. 31, *ἡ μὲν οὖν ἐκκλ. καθ’ ὅλης τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ Γαλιλαίας καὶ Σαμαρείας εἶχεν εἰρήνην* (E G H, Received text, Bengel read, *αἱ μὲν οὖν ἐκκλησίαι*);

1 Cor. vi. 4, xiv. 4, 5, 12; Acts xii. 1, ἐπέβαλεν Ἡρώδης ὁ βασιλεὺς τὰς χεῖρας κακῶσαι τινὰς τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλ.; ver. 5; Rom. xvi. 23; 1 Cor. x. 32, ἀπρόσκοποι καὶ Ἰουδαίους γίνεσθε καὶ Ἕλλησιν καὶ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ; xi. 22, xii. 28, xv. 9; Gal. i. 13; Phil. iii. 6; Col. i. 18, 24. It is designated ἐκκλ. τοῦ θεοῦ in 1 Cor. x. 32, xi. 22, xv. 9; Gal. i. 13; 1 Tim. iii. 5, 15; cf. Acts xx. 28, ποιμαίνειν τὴν ἐκκλ. τοῦ θεοῦ ἣν περιεποιήσατο διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ ἰδίου (cf. Ex. xv. 16); σῶμα Χριστοῦ, Col. i. 18, 24; Eph. i. 22, 23; cf. iii. 21, ἡ ἐκκλ. ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ; v. 23, 24. In the Epistle to the Ephesians, ἐκκλ. denotes exclusively the entire church, Eph. i. 22, iii. 10, 21, v. 23, 24, 25, 27, 29, 32.—Heb. xii. 23, ἐκκλ. πρωτοτόκων ἀπογεγραμμένων ἐν οὐρανοῖς.

(II.) The N. T. churches as confined to particular places, cf. ἡ κατ' οἶκόν τινος ἐκκλησία, Rom. xvi. 5; 1 Cor. xvi. 19; Col. iv. 15; Philem. 2; ἡ ἐκκλ. ἡ οὖσα ἐν κ.τ.λ., 1 Cor. i. 2; 2 Cor. i. 1; 1 Thess. ii. 14; cf. Acts xiii. 1, ἦσαν ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ κατὰ τὴν οὖσαν ἐκκλησίαν, as it then was, e.g., in the assemblies, 1 Cor. xi. 18, συνερχομένων ὑμῶν ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ; xiv. 19, 28, 35; Acts xiv. 27; Rev. ii. 1, 8, 12, 18, iii. 1, 7, 14; therefore of a single church, ἡ ἐκκλ. ἡ ἐν κ.τ.λ., Acts viii. 1, xi. 22; Rom. xvi. 1; ἡ ἐκκλ. Θεσσαλονικέων, 1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Thess. i. 1, cf. Col. iv. 16; Phil. iv. 15, οὐδεμία ἐκκλησία; 1 Cor. iv. 17, πανταχοῦ ἐν πάσῃ ἐκκλ., every church in which the character of the church as a whole is repeated, cf. τοῦ θεοῦ, 1 Cor. i. 2, xi. 16; 2 Cor. i. 1; 2 Thess. i. 4; 2 Thess. i. 1. So still in the singular, Acts viii. 3, xi. 26, xiii. 1, xiv. 23, xv. 3, 4, 22, xviii. 22, xx. 17; 1 Cor. xiv. 23, xvi. 19; 1 Tim. v. 16; Jas. v. 14; 3 John 6, 9, 10. The plural, in Acts xv. 41, xvi. 5; Rom. xvi. 16; 1 Cor. vii. 17, xi. 16, xiv. 33, 34, xvi. 1, 19; 2 Cor. viii. 1, 18, 19, 23, 24, xi. 8, 28, xii. 13; Gal. i. 2, 22; 1 Thess. ii. 14; 2 Thess. i. 4; Rev. i. 4, 11, 20, ii. 7, 11, 17, 23, 29, iii. 6, 13, 22, xxii. 16. With reference to the elements constituting them, they are termed ἐκκλησίαι τῶν ἐθνῶν, Rom. xvi. 4; τῶν ἀγίων, 1 Cor. xiv. 33.

The word does not occur in Mark, Luke, the Gospel of John, 1 and 2 John, 2 Tim., Titus, Jude.

Ἑπικαλέω, to call to, to call upon (not to call hither, for ἐπὶ relates to the object and not the subject).—(I.) To call to any one (because in calling one turns towards him). In profane Greek we find usually, along with the active, the middle of interest or advantage, μάρτυρά τινα, to appeal to any one as witness; θεοὺς ἐπικαλείσθε, et al. This is the only form used in the N. T., and appears as a middle of interest most distinctly in Acts xxv. 11, 12, xxvi. 32, xxviii. 19, Καίσαρα ἐπικαλείσθαι, to invoke Caesar for oneself, to appeal to him, Acts xxv. 25. Without this object=to appeal, Acts xxv. 21, τοῦ δὲ Παύλου ἐπικαλεσαμένου κ.τ.λ.—2 Cor. i. 23, μάρτυρα τὸν θεὸν ἐπικαλοῦμαι ἐπὶ τὴν ἐμὴν ψυχήν, I call God to witness for me.—Specially τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ κ.τ.λ. = הַשֵּׁם הַגָּדוֹל הַקָּדוֹשׁ, of the invocation of God or Christ; τὸ ὄν. τοῦ θ., Acts ix. 14, 21, xxii. 16 (Symmachus, Ps. lxxv. 17, τῷ ὀνόμ.); τοῦ κυρίου, Rom. x. 13; 1 Cor. i. 2; 2 Tim. ii. 22, ἐπικ. τὸν κύριον ἐκ καθαρᾶς καρδίας; Rom. x. 12. Without mention of object, Rom. x. 14, πῶς

οὖν ἐπικαλέσονται, εἰς ὃν οὐκ ἐπίστευσαν; Acts vii. 59, ἐλιθοβόλουν τὸν Στέφανον ἐπικαλούμενον καὶ λέγοντα· κύριε κ.τ.λ.

(II.) *To call a person something, i.e. a name = to name, to designate* (Phavorin. ἐπ-ονομάζομαι). This meaning is combined with the foregoing in 1 Pet. i. 17, εἰ πατέρα ἐπικαλεῖσθε τὸν ἀπροσωπολήμπτως κρίνοντα.—The active in Matt. x. 25, τὸν οἰκοδεσπότην Βεελζ. ἐπεκάλεσαν (Received text, Lünem. τῷ οἴκ.). The passive, Heb. xi. 16, οὐ ἐπαισχύνεται αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς ἐπικαλεῖσθαι αὐτῶν. Of the *surnames* of single persons, Acts i. 23, iv. 36, x. 5, 18, 32, xi. 13, xii. 12, 25, xv. 22 (in Matt. x. 3 Tisch. omits it; in Luke xxii. 3 he reads καλούμενον).—Acts xv. 17, ἐφ' οὗ ἐπικέκληται τὸ ὄνομά μου (from Amos ix. 12, דַּרְיָאֵל מִן־יְהוָה יִשְׂרָאֵל, cf. 2 Chron. vii. 14; especially 2 Sam. vi. 2, of the ark of God, ἐφ' ἣν ἐπεκλήθη τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου); to be understood as in Deut. xxviii. 9, 10; Jer. xiv. 9, vii. 10, 11; Isa. lxiii. 19, xlviii. 1; Gen. xlviii. 16.

Π α ρ α κ α λ έ ω, *to call hither, towards, to speak to, to speak cheerfully to*, "every kind of *speaking to*, which is meant to produce a particular effect" (Hofmann's *Schriftbeweis*, ii. 2. 17).—(I.) *To call some one, that he may do something = to beg*, (a.) with specification of the substance of the petition introduced by λέγων, Matt. viii. 5, 31, etc.; or by a conjunction, ἵνα, Matt. xiv. 36; Mark v. 10, etc.; ὅπως, Matt. viii. 34; Acts xxv. 2; by means of the infinitive, Mark v. 17; Luke viii. 41, etc.; by the accus. with the infinitive, Acts xiii. 42, xxiv. 4.—Philem. 10, παρακαλῶ σε περὶ τοῦ ἐμοῦ τέκνου. (b.) Without specification of the thing sought, Matt. xviii. 32, xxvi. 53; Philem. 9; Acts xvi. 39; Luke xv. 28.

(II.) *To call on any one, to call him hither* in order to say something to him, to use persuasion, and, indeed, (a.) *to admonish*, followed by the imperative, Acts ii. 40; 1 Cor. iv. 16; 1 Thess. v. 14; Heb. xiii. 22; 1 Pet. ii. 11, v. 1; Jude 3; with following infinitive, Acts xi. 23, xiv. 22; Rom. xii. 1, xv. 30, xvi. 17; 2 Cor. ii. 8, vi. 1; Eph. iv. 1; Phil. iv. 2; 1 Thess. iv. 10; 1 Tim. ii. 1; Titus ii. 6; Heb. xiii. 19; 1 Pet. v. 12; cf. 1 Thess. iii. 2; 1 Thess. ii. 11, εἰς τὸ περιπατεῖν ὑμᾶς. With following ἵνα, 1 Cor. i. 10, xvi. 15; 1 Thess. iv. 1; 2 Thess. iii. 12. Without specification of contents, π. τινά, Acts xv. 32, xvi. 40, xx. 2; 2 Cor. x. 1; 1 Thess. v. 11; 1 Tim. v. 1; Col. iv. 8; Eph. vi. 22; 2 Thess. ii. 17; Heb. iii. 13; π. τινα ἐν τινί, 1 Thess. iv. 18; Titus i. 9; τὸ, Luke iii. 18. The passive, 1 Cor. xiv. 31; Col. ii. 2. Without object, in Rom. xii. 8; 2 Cor. v. 20; 1 Tim. vi. 2; 2 Tim. iv. 2; Titus i. 9, ii. 15; Heb. x. 25. (b.) = *to encourage, to cheer up, to comfort*, 1 Thess. iii. 2; 2 Thess. ii. 17; 2 Cor. i. 4, ii. 7, vii. 6 (Matt. ii. 18, v. 4; Luke xvi. 25; Acts xx. 12; 2 Cor. i. 4, 6, vii. 7, 13; 1 Thess. iii. 7). With 1 Cor. iv. 13, βλασφημούμενοι παρακαλοῦμεν, we may compare 2 Macc. xiii. 23, τοὺς Ἰουδαίους παρεκάλεσεν = *to use good words, i.e. to persuade*. This, however, scarcely exhausts the force of the expression; for the apostle seems to oppose to the unchristian βλασφημεῖν the Christian παρακαλεῖν of his office and calling. Παρακαλεῖν, namely, in most of the passages quoted, is the technical term for a specific kind of Christian teaching, namely, *that in which beseeching* (cf. 2 Cor. v. 20), *admonition, and comfort*

predominate; perhaps the connection with *καλεῖν* ought not to be overlooked; 1 Thess. ii. 11, *παρακαλοῦντες . . . καὶ παραμυθούμενοι καὶ μαρτυρόμενοι*; 2 Thess. iii. 12, *παραγγέλλομεν καὶ παρακαλοῦμεν*; Acts ii. 40, *διεμαρτύρετο καὶ παρεκάλει*; 1 Pet. v. 12, *παρακαλῶν καὶ ἐπιμαρτυρῶν*; Luke iii. 18, *παρακαλῶν εὐηγγελίζετο*. According to 1 Cor. xiv. 31, Acts xv. 32, it belongs, like *διδάσκειν* and *στηρίζειν*, to the domain of prophecy, and is like this a special *charisma* (Rom. xii. 8), though it does not appear to have manifested itself *separately* as such. The design of *παρακαλεῖν*, besides, first of all, gaining the hearer, was to confirm him, 1 Thess. iii. 2; 2 Thess. ii. 17 (conjoined with *στηρίζειν*). LXX. Deut. iii. 28; Isa. xxxv. = יְבֹשֶׁת; Job iv. 3 = רָחַץ. *Encouragement, cheering up*, 2 Cor. vii. 6, *ὁ παρακαλῶν τοὺς ταπεινούς*; Heb. x. 25; 2 Thess. ii. 17. Cf. the combination with *χαρά*, 2 Cor. vii. 13, xiii. 11; 1 Thess. iii. 7, 9. Hence = *to cheer up, to console*, Isa. xxxv. 3. Whilst *διδάσκειν* appeals to the intellect, *παρακαλεῖν* appeals to the will; according to Titus i. 9, to be distinguished from *ἐλέγχειν*. As a characteristic element of the promise and proclamation of salvation, it aims at winning, not breaking the will. Cf. Isa. xl. 1 = מְנַחֵם; xli. 27, יְהוָה יְבֹשֶׁת דְּלִיָּהּ = Ἰερουσαλὴμ παρακαλέσω εἰς δόδον. Cf. the *παρακαλεῖν* of Wisdom, Prov. viii. 4, Hebrew נָחַם. The word does not occur in John's writings, nor in Galatians, James, 2 Peter.—*συμπαρακαλεῖν*, *at the same time to comfort, encourage*, Rom. i. 11, *συμπαρακληθῆναι ἐμέ*, parallel with *εἰς τὸ στηριχθῆναι ὑμᾶς*.

Παράκλητος, ὁ, properly a verbal adj., *he who has been or may be called to help (helper)*; in Dem. 343. 10, of a legal adviser, *αἱ δὲ τῶν παρακλήτων αὐταὶ δεήσεις, a pleader, proxy, or advocate*, one who comes forward in behalf of and as the representative of another; Diog. L. iv. 50, *ἐὰν παρακλήτους πέμψῃς καὶ αὐτὸς μὴ ἔλθῃς*. Thus Christ, in 1 John ii. 1, is termed our substitutionary, intercessory *advocate*, *παράκλητον ἔχομεν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν δίκαιον* (cf. John i. 1, *πρὸς τὸν θεόν*); cf. ver. 3, *αὐτὸς ἱλασμός ἐστιν περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν*. Thus Philo says, *de vit. Mos.* 673 C, that the atoning and interceding priest, in performing his official duties, stood in need of the Logos as advocate or Paraclete, *ἀναγκαῖον γὰρ ἦν τὸν ἱερωμένον τῷ τοῦ κόσμου πατρὶ παρακλήτῳ χρῆσθαι τελειοτάτῃ τὴν ἀρετὴν νύφῃ πρὸς τε ἀμνηστίαν ἁμαρτημάτων καὶ χορηγίαν ἀφθονωτάτων ἀγαθῶν*. So, too, in other passages in Philo; cf. Lösner on 1 John ii. 1 (*Observatt. Philon.*). Now, when Christ designates the Holy Spirit as Paraclete, John xiv. 16, *ἄλλος παράκλη*, we might suppose that He is this in the same sense as Christ, 1 John ii. 1. But a closer comparison of the two passages shows how little real resemblance there is; and if we compare John xiv. 26, *ὑπομνήσει ὑμᾶς πάντα ἃ εἶπον ὑμῖν*, xv. 26, *μαρτυρήσει περὶ ἐμοῦ*, xvi. 7, 14, *ἐμὲ δοξάσει κ.τ.λ.*, it will be clear that the Holy Spirit is called *παράκλητος* because He undertakes Christ's office to be a *παράκλητος*, or becomes Christ's substitute in this: it will be evident not so much as a logical sequence, but from the nature of the case, that the Spirit, as the representative of Christ's office, is above all the representative of His person and cause. But when Christ, in John xiv. 16, designates

Himself at the same time as *παράκλητος*, *παράκλητος* must not here be understood as applied to Christ in the same sense as in 1 John ii. 1, where it is = *our substitutionary Advocate*, but as = *He who pleads God's cause with us*; cf. John xiv. 7-9. In favour of this view, we may mention that the duty of a *רַבִּי מְשִׁיבָה*, Job xxxiii. 23 (cf. 2 Chron. xxxii. 31; Rabb. *מְשִׁיבָה*; *Test. XII. patr.* ἄγγελος παραιτούμενος), was not merely to represent man with God (cf. Matt. xviii. 10?), but at the same time to represent God with men, *רַבִּי מְשִׁיבָה*, Job xxxiii. 23. To maintain, with regard to this passage, that *παράκλητος* is related to *παρακαλεῖν* as *διδάσκαλος* to *διδάσκειν*, and that the Holy Spirit is called Paraclete because He has the office of *παράκλησις*, apart from the impossibility of deriving *παράκλητος* from *παρακαλεῖν* instead of from *παρακέκλησθαι*, is also rendered difficult by the circumstance that *παρακαλεῖν* and *παράκλησις* do not occur at all in the writings of John, much less in the specific N. T. sense; and that the Targum rendering in Job xxxiii. 23, *מְשִׁיבָה*, has for its antithesis *קַטְיָגוֹרָה*, *κατήγορος*, *κατήγορ*, see Delitzsch on the passage. The connection of the meaning of *παράκλητος* with *παρακαλεῖν*, and not with *παρακέκλησθαι*, is defended by an appeal to the *usus loquendi*; but actual examples of this can alone influence the lexicographer; and the only instances adducible are the versions of Aquila and Theodotion, which render *מְשִׁיבָה* (*comforter*) in Job xvi. 2 by *παράκλητος*, where the LXX. has *παρακλήτωρ*, and Symmachus *παρηγορῶν*; but their peculiar application of the word, moreover, may have been due quite as much to the age at which they wrote (the first half of the second century A.D.), or to their Christian surroundings, the active rendering of *παράκλητος* as = *ὁ παρακαλῶν* having begun to obtain a footing among Christians (*vid.* Suicer). This latter usage was due to the fact that, on the one hand, precisely the doctrine of the Holy Spirit was then least understood; on the other hand, that it was natural to regard the *advocate* of the helpless, needy, and troubled *ἰκέτης* as his consolation or comforter. The example adduced from Philo in favour of deriving *παράκλητος* from the active *παρακαλεῖν* proves nothing, for *παράκλητος* there also clearly means *intercessor*, Philo, *de mund. creat.* p. 4 (5), οὐδενὶ δὲ παρακλήτῳ . . . μόνῳ δὲ ἑαυτῷ χρῆσάμενος ὁ θεὸς ἔγνω δεῖν εὐεργετεῖν κ.τ.λ.

Παράκλησις, ἡ, (I.) *Calling towards or hither to help, begging*. — (II.) *Exhortation, encouragement*, e.g. πρὸς ἀρετήν. In Isocr. 2 A, over against *παραίνεσις*, *warning*. Herewith is connected the N. T. sense of the word, which corresponds to the use of *παρακαλεῖν*. Accordingly the word of Scripture is a *παράκλησις*, an **admonitory, encouraging, and consolatory exhortation** for the purpose of strengthening and establishing the believing possession of redemption. Rom. xv. 4, ὅσα προεγράφη, εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν διδασκαλίαν ἐγράφη, ἵνα διὰ τῆς ὑπομονῆς καὶ τῆς παρακλήσεως τῶν γραφῶν τὴν ἐλπίδα ἔχωμεν; cf. Phil. ii. 1; Heb. xii. 5; and the Epistle to the Hebrews is termed *λόγος τῆς παρακλήσεως*, xiii. 22, because its design is to *strengthen faith*. Paul terms his preaching of the gospel also *παράκλησις*, 1 Thess. ii. 2, 3 (cf. 2 Cor. viii. 4, 17; Luke iii. 18, πολλὰ μὲν οὖν καὶ ἕτερα παρακαλῶν εὐηγγελίζετο τὸν λαόν), and admonishes Timothy, πρόσχε τῇ

ἀναγνώσει, τῇ παρακλήσει, τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ, cf. Acts xiii. 15. The contents of the letter, addressed to the church at Antioch by the Apostolic Council, are designated *παρακλήσις* in Acts xv. 31. It accordingly denotes *comforting words, consolation*, in Acts ix. 31; 2 Thess. ii. 16, ὁ ἀγαπήσας ἡμᾶς καὶ δὸς παρακλήσιν αἰωνίαν καὶ ἐλπίδα ἀγαθὴν ἐν χάριτι; Philem. 7. Opposed to θλίψις and παθήματα, 2 Cor. vii. 4; conjoined with χαρά, vii. 7, 13. Cf. 2 Cor. i. 3-7; Luke vi. 24. On Luke ii. 25, where the Messiah is described as *παρακλήσις τοῦ Ἰσρ.*, cf. Nah. iii. 7 = מְנַחֵם. — *Παράκλησις*, as a distinct feature of the proclamation of salvation, belongs to the department of prophesying, 1 Cor. xiv. 3, and appears as a special *charisma* in Rom. xii. 8. It is therefore not an inaccuracy when, in Acts iv. 36, the name Barnabas, בָּרְנָבָא, is interpreted υἱὸς παρακλήσεως (cf. Acts xiii. 1), in order to indicate that his prophetic gift manifested itself specially in the exercise of *paraclesis*. — In connection with Acts xiii. 15 and 1 Tim. iv. 13, *παρακλήσις* was regarded as based on the reading of a portion of Scripture (Luke iv. 20, 21, an expository application of the prophetic word), although this was by no means the whole. Just. Mart. *apol.* i. 67, εἰτα πανσαμένου τοῦ ἀναγινώσκοντος ὁ προσεστὼς διὰ λόγου τὴν νοουθεσίαν καὶ πρόκλησιν τῆς τῶν καλῶν τούτων μιμήσεως ποιεῖται.

Προσκαλέω, to call to, to call hither. In the N. T., as in the LXX., only the middle, to call to oneself, Matt. x. 1, xv. 10, 32, xviii. 2, xx. 25; Mark iii. 13, 23, vi. 7, vii. 14, viii. 1, 34, x. 42, xii. 43, xv. 44; Luke vii. 19, xv. 26, xvi. 5, xviii. 16; Acts vi. 2, xiii. 7, xx. 1, xxiii. 17, 18, 23; Jas. v. 14. We find an approximation to the Attic use = *to cause to be summoned before court, to accuse*, in Matt. xviii. 32; Acts v. 40 = *to summon before one* (cf. πρόσκλησις, summons, 1 Tim. v. 21, Lachm.). A use suggested by the peculiar meaning of καλεῖν (cf. Mark iii. 13) is found in Acts ii. 39, ὅσους ἂν προσκαλέσῃται κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν, from Joel iii. 5, where the same persons are designated εὐαγγελιζόμενοι (passive). The preposition has here local significance, in that Israel in its dispersion is primarily meant. Figuratively = *to call any one to a work*; Acts xiii. 2, εἰς τὸ ἔργον ὃ προσκέκλημαι αὐτούς; xvi. 10, προσκέκληται ἡμᾶς ὁ κύριος εὐαγγελίσασθαι αὐτούς. (On the perfect, cf. Winer, § 234.)

Καλός, ἡ, ὄν, beautiful, related probably to the German *heil*, Goth. *hails*, Sanscr. *kaljas*, healthy, agreeable; *kaljanas*, beautiful, excellent; vid. Curtius, *Grundzüge der griech. Etymologie*, 130. It is an epithet of that whose appearance has a certain harmonious completeness; cf. the connection between the German *schön* and *scheinen*, *schonen*; middle High German, *schoon* = *pure*. *Καλός* is related to its syn. ἀγαθός, as the appearance to the essence. See under (II.). — *Καλός* answers chiefly to the two Heb. words מְדֹבָר and צֶמֶךְ, — the former being usually translated by καλός, and only occasionally by ὡραῖος and compounds with εὖ, as εὐπρόσωπος, εὐριζος; the latter as frequently by ἀγαθός. The former (מְדֹבָר) corresponds to the meaning (I. a), the latter (צֶמֶךְ) to (I. b) and (II.), which see for further details.

(I.) (a.) Beautiful, pleasing, of objects perceived by the senses; Heb. מְדֹבָר, Gen. xii. 14;

Deut. xxi. 11, and often. In the N. T., only in Luke xxi. 5, *καλοὶ λίθοι*. — (b.) **Acceptable, agreeable, serviceable, well fitted** — כָּיָו, which, however, in this sense is quite as frequently, if not more frequently, rendered ἀγαθός. Gen. ii. 9, *καλὸν εἰς βρώσιν*; Xen. *Mem.* iii. 8. 7, *πάντα γὰρ ἀγαθὰ μὲν καὶ καλὰ ἐστὶ πρὸς ἃ ἂν εὖ ἔχῃ, κακὰ δὲ καὶ αἰσχροὶα πρὸς ἃ ἂν κακῶς*; synonymously with *χρήσιμος*, *ibid.* 4–10; Plat. *Hipp. maj.* 295 C, *σῶμα καλὸν πρὸς δρόμον*. So in Matt. xiii. 8, 23; Mark iv. 8, 20; Luke viii. 15, *ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν τὴν καλὴν καὶ ἐδίδου καρπὸν*. Figuratively, *καρδία καλὴ καὶ ἀγαθή* (not in a directly ethical sense, and therefore not conformable to the classical *καλὸς καὶ ἀγαθός*) in the same passages. Compare Ezek. xvii. 8, *πεδίον καλὸν . . . τοῦ ποιῆσαι βλαστὸν καὶ ἐνέγκαι καρπὸν*. — Mark ix. 50, *καλὸν τὸ ἄλας*; Luke xiv. 34; Luke vi. 38, *μέτρον καλόν*; Heb. vi. 5, *καλὸν γευσασθαι θεοῦ ῥῆμα*. Cf. *καλὸν καὶ ἀπόδεκτον*, 1 Tim. ii. 3, under (II. b). Especially do we find in the N. T. the neuter *καλόν*, *sc. ἐστίν* = *it agrees with, it is good, beneficial*; not to be confounded with *καλόν ἐστι* in the moral sense as = *πρέπει*. Cf. Gen. ii. 18, *οὐ καλὸν εἶναι τὸν ἄνθρωπον μόνον*; Jonah iv. 3; so Matt. xvii. 4, xviii. 8, 9, xxvi. 24; Mark ix. 5, 42, 43, 45, 47, xiv. 21; Luke ix. 33; Rom. xiv. 21 (cf. ver. 19); 1 Cor. vii. 1, 8, 26; cf. *καλῶς . . . κρεῖσσον*, vii. 38.—ix. 15.

(II.) Of a perfected inner nature manifesting and demonstrating itself outwardly = *distinguished, excellent, valuable, costly, important, beautiful*, in the physical and moral sphere. In the LXX. = כָּיָו, and indeed in Genesis constantly; in the other books interchangeably with ἀγαθός, which is preferred when physical excellence is referred to; whereas, for moral excellence, one word is as often applied as the other; see II. b.

(a.) Of physical characteristics = *spotless, exquisite, genuine*, 1 Tim. iv. 4, *πάν κτίσμα θεοῦ καλόν*, cf. Gen. i. 4, 10, 31, and often = *spotless, perfect in form and nature*. Hence, Matt. xiii. 45, *καλοὶ μαργαρίται, genuine pearls* (cf. ver. 46, *εὐρὼν δὲ ἓνα πολύτιμον μαργαρίτην*). Cf. Xen. *Mem.* iii. 1. 9, *διαγινώσκειν τό τε καλὸν ἀργύριον καὶ τὸ κίβδηλον*.—Of *καρπός*, opposed to *σαπρός*, Matt. iii. 10, vii. 17–19, xii. 33; Luke iii. 9, vi. 43; *δένδρον*, Matt. xii. 33; Luke vi. 43; *σπέρμα*, Matt. xiii. 24, 27, 37, 38; cf. xiii. 48; *οἶνος*, John ii. 10 = *costly, valuable*; 1 Tim. iii. 1, *εἴ τις ἐπισκοπῆς ὀρέγεται, καλοῦ ἔργου ἐπιθυμεῖ*; iii. 13, *βαθμὸς καλός*; vi. 19, *θεμέλιον καλόν*; 2 Tim. i. 14, *καλὴ παραθήκη*; Jas. ii. 7, *καλὸν ὄνομα*; Heb. xiii. 9, *καλὸν βεβαιοῦσθαι τὴν καρδίαν*; Matt. xxvi. 10, *ἔργον καλόν*; Mark xiv. 6.

(b.) In the moral sphere; *excellent, noble, worthy of recognition, spotless, becoming, well-suited, beautiful, good*. An aesthetic designation of what is morally good, very frequently used by classical writers, especially by Plato; cf. *τὸ καλόν*, of *virtue*, opposed to *αἰσχρόν*, *disgraceful*, *τὸ αἰσχρόν*, *disgrace*, synonymously with *ὄνειδος*. Cf. *εἰς κάλλος ζῆν*, *ὁ εἰς κάλλος βίος*, Xen. *Cyrop.* viii. 1. 33; *Ages.* ix. 1, of the manifestations of *σωφροσύνη* and *δικαιοσύνη*; see Nägelsbach, *Nachhom. Theol.* v. 2. 60. Whilst *δίκαιος* expresses a simply legal judgment, *καλός* reflects the satisfactory, agreeable impression made by what is good as it manifests itself. Cf. Hom. *Od.* xx. 24, *οὐ γὰρ καλὸν ἀτέμβειν, οὐδὲ δίκαιον, ξείνους Τηλεμάχου*. The frequent use of this word in the profane sphere evinced great

refinement and delicacy, though it involved the danger of introducing a too outward estimate of the moral. This is especially true of the Attic designation of a man of honour,—καλὸς καὶ ἀγαθός, “a man, as he ought to be; apt and competent in outward matters; upright and reliable in sentiment—a man of honour. The καλοὶ καὶ ἀγαθοί, especially in Athens, were the *optimates*, the men of good family, education, and manners—the cultured, in opposition to the rough masses of the people,” Pape; those “who were expected to have the outward and inward properly adjusted,” Passow. As respects the biblical view of life, it is worthy of note that the expression καλὸς καὶ ἀγαθός (opposed to ἄδικος καὶ πονηρός, Plat. *Gorg.* 470 E) occurs neither in the translation of the LXX. nor in the N. T., but only in the Apocrypha, Tob. vii. 7; 2 Macc. xv. 12. Even καλός, in the moral sense, does not occur, so far as the usage can be surveyed, as applied to *persons* in the LXX.; we find, however, ἀγαθός = צַדִּיק, Prov. xiii. 2, 22, xiv. 14, 22, xv. 3; 1 Kings ii. 32; 1 Sam. ii. 26; Eccles. ix. 2. It is true καλός is applied in the N. T. to persons; but only with respect to particular calling or office, in which they show efficiency. So in John, ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός, John x. 11, 14, and in the Pastoral Epistles, 1 Tim. iv. 6, καλὸς διάκονος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ; 2 Tim. ii. 3, καλὸς στρατιώτης Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ; as also in 1 Pet. iv. 10, ὡς καλοὶ οἰκονόμοι ποικίλης χάριτος θεοῦ. On the other hand, it is more frequently used in the LXX. and the N. T., both as an adjective qualifying nouns which denote things, and alone, τὸ καλόν, καλά. Apart from Genesis, in which, as remarked, צַדִּיק regularly = καλός, it is used as frequently as ἀγαθός, ἀγαθόν in a *moral* sense = צַדִּיק; and, indeed, the latter ἀγαθός, on the one hand, in Deut. i. 39, xxx. 15; 2 Sam. xix. 35; 1 Kings iii. 9, viii. 36; 2 Chron. vi. 27; Neh. v. 9; Prov. ii. 9, 20, xxiv. 23; Eccles. ix. 2, xii. 14; Isa. vii. 15. Καλός, on the other hand, just in the same combinations in Lev. xxvii. 12; Num. xxiv. 13; Deut. vi. 18; Job xxxiv. 4; Prov. xvii. 26, xviii. 5, xx. 23; Isa. v. 20; Amos v. 14, 15; Mic. iii. 2, vi. 8 (Gen. ii. 17, iii. 5, 21). The antithesis to καλός is πονηρός, Lev. xxvii. 12; Num. xxiv. 13; Amos v. 14, etc.; to ἀγαθός, on the contrary, κακός, Deut. i. 39, xxx. 15, etc. In the N. T., however, we find κακόν as the antithesis of καλόν, Rom. vii. 21, xii. 17; 2 Cor. xiii. 7; Heb. v. 14, cf. John xviii. 23; Mark xvi. 18, καλῶς... κακῶς.—Καλός is conjoined with νόμος in Rom. vii. 16 (1 Tim. i. 8, κ. ὁ νόμος ἐάν τις αὐτῷ νομίμως χρῆται; probably, however, better explained according to II. a.); Jas. iii. 13, κ. ἀναστροφή, as in 1 Pet. ii. 12, ἀναστροφὴν ὑμῶν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἔχοντες καλήν; Heb. xiii. 18, καλὴ συνείδησις, synonymously with καθαρά, see συνείδησις. Further, στρατεία, 1 Tim. i. 18, cf. 2 Tim. ii. 3; ἀγὼν τῆς πίστεως, 1 Tim. vi. 12; 2 Tim. iv. 7; ὁμολογία, 1 Tim. vi. 12, 13; διδασκαλία, 1 Tim. iv. 6; μαρτυρία, 1 Tim. iii. 7; ἔργα, 1 Tim. v. 10, 25, vi. 18; Tit. ii. 7, 14, iii. 8, 14; Heb. x. 24; 1 Pet. ii. 12; Matt. v. 16; John x. 32, 33. (“It is interesting to note that in the Pastoral Epistles, whose design was to call the attention of Christians, on the eve of their great struggle with the world, to the *beauty and nobility* of perseverance in holiness, the reward thereof, and the goal of glorification, the word καλός is very frequently employed,” Zezschwitz, p. 61.) It would perhaps be more correct to say, that the necessity of paying heed to the outward

character and consistency of Christian conduct became the more imperative the further the church advanced from its mere beginning, and the nearer it approached a position of importance in the world. Cf. 1 Pet. ii. 12; Matt. v. 16. To this state of things the Pastoral Epistles owe their peculiar character. The neuter τὸ καλόν, Rom. vii. 18, 21; 2 Cor. xiii. 7; Gal. iv. 18, vi. 9; 1 Thess. v. 21; Heb. v. 14; Jas. iv. 17; καλά, Rom. xii. 17; προνοούμενοι καλὰ ἐνώπιον πάντων ἀνθρ., as in 2 Cor. viii. 21; Tit. iii. 8. *K* is not merely what is morally good and right, but also what recommends itself by its outward appearance, cf. 1 Cor. v. 6, οὐ καλὸν τὸ καύχημα ὑμῶν.—The adverb καλῶς, *beautifully, well*, corresponding to καλός, I. *b*, Matt. v. 44, καλῶς ποιεῖν, *to act well, usefully, to do well*, Matt. xii. 12; Luke vi. 27; 1 Cor. vii. 37, 38; 3 John 6 (= צדק, Zech. viii. 15, καλῶς ποιῆσαι τὴν Ἱερουσαλήμ, opposed to κακῶσαι ὑμᾶς, ver. 14). Cf. καλῶς ἔχειν, Mark xvi. 18. In profane Greek, καλῶς, in the combination καλ. ποιεῖν, generally expresses, agreeably to II. *a*., *approval and recognition*; or, agreeably to II. *b*., *a moral judgment*. In the N. T. the former occurs in Matt. xv. 7; Mark vii. 6, 37, xii. 28, 32; Luke vi. 26, xx. 39; John iv. 17, viii. 48, xiii. 13; Acts x. 33 (xxv. 10, κάλλιον ἐπιγινώσκειν), xxviii. 25; 1 Cor. xiv. 17; Phil. iv. 14; Jas. ii. 3. And the latter, the moral sense, Gal. iv. 17, v. 7; 1 Tim. iii. 4, 12, 13, v. 17; Heb. xiii. 18; Jas. ii. 8, 19; 2 Pet. i. 19.—It denotes an *ironical approval or recognition* in Mark vii. 9; 2 Cor. xi. 4. Cf. Soph. *Ant.* 738, καλῶς ἐρήμης γ' ἂν σὺ γῆς ἄρχοις μόνος.

Καλύπτω, to wrap round, to cover up, synonymous with κρύπτειν, Matt. x. 26; Luke viii. 16, xxiii. 30; Matt. viii. 24. Figuratively, ἀγάπη καλύπτει πλήθος ἁμαρτιῶν, 1 Pet. iv. 8; Jas. v. 20, cf. Prov. x. 12; it corresponds with חָפַץ, Ps. xxxii. 1; LXX. ἐπικαλύπτ., Ps. lxxxv. 2.—2 Cor. iv. 3, τὸ εὖ. ἐστὶν κεκαλυμμένον, *it is not recognised as that which it is*; cf. vv. 2, 4, iii. 13. Cf. Luke ix. 45, ἡγνούν τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο καὶ ἦν παρακεκαλυμμένον ἀπ' αὐτῶν, ἵνα μὴ αἰσθωνται αὐτό.

Ἀποκαλύπτω, to unveil, to discover, to make visible, to reveal, opposed to καλύπτειν, Matt. x. 26; συγκαλύπτειν, Luke xii. 2; κρύπτειν, Matt. xi. 25; ἀποκρύπτειν, Luke x. 21, both for the purpose of sentient (Matt. x. 26; Luke xii. 2; 1 Cor. iii. 13; 2 Thess. ii. 3, 6, 8) and spiritual perception, cf. Matt. xi. 27, where ἐπιγινώσκειν, and Luke x. 22, where γινώσκειν is the result. It answers to פָּלַג, 1 Sam. iii. 21; Dan. ii. 19, 28. The word serves specially in the N. T. to denote the *act of divine revelation*, whether it relate to redeeming facts, to the objects of faith and hope, or to the objects of Christian knowledge and intelligence,—and that both to believers and unbelievers. As objects, we find *the Father and the Son* in Matt. xi. 27; Luke x. 22; Gal. i. 16; ὁ βραχίων κυρίου, John xii. 38 (Isa. liii. 1); ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρ., Luke xvii. 30; δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ, Rom. i. 17; ὁργὴ θεοῦ, Rom. i. 18; μέλλουσα δόξα τῶν υἱῶν τ. θ., Rom. viii. 18, 1 Pet. v. 1; σωτηρία, 1 Pet. i. 12; πίστις, Gal. iii. 23; μυστήριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ, Eph. iii. 5; cf. διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος, 1 Cor. ii. 10. Cf. besides, 1 Cor. iii. 13, ἐκάστου τὸ ἔργον; Phil. iii. 15; Matt. xi. 25, xvi. 17; Luke x. 21. Without object, 1 Cor. xiv. 30, εἰ ἄλλω ἀπο-

καλυφθῇ, if a divine revelation, disclosure, communication has been made.—Applied to the appearance of Antichrist in 2 Thess. ii. 3, 6, 8.

Ἀποκάλυψις, ἡ, uncovering, unveiling, disclosure, revelation; rare in profane Greek, e.g. Plut. Cat. maj. 20, as synonymous with γύμνωσις. 1 Sam. xx. 30 = נִגְעָה, *denudatio*. In the N. T. it is applied exclusively to disclosures and communications proceeding from God or Christ, of objects of Christian faith, knowledge, and hope, that are in and by themselves hidden, unknown, and unrecognised, Rom. xvi. 25, ἀπ. μυστηρίου. Cf. Eph. iii. 3; 1 Cor. ii. 10.—(I.) With the genitive of the revealing subject, ἀ. κυρίου, 2 Cor. xii. 1; Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, Rev. i. 1.—(II.) With the genitive of the object revealed, Rom. viii. 19, τῶν νύων τοῦ θεοῦ, cf. Col. iii. 3, ἡ ζωὴ ὑμῶν κέκρυπται σὺν Χριστῷ ἐν τῷ θεῷ.—ἀποκάλ. τοῦ κυρίου, 1 Cor. i. 7, 2 Thess. i. 7; Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, 1 Pet. i. 7, 13; τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ, 1 Pet. iv. 13, namely, at His second coming, cf. Luke xvii. 30; Gal. i. 12, 15, 16; Rom. ii. 5, ἀ. δικαιοκρισίας τοῦ θεοῦ.—(III.) Absolutely, in Eph. iii. 3, κατὰ ἀποκ. ἐγνωρίσθη μοι τὸ μυστήριον, cf. 1 Cor. ii. 10; 2 Cor. xii. 7, ὑπερβολὴ τῶν ἀποκαλύψεων; 1 Cor. xiv. 6, λαλεῖν ἐν ἀποκαλύψει, ἐν γνώσει, ἐν προφητείᾳ, ἐν διδαχῇ, where ἀποκάλυψις denotes the separate communication of new facts; γνώσις, the knowledge of revelations of grace already given; προφητεία, the application of existing and new revelations. In Luke ii. 32, φῶς εἰς ἀποκ. ἐθνῶν might denote the dispersion of the darkness in which, according to Isa. xlii. 6, 7, xlii. 9, xxv. 7, καθημένοι ἐν σκότει, the nations sit. Ἐθνῶν, however, as the genitive of possession, may correspond to the dative (cf. Krüger, § xlvi. 7. 5), so that the passage would have to be explained analogously to Eph. i. 17, ἵνα ὁ θεὸς . . . δώῃ ὑμῖν πνεῦμα ἀποκαλύψεως, ἐν ἐπιγνώσει αὐτοῦ. The word is peculiarly Pauline, as is indeed also the verb in this special sense.

Καρδία, ἡ (in Homer mostly καρδίη), the heart, as a bodily organ, and at the same time, especially in Homer and the Tragedians, as the seat of the emotions and impulses, particularly of those which are not specifically moral, but are associated with a physical affection, as e.g. fear, courage, anger, joy, sadness. Where love, too, is ascribed to the heart, it is considered more an *affection* than an *act* of the heart; cf. e.g. Ar. Nub. 86, ἐκ τῆς καρδίας με φιλεῖς, with Eurip. Hipp. 26, καρδίαν κατέσχετο ἔρωτι δεινῇ. So also when it is represented as the seat of the inclinations and desires. When Homer further ascribes to it meditation and thought (Il. xxi. 441, ὡς ἄνοον καρδίην ἔχεις, cf. Pind. Ol. xiii. 16, ἐν καρδίαις σοφίαν ἐμβάλλειν, cf. Prov. x. 8; Ex. xxviii. 3. xxxi. 6, xxxv. 10, 25, 35, xxxvi. 1, 2, 8), it is the mode of representation of an immediate, non-reflective life, which does not distinguish between thought and feeling.

How closely allied to this the biblical usage is, we shall further see below. In some passages καρδία is used to translate the Hebrew כֶּלֶב (Ps. v. 10, lxii. 5, xxxix. 4); but a better equivalent, considering the fundamental meaning of כֶּלֶב (elsewhere = κοιλία, ἐγκοιλία, γαστήρ, τὰ ἔγκατα, strictly the internal part of the body, the entrails), where it has a psychological and not a purely physiological force, would be the Homeric φρένες (not in

the LXX., except in Dan. iv. 31, 33, where it is = נְפֶשׁ), which denotes the "corporeal principle of the spiritual life," in which the functions of the mind, feeling, thought, and volition all have their seat, and which is then put for the spiritual (mental) activity itself, whilst the incorporeal principle is designated *θύμος* (the biblical term is *πνεῦμα*; cf. the remarks made below on the relation of the heart to the mind). Cf. the Lexicons, and Nägelsbach, *homer. Theol.* vii. 17 ff.; Ps. li. 11, *καρδίαν* (כֶּלֶב) *καθαράν κτίσων ἐν ἐμοί, καὶ πνεῦμα εὐθὲς ἐγκαίμισον ἐν τοῖς ἐγκάτοις μου*; Hos. v. 4, *πνεῦμα πορνείας ἐν αὐτοῖς*, כֶּבֶד וְכָבוֹד; cf. כָּבוֹד, as = *αὐτός, ἑαυτός*, etc., Gen. xviii. 12; Jer. ix. 8; Ps. lv. 5; 1 Kings iii. 28. *διάνοια*, Jer. xxxi. 33.

Καρδιά is the proper equivalent of the Hebrew כֶּלֶב, כָּבוֹד, though it must be observed also that in several passages *ψυχή* answers to this, and indeed justly, as far as the Greek usage is concerned. The following are the passages: 1 Kings xviii. 37; 1 Chron. xiii. 38, xv. 29, xvii. 2; 2 Chron. vii. 11, xv. 15, xxxi. 21; Job vii. 11; Ps. lxix. 21; Prov. vi. 21; Isa. vii. 2, 4, x. 7, xiii. 7, xxiv. 7, xxxiii. 18, xlv. 19; Ezek. xxxv. 4; cf. Isa. xxxv. 4, *ὀλιγόψυχος τῇ διανοίᾳ* = כֶּלֶב יָחַד; *ὀλιγοψυχεῖν* = עָנָה רָצָה, Num. xxi. 4. In the language of ordinary life and in prose *ψυχή* was chiefly used, instead of the Homeric and poetic *καρδιά*, to denote the seat, not merely of the desires, passions, and sensations, but also of the will; cf. the details in Passow's *Lexicon* under *ψυχή*. Plat. *Conv.* 218 A, *ἐγὼ οὖν δεδηγμένος τε ὑπὸ ἀλγεινοτέρου καὶ τὸ ἀλγεινότατον ὦν ἂν τις δηχθείη τὴν καρδίαν γὰρ ἢ ψυχὴν ὃ τι δεῖ αὐτὸ ὀνομάσαι πληγεῖς τε καὶ δηχθεὶς ὑπὸ τῶν ἐν φιλοσοφίᾳ λόγων, οἱ ἔχονται ἐχίδνης ἀγριώτερον*. On the other hand, the Hebrew עָנָה is never translated *καρδιά*; the passages cited for this, Gen. xxxiv. 3 and Lam. iii. 21, are owing to a mistake. Now, although the biblical כֶּלֶב, *καρδιά*, in its full meaning—as we shall show further on—corresponds more to the profane *ψυχή*, still there was sufficient ground for employing *καρδιά* to express that which was meant by כֶּלֶב. For the range of the Hebrew עָנָה, to which in Greek *ψυχή* alone corresponds, differs so widely from the ideas connected with *ψυχή*, that utter confusion would have been the consequence of the unlimited employment of *ψυχή* as a rendering of כֶּלֶב. Not only does כֶּלֶב, *καρδιά*, in the Bible, never, like עָנָה, *ψυχή*, denote the personal subject itself, indeed it could not do so; but precisely that which in profane Greek is ascribed to the soul,—*ψ. ἀγαθή, ὀρθή, δικάια, εὔνοος, εὖ φρονούσα; ἀγαθὸς, πονηρὸς τὴν ψυχὴν*,—is, in the Bible, ascribed to the heart alone, and cannot be otherwise, cf. Ps. li. 12, lxiv. 7, ci. 4; 1 Kings iii. 6, ix. 4; Neh. ix. 8; Job xi. 13; Ps. xxiv. 4, lxxiii. 1; Prov. xxii. 11; Rom. ii. 5; 1 Tim. i. 5; Heb. iii. 12, x. 22; Matt. v. 8; Luke viii. 15; 2 Pet. ii. 14, *καρδίαν γεγυμνασμένην πλεονεξίαις*, cf. Isocr. ii. 11, *τὴν ψυχὴν γυμνάζεσθαι*. The usage of the apocryphal Book of Wisdom alone follows that of profane Greek, viii. 19, *ψυχῆς δὲ ἔλαχον ἀγαθῆς*; cf. ii. 22, *ψυχὰς ἀμώμοις*; vii. 27, *ψυχὰς ὅσαι (ψυχὴν δικάαν, in 2 Pet. ii. 8, is not to be confounded therewith)*. According to biblical representations, the *soul* is not to be measured by attributes, because moral qualities do not belong to its *substance*, but are strictly its *accidents*, attributable to the heart as the seat and direct organ of the soul; see below. Cf. Prov.

xxi. 10, *ψυχὴ ἀσεβοῦς*, not *ἀσεβής*. (At the same time, it is already clear here how very important the idea of *the heart* is in connection with biblical views of life.)

Further, when we find, finally, that *לֵב*—apart from the passages in which by abstract generalization the reflective personal pronouns are used in the same way as they are for *לֵב, נַפֶּשׁ, רִיחַ*—is rendered by *διάνοια* in Lev. xix. 17; Num. xv. 39; Deut. vii. 17; Gen. xvii. 17, xxiv. 45, xxvii. 41, xxxiv. 3, xlv. 26; Ex. ix. 21, xxxv. 34; Deut. xxviii. 28, xxix. 18; Josh. v. 1; Job i. 5; Isa. xiv. 13; cf. Gen. vi. 6, viii. 21 = *διανοεῖν*; Ex. vii. 23 = *νοῦς*,—no rule can be deduced therefrom for the cases in which a reflective activity is ascribed to the heart. For there are just as many, if not more, passages in which *καρδιά* is used in the same combinations. Comp. *e.g.* Gen. xxxiv. 3 with Isa. xl. 2, Deut. viii. 5, 17, 1 Sam. xxvii. 1, and other places (in Ex. xxxv. 10, *σοφὸς τῇ διανοίᾳ* is a doubtful reading instead of *σοφ. τ. καρδίᾳ* used in the other places). But it is with this translation as it was with that through *ψυχή*—it was more natural, on the whole, for a Greek, in thinking and speaking, to separate the reflective power from the heart. It may appear strange, however, that the LXX. translators were never led astray to render *לֵב* by *νοῦς* or *διάνοια*.

In all this we see the energy of the spirit of the Bible, compelling the LXX. to retain *καρδιά*, a word which was relatively obsolete, and to give it a new force. That mention is, on the whole, much more rarely made of *the heart* in the N. T. than in the O. T., is due mainly to the circumstance that the reflexive personal pronouns are much more frequently employed where in Hebrew the more concrete *לֵב* would stand, *e.g.* in 2 Cor. ii. 1; Matt. ix. 3, xvi. 7, 8, xxi. 25, 38, etc.; cf. Ex. iv. 14; Num. xvi. 28, xxiv. 13; Esth. vi. 6; Ps. xxxvi. 2.

Καρδιά denotes, then, (I.) *the heart*; (a.) simply as *the organ of the body*, 2 Sam. xviii. 14; 2 Kings ix. 24; (b.) as *the seat of life*, which chiefly and finally participates in all its affections. Judg. xix. 5, *στήρισον τὴν καρδίαν σου ψωμῷ ἄρτου*, cf. ver. 8. In Ex. ix. 14, *ἐξαποστέλλω πάντα τὸ συναντήματά μου εἰς τὴν καρδίαν σου*, the point is, that the plagues to come, in distinction from those that were past, would directly affect *the life* of Pharaoh and his people; cf. Job ii. 4–6. Cf. also the LXX. rendering of Ps. xxviii. 7, *לֵבִי יִשְׁמַח בְּיְהוָה* = *ἀνέθαλεν ἡ σὰρξ μου*. This mode of speech, however, involves also a decided reference to the fact that the heart as the seat of life is the centre of the collective life of *the person*, and as such is influenced by all the affections of life. Cf. 1 Kings xxi. 7, *לֵבִי יִשְׁמַח בְּיְהוָה* φάγε ἄρτον καὶ σεαυτοῦ γενοῦ; Acts xiv. 17, *ἐμπιπλῶν τροφῆς καὶ εὐφροσύνης τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν*. Cf. Gen. xviii. 5; Ps. xxxviii. 11, cii. 5, xxii. 27, lxxiii. 26, where *σὰρξ* and *καρδιά* answer perhaps to the German *Leib und Leben*, *body and life*. In particular, compare Luke xxi. 34, *μή ποτε βαρυνθῶσιν ὑμῶν αἱ καρδίαι ἐν κραιπάλῃ καὶ μέθῃ καὶ μερίμναις βιωτικαῖς*. The heart is more than the centre of the animated material organism; were this not the case, *לֵב*, like *נַפֶּשׁ* and *רִיחַ*, would be predicated of *animals*, which it never is except in Job xli. 16, where the heart is named solely as a part of the body, and in Dan. iv. 13, *ἡ καρδιά αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀλλοιωθήσεται, καὶ*

καρδιά θηρίου δοθήσεται αὐτῷ,—a passage from which we first clearly learn that the heart, as the seat and main organ of the life, is in particular—

(II.) The seat and centre of man's personal life, in which the distinctive character of the human לֵב and לֵב manifests itself; which, on the one hand, concentrates the personal life of man in all its relations,—the unconscious and the conscious, the voluntary and the involuntary, the physical and spiritual impulses, sensations, and states; and, on the other hand, is the immediate organ by which man lives his personal life; compare for both the principal passage, Prov. iv. 23, *τήρει σὴν καρδίαν ἐκ γὰρ τούτων ἔξοδοι ζωῆς*; Ps. lxxix. 33, *ἐκζητήσατε τὸν θεὸν καὶ ζήσεσθε*, Hebrew לֵב לֵב יְיָ . Accordingly, it is not surprising that in some passages and expressions καρδιά is used as parallel both to ψυχή and to πνεῦμα,—to the latter even more prominently than to the former. The ψυχή, the subject of life, whose principle is the πνεῦμα, has in καρδιά its immediate organ, concentrating and mediating all its states and activities, and therefore occupies a position between the two, πνεῦμα—ψυχή—καρδιά. And further, it is the heart, as the organ concentrating, and the medium of all states and activities, in which the πνεῦμα, the distinctive principle of the ψυχή, has the seat of its activity. Accordingly, on the one hand, the emotions of joy, sorrow, etc., are ascribed both to the heart and the soul; comp. Prov. xii. 25, *καρδίαν ταρασσει*; Ps. cxix. 21; Job xxxvii. 1; Ps. cxliii. 4; John xiv. 1, 27, *μὴ ταρασσέσθω ὑμῶν ἡ καρδιά*, with John xii. 27, *ἡ ψυχή μου τετάρακται*; Acts xv. 24; Gen. xli. 8, *ἐταράχθη ἡ ψυχή αὐτοῦ*; Ps. vi. 4, lxxxvi. 4, *εὐφραίνον τὴν ψυχὴν τοῦ δούλου σου*; civ. 16, *εὐφραίνει καρδίαν*; Acts xiv. 17; Ps. xxii. 27, *ζήσονται αἱ καρδίαι αὐτῶν*; Prov. iii. 22, *ἵνα ζήσῃ ἡ ψυχή σου*. Further, cf. the parallelism, Ps. xciv. 19, *κατὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν ὀδυνῶν μου ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ μου αἱ παρακλήσεις σου ἠὺφραναν τὴν ψυχὴν μου*; Prov. xxvii. 9, *μύροις καὶ οἶνοις καὶ θυμιάμασιν τέρπεται καρδιά, καταρρήγνυται δὲ ὑπὸ συμπτωμάτων ψυχή*; ii. 10, *ἐὰν γὰρ ἔλθῃ ἡ σοφία εἰς τὴν σὴν διάνοιαν (בֵּל), ἡ δὲ αἴσθησις τῇ σῇ ψυχῇ καλὴ εἶναι δόξῃ κ.τ.λ.* With respect to the emotional life, a review of the usage shows this distinction, namely, that the immediate desire, which makes its appearance in the form of a natural instinct, is ascribed to the soul (לֵב , *ἐπιθυμία*, of the heart, only in Ps. xxi. 3; LXX. ψυχή, cf. Rom. i. 24; elsewhere only of the soul, Isa. xxvi. 8; Ps. x. 3; cf. Deut. xii. 15, 20, 21, xviii. 6; 1 Sam. xxiii. 30; Jer. ii. 24.—Prov. xxi. 10; Job xxiii. 13; Mic. vii. 1; 1 Sam. ii. 16; 2 Sam. iii. 21, etc.), cf. Ps. lxxxiv. 3, xlii. 3; whereas the desire cherished with consciousness and expressed with will, reflective volition, and resolve, activity of thought, is ascribed to the heart. Cf. לֵב לֵב יְיָ , Esth. vii. 5; Eccles. viii. 11, ix. 3. Cf. further, Ps. xxxvii. 4, xxviii. 3, lxvi. 18; Jer. iii. 17, *et alia*. (Ps. xiii. 3, *ὥς τίνος θήσομαι βουλὰς ἐν ψυχῇ μου, ὀδύνας ἐν καρδίᾳ μου ἡμέρας*, is not to be confounded with the expression in 1 Cor. iv. 5, *αἱ βουλὰι τῶν καρδιῶν*; in Ps. xiii. they are the manifold involuntary thoughts, plans, etc., which arise within man, and which not till afterwards claim reflection.) *Vid.* Oehler in Herzog's *Real-Encycl.* vi. 15, etc., under “Herz.”—The relation of the heart to the soul is clearly expressed in Jer. iv. 19, *τὰ αἰσθητήρια τῆς καρδίας μου μαιμάσσει (τουτέστιν θορυβεῖται) ἡ ψυχή μου (= לֵב לֵב יְיָ לֵב יְיָ) σπαράσσεται*

ἡ καρδιά μου· οὐ σιωπήσομαι, ὅτι φωνὴν σάλπυγγος ἤκουσεν ἡ ψυχὴ μου; Ps. xxiv. 4, καθαρὸς τῇ καρδίᾳ, ὃς οὐκ ἔλαβεν ἐπὶ ματαίῳ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ; Jas. iv. 8, ἀγνίσατε καρδίας δίφθυχοι; cf. Jer. vi. 16, ἀγνισμὸς τῇ ψυχῇ; Luke ii. 35. When heart and soul are spoken of in the Bible as conjoining, especially in a religious respect, it is not a combination of two synonymous expressions for the purpose of gaining force, but as, for example, in the passage ἀγαπᾶν τὸν θεὸν ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας [διαν.] καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς, the words ἐκ καρδ. denote the love of conscious resolve, which must at once become a natural inclination or second nature. Cf. 1 Sam. xviii. 1. We always find καρδιά first, ψυχὴ second. The design is distinctly to teach that the entire, undivided person must share in that which it has to perform with the heart. Comp. Deut. iv. 9, φύλαξον τὴν ψυχὴν σου σφόδρα . . . μὴ ἀποστήτωσαν (οἱ λόγοι) ἀπὸ τῆς καρδίας σου; 1 Chron. xxviii. 9, δούλευε τῷ θεῷ ἐν καρδίᾳ τελείᾳ, καὶ ψυχῇ θελούσῃ (נַחֲשֶׁת שְׂפָרְדִּי דָלֶשׁ דָּלָה, cf. Isa. xlii. 1); Deut. xi. 18. Cf. also 1 Sam. ii. 35, where God says, πάντα τὰ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ μου—all that I intend—καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ μου—all that I must demand, to which I am impelled by myself—ποιήσῃ. Further, cf. Deut. vi. 6, Josh. xxii. 5, where דָּלָה = διάνοια gives prominence to the element of reflection, intention, and consciousness in the conduct. (The passages in question are Deut. iv. 9, 29, x. 12, xi. 13, xiii. 4, xxvi. 16, xxx. 2, 6, 10; Josh. xxiii. 14; 1 Sam. ii. 35; 1 Kings ii. 4, viii. 48; 2 Kings xxiii. 3, 25; 1 Chron. xxii. 19, xxviii. 9; 2 Chron. xxxiv. 31, vi. 38, xv. 12, xxviii. 9; Jer. xxxii. 41.)

On the other hand, we find heart and spirit used as parallels, or in the closest connection with each other. For as the personal life (of the soul) is conditioned by the spirit and mediated by the heart, the activity of the spirit must be specially sought in the heart; accordingly it is possible to attribute to the heart what properly and in the last instance belongs to the spirit. As the spirit is *specially* the divine principle of life, and is therefore particularly employed where manifestations, utterances, states of the religious, God-related life come under consideration, we can understand why religious life and conduct pertain mainly to the heart.—Spirit and heart are parallelized, *e.g.*, in Ps. xxxiv. 19, συντετριμμένοι τὴν καρδίαν . . . ταπεινοὶ τῷ πν.; li. 19, θυσία τῷ θεῷ πνεῦμα συντετριμμένον, καρδίαν συντετριμμένην καὶ τεταπεινωμένην ὁ θεὸς οὐκ ἐξουδενώσει; lxxviii. 9, γενεὰ ἥτις οὐ κατεύθυνεν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῆς, καὶ οὐκ ἐπιστώθη μετὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τὸ πν. αὐτῆς (Ezek. xiii. 3, חָרָה = καρδιά; cf. Jer. xxiii. 16, 26, etc.). Further, in one case we find ascribed to the spirit what in another case is ascribed to the heart; cf. Acts xix. 21, ἔθετο ἐν τῷ πνεύματι, with Acts xxiii. 11, ἡ πρόθεσις τῆς καρδίας; 2 Cor. ix. 7.—1 Thess. ii. 17, ἀπορφανισθέντες ἀφ' ὑμῶν . . . προσώπῳ οὐ καρδίᾳ; Col. ii. 5, τῇ σαρκὶ ἀπειμι . . . τῷ πνεύματι σὺν ὑμῖν εἰμί. It is of chief importance to recognise the heart as the seat of the activity of the Spirit, of the divine principle of life, *vid.* 1 Pet. iii. 4, ὁ κρυπτός τῆς καρδίας ἄνθρωπος, ἐν τῷ ἀφθάρτῳ τοῦ πραέος καὶ ἡσυχίου πνεύματος; Rom. ii. 29, which is also at once the seat of the Holy Ghost (*vid.* πνεῦμα); Ps. li. 11; Eph. iii. 16, 17; Rom. v. 5, ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκκέχυται ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν διὰ πνεύματος τοῦ δοθέντος ἡμῖν; Gal. iv. 6, ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰς καρδίας

ὑμῶν, cf. Rom. viii. 15, 16; 2 Cor. i. 22, καὶ δοὺς τὸν ἀρραβῶνα τοῦ πν. ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν. This is the explanation of the connection existing between the heart and conscience. If the latter is the self-consciousness as determined by the spirit as the divine principle of life (*vid. συνείδησις*), it would perhaps be psychologically correct to describe it as the *result of the action of the spirit in the heart*. Heb. x. 22, ἐρραντισμένοι τὰς καρδίας ἀπὸ συνειδήσεως πονηρᾶς; Rom. ii. 15, οἵτινες ἐνδείκνυνται τὸ ἔργον τοῦ νόμου γραπτὸν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν, συμμαρτυροῦσης αὐτῶν τῆς συνειδήσεως κ.τ.λ. We can thus understand why in the O. T. and partly also in the N. T. the activity of conscience is ascribed to the heart; so that R. Hofmann (*Die Lehre vom Gewissen*, p. 25) is wrong when he asserts, "To speak of the heart, which is the seat of our spiritual activities, as the groundwork of conscience, is so *indefinite* that it is nothing more than saying that the phenomena of conscience are to be traced back to the innermost personal life." The seeming "indefiniteness" rests upon a misapprehension of the ideas connected with **לֵב** and **קָדַשׁ**. Compare from the O. T. 1 Kings ii. 44; 1 Sam. xxiv. 6; 2 Sam. xxiv. 10; Job xxvii. 6; Eccles. vii. 23; Jer. xvii. 1 (cf. 2 Cor. iii. 2, 3); 1 Sam. xxv. 31; Prov. xiv. 10. In the N. T. 2 Cor. iii. 2, 3; Heb. x. 22; 1 John iii. 19-21. Very instructive is the comparison of the last-named passage with Rom. viii. 15; Gal. iv. 6. Compare also the remarkable passage Job ix. 21, εἶτε γὰρ ἠσέβησα, οὐκ οἶδα τῇ ψυχῇ, **וְלֵבִי אֵלֹהִים** = οὐ σύννοια ἐμὰντῶ, comp. 1 Cor. iv. 4; 2 Sam. xviii. 13. (We may be allowed here to remark that it is only very partially correct to make *the conscience* and not *the heart* the seat of *religion*.)—In view of the contents and aim of holy Scripture, it need not surprise that the heart comes into consideration there chiefly in its spiritual nature.

If, then, the heart is to be regarded as the seat and immediate organ of man's personal life, of the **וְלֵבִי**, both in its material (I.) and (II.) in its spiritual aspect, it presents itself in this latter quality primarily and mainly (*a.*) as the place where the *entire personal life*, in respect both of its states and its utterances, concentrates itself; Isa. i. 5; Eph. iv. 18, ἀπηλλοτριωμένοι τῆς ζωῆς τοῦ θεοῦ . . . διὰ τὴν πώρωσιν τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν. Cf. 1 Pet. iii. 4; Eph. iii. 17, κατοικῆσαι τὸν Χριστὸν διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν; cf. with ver. 16 and Gal. ii. 20, ζῶ δὲ οὐκέτι ἐγώ, ζῇ δὲ ἐν ἐμοὶ Χριστός. Hence Acts iv. 32, ἦν ἡ καρδιά καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ μία (*vid. above*); Phil. iv. 7, ἡ εἰρήνη τοῦ θεοῦ . . . φρουρήσει τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν . . . ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. Further, στηρίζειν τὰς κ., 1 Thess. iii. 13; Jas. v. 8, cf. iv. 8; Heb. xiii. 9, καλὸν χάριτι βεβαιοῦσθαι τὴν κ. The heart accordingly represents the proper character of the personality, or hides it, Matt. v. 8, καθαροὶ τῇ κ.; cf. Ps. lxxiii. 1, xxiv. 4; Prov. xxii. 11; Matt. xi. 29, τάπεινος τῇ κ.; Luke iv. 18, συντετριμμένοι τῇ κ.; viii. 15, καρδιά καλὴ καὶ ἀγαθή; Acts vii. 51, ἀπερίτμητοι τῇ κ.; viii. 21, ἡ κ. σου οὐκ ἔστιν εὐθεία ἐναντι τοῦ θεοῦ; Rom. viii. 27; Rev. ii. 23, ἐρευνῶν νεφροὺς καὶ καρδίας; Rom. i. 21, ἐσκοτίσθη ἡ ἀσύνετος αὐτῶν κ.; ii. 5, κατὰ δὲ τὴν σκληρότητά σου καὶ ἀμετανόητον καρδίαν; 1 Cor. xiv. 25, τὰ κρυπτὰ τῆς καρδίας αὐτοῦ φανερὰ γίνεται; 1 Thess. ii. 4, θεὸς ὁ δοκιμάζων τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν; Jas. iii. 14, ζῆλον πικρὸν ἔχετε καὶ ἐριθείαν ἐν τῇ κ. ὑμῶν; iv. 8, ἀγνίσατε καρδίας δίψυχοι; 2 Pet. ii. 14. On this is based the possibility of an

antagonism between the inner character and the outward appearance; Matt. xv. 8, ὁ λαὸς οὗτος ταῖς χεῖλεσίν με τιμᾷ, ἡ δὲ καρδιά αὐτῶν πόρρω ἀπέχει ἀπ' ἐμοῦ; cf. 1 Sam. xvi. 7, ἄνθρωπος ὄψεται εἰς πρόσωπον, ὁ δὲ θεὸς ὄψεται εἰς κ.; Luke xvi. 15, ὑμεῖς ἐστὲ οἱ δικαιοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὁ δὲ θεὸς γινώσκει τὰς κ. ὑμῶν; Lam. iii. 41; Joel ii. 13; Rom. ii. 29; 2 Cor. v. 12, πρὸς τοὺς ἐν προσώπῳ καυχωμένους καὶ οὐ καρδίᾳ; 1 Thess. ii. 17; 1 Pet. iii. 4. This is further the reason why thoughts which may eventually not find expression are traced to the heart as the place where they exist, though remaining hidden. So λογίζεσθαι, διαλογίζεσθαι ἐν καρδίᾳ, equivalent to ἐν ἑαυτῷ, cf. Mark ii. 6, 8; Matt. ix. 4; Luke ii. 35, iii. 15, v. 22, ix. 47; εἰπεῖν ἐν κ., Matt. xxiv. 48; Luke xii. 45; Rom. x. 6, 8; Rev. xviii. 7, cf. Luke i. 66, ii. 19, 51; Matt. v. 28, ἤδη ἐμοίχευσεν αὐτὴν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ (cf. Mark vii. 21); Matt. ix. 4; Mark xi. 23; 1 Cor. iv. 5; cf. 1 Cor. vii. 37; Eph. v. 19; Col. iii. 16. Altogether, indeed, the heart, as the point in which the entire personal life is concentrated, is specially (as the passages quoted show) **the point of concentration** (focus and spring) of the religious life. This is its function, because it is the seat or organ of that which is the distinctive feature of man's personality, to wit the πνεῦμα, which ultimately and mainly must be regarded as the principle of the divine life, and therefore the principle of the God-related life.—With this view of the heart as the point of concentration of man's personal life is connected (b.) the significance of the heart as **the starting-point** whence the particular developments and manifestations of personal life proceed; comp. Prov. iv. 23, τήρει σὴν καρδίαν· ἐκ γὰρ τούτων ἔξοδοι ζωῆς; Luke vi. 45, ὁ ἀγαθὸς ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ θησαυροῦ τῆς κ. αὐτοῦ προφέρει τὸ ἀγαθόν . . . ἐκ γὰρ περισσεύματος καρδίας λαλεῖ τὸ στόμα; Matt. xii. 34, 35, xv. 18, 19; Mark vii. 21, ἔσωθεν γὰρ ἐκ τῆς κ. τῶν ἀνθρώπων οἱ διαλογισμοὶ οἱ κακοὶ ἐκπορεύονται, μοιχεύει κ.τ.λ. So also ἀγαπᾶν ἐκ καρδίας, Matt. xxii. 37; Mark xii. 30, 33; Luke x. 27; 1 Tim. i. 5; 1 Pet. i. 22.—2 Tim. ii. 22, ἐπικαλεῖσθαι τὸν κύριον ἐκ καθαρᾶς καρδίας.—Both as the point of concentration and as the point of outgo for man's personal life, the heart is (c.) the organ which takes upon itself the **mediations** (or adjustments) of all the states and expressions of the personal life, especially of the religious life. (Here again those passages come before us in which this aspect preponderates, because nowhere is one only of the three aspects isolated.) It is the heart by means of which man lives, Matt. vi. 21, ὅπου γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ θησαυρὸς ὑμῶν, ἐκεῖ ἐστὶ καὶ ἡ κ. ὑμῶν; Luke xii. 34; Acts ii. 46, μετελάμβανον τροφῆς ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει καὶ ἀφελότητι καρδίας αἰνοῦντες τὸν θεόν; Rom. xvi. 18, ἐξαπατῶσι τὰς κ. τῶν ἀκάκων; Jas. i. 26. In it are concentrated the emotions which, as such, lay claim to the whole man; John xiv. 1, 27, xvi. 6, ἡ λύπη πεπλήρωκεν ὑμῶν τὴν κ.; xvi. 22, χαρήσεται ὑμῶν ἡ κ.; Acts ii. 26, xiv. 17, xxi. 13; Rom. ix. 2; 2 Cor. ii. 4; Jas. v. 5. It is the organ for the reception of all that goes to mould the personal life, especially for the reception and conception of the word of God and the operations of grace, etc., Matt. xiii. 19, τὸ ἐσπαρμένον ἐν τῇ κ.; Mark iv. 15, cf. Mark vii. 9; Luke viii. 12, 15, xxiv. 32, ἡ κ. ἡμῶν καιομένη ἦν ἐν ἡμῖν, ὡς ἐλάλει κ.τ.λ.; Acts ii. 37, κατενύγησαν τῇ κ. (τὴν κ.); vii. 54,

ἀκούοντες δὲ ταῦτα διεπρίοντο ταῖς κ.; xvi. 14; Rom. ii. 15, v. 5; 1 Cor. ii. 9; 2 Cor. iii. 15, ἡνίκα ἀναγινώσκεται Μωϋσῆς κάλυμμα ἐπὶ τὴν κ. αὐτῶν κείται; iv. 6, ἔλαμψεν ἐν ταῖς κ. ἡμῶν; 2 Pet. i. 19, ἕως οὗ . . . φωσφόρος ἀνατείλῃ ἐν ταῖς κ. ὑμῶν; Luke xxi. 14, θέτε οὖν εἰς τὰς κ. ὑμῶν, μὴ προμελετᾶν ἀπολογηθῆναι; Heb. viii. 10, ἐπὶ καρδίας αὐτῶν ἐπυγράψω κ.τ.λ.; x. 16, παρακαλεῖν τὴν καρδίαν; Eph. vi. 22; Col. ii. 2, iv. 8; 2 Thess. ii. 17. In agreement herewith we must explain John xiii. 2, τοῦ διαβόλου ἤδη βεβληκότος εἰς τὴν κ. Ἰῶα κ.τ.λ.; Acts v. 3, ἐπλήρωσεν ὁ σατανᾶς τὴν κ. σου. Hence νοεῖν τῇ κ., John xii. 40, cf. Heb. iv. 12, ἔννοια καρδίας; Luke i. 51, διάνοια κ.; Acts viii. 22, ἐπίνοια κ. Further, συνιέναι τῇ κ., Matt. xiii. 15; Acts xxviii. 27, cf. Rom. i. 21. Hereto correspond also the expressions ἐπαχύνθη ἡ κ., Acts xxviii. 27; Matt. xiii. 15; παροῦν τὴν κ., Mark vi. 52, viii. 17; John xii. 40, cf. Mark iii. 5; Eph. iv. 18. σκληρύνειν τὴν κ., Heb. iii. 8, 15, iv. 7. *To bear any one in one's heart*, ἔχειν τινὰ ἐν κ., means to be united with him so that what affects the one affects also the other, 2 Cor. vii. 3; Phil. i. 7. The heart is the proper seat and immediate organ of the resolves, etc., Acts v. 4, vii. 23, xi. 23; 1 Cor. iv. 5; 2 Cor. ix. 7, viii. 16; 1 Cor. vii. 37; Rom. x. 1, i. 24; Rev. xvii. 17, cf. Luke xxiv. 38; 1 Cor. ii. 9; Acts vii. 39. But it is, above all, the *seat and organ of belief and unbelief*, Rom. x. 10, καρδίᾳ γὰρ πιστεύεται; cf. Mark xi. 23, καὶ μὴ διακριθῇ ἐν τῇ κ. αὐτοῦ, ἀλλὰ πιστεύσῃ; Rom. x. 9; Eph. iii. 17; Luke xxiv. 25, ὧ ἀνόητοι καὶ βραδεῖς τῇ κ. τοῦ πιστεῖν; Acts viii. 37, Received text; and, indeed, generally the seat of the life of faith and of the religious walk; Rom. vi. 17, ὑπηκούσατε ἐκ κ. εἰς ὃν παρεδόθητε τύπον διδαχῆς; 1 Pet. iii. 4; Eph. vi. 5; Col. iii. 22; Matt. xviii. 35; 2 Thess. iii. 5, ὁ δὲ κύριος κατευθύνει ὑμῶν τὰς καρδίας εἰς τὴν ἀγάπην τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ εἰς τὴν ἵππομονὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ; Heb. x. 22, προσερχώμεθα μετὰ ἀληθινῆς καρδίας; 1 Pet. iii. 15; Acts vii. 39.

(III.) Metaphorically used; e.g. καρδία τῆς γῆς, Matt. xii. 40; cf. Ex. xv. 8; Deut. iv. 11 — *the hidden and inmost part of anything*.

Καρδιογνώστης, ὁ, heart-knower, heart-searcher, inasmuch as the heart represents or conceals the proper character of the person, see καρδία, II. α. The word is, so to speak, as a matter of course, foreign to profane Greek; it does not occur even in LXX. We find it only in Acts i. 24, xv. 8, and in patristic Greek as a designation of God, cf. 1 Sam. xvi. 7; Jer. xvii. 9, 10; 1 Thess. ii. 4; Rom. viii. 27; Rev. ii. 23.

Σκληροκαρδία, ἡ, only in biblical and patristic Greek, Deut. x. 16; Jer. iv. 4, סְלִיחוּתָא לִבָּי, cf. περιτομή καρδίας, Rom. ii. 28; Ecclus. xvi. 10; Matt. xix. 8; Mark x. 5, xvi. 14, ὠνείδισε τὴν ἀπιστίαν αὐτῶν καὶ σκληροκαρδίαν, ὅτι . . . οὐκ ἐπίστευσαν. It denotes the *disdain and stubbornness* of man in his bearing towards God and the revelation of His grace, for which he ought to have a willing and receptive place in his heart. Cf. σκληρὸν ἦθος, an *unbending character*, Plat. Conv. 195 E; Rom. ii. 5, κατὰ τὴν σκληρότητά σου καὶ ἀμετανόητον καρδίαν, Matt. xxv. 24. — In the LXX. we find also σκληροκάριος, Ezek. iii. 7; Prov. xvii. 21. Schleusner aptly compares Hesiod, ἐ. κ. ἡ, 146, where it is said of the human race, ἀδάμαντος ἔχον κρατερόφρονα θυμόν; on which

Tzetzwitz remarks, *τουτέστι σκληρὰν ψυχὴν* (bibl. καρδίαν) εἶχον, καὶ ἀκαμπεῖς ἦσαν, ὥσπερ ὁ ἀδάμας. Cf. also the biblical σκληροτράχηλος, Prov. xxix. 1; Ex. xxxiii. 5, xxxiv. 9; Deut. ix. 6, 13; Baruch ii. 22; Ecclus. xvi. 12; Acts vii. 51.

Καρτερέω, to be strong, steadfast, firm; to endure, to hold out; with the dat.; ἐπί with the dat., ἐν, πρὸς with the acc.; also with the acc. alone, e.g. τὸν ὄγκον, Isocr. i. 30, to bear the burden. In Heb. xi. 27, τὸν ἀόρατον ὡς ὁρῶν ἐκαρτέρησεν, ὁρῶν governs τὸν ἀόρατον; we must not join τὸν ἀόρατον to ἐκαρτ., for to render it "he held fast to the invisible" seems a violation of linguistic usage. Neither need we (as Delitzsch does) supply an object to ἐκαρτ.—"he endured severe yet voluntary exile." The object lies in the participle ὁρῶν, and the ὡς indicates the inexactness and figurativeness of the phrase ὁρῶν τὸν ἀόρατον (compare Krüger, lxix. 63. 3, against Kurtz' objection to this view of the ὡς), as in Job ii. 9, μέχρις τίνος καρτερήσεις λέγων; Plat. Soph. 254 A, τὰ τῆς τῶν πολλῶν ψυχῆς ὅμματα καρτερεῖν πρὸς τὸ θεῖον ἀφορῶντα ἀδύνατα; Lach. 192 E, etc. Cf. Krüger, lvi. 6. 1.

Προσκαρτερέω, to tarry, to remain somewhere, τιλ, Mark iii. 9. To continue steadfastly with some one, Acts viii. 13; Dem. 1386. 6; Polyb. xxiv. 5. 3. To cleave faithfully to some one, Acts x. 7; ἐν τόπῳ, to continue anywhere, Susannah 7; Acts ii. 46; Rom. xiii. 6, εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο . . . sc. εἰς τὸ ὑμᾶς φόρους τελεῖν . . . προσκατεροῦντες, those who continually insist thereon. Metaphorically, of steadfastness and faithfulness in the outgoings of the Christian life, especially in prayer. Acts i. 14, τῇ προσευχῇ; vi. 4, τῇ προσευχῇ καὶ τῇ διακονίᾳ τοῦ λόγου; Rom. xii. 2; Col. iv. 2, τῇ προσευχῇ προσκατερεῖτε γρηγοροῦντες ἐν αὐτῇ ἐν εὐχαριστίᾳ; Acts ii. 42, τῇ διδαχῇ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ τῇ κοινωνίᾳ, καὶ τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου καὶ ταῖς προσευχαῖς; Num. xiii. 20; absolutely = Πλητῇ, not to lose courage.

Προσκαρτέρησις, perseverance, endurance, faithful continuance in something, cf. Acts x. 7. Only used in later Greek. In the N. T. only in Eph. vi. 18, where its use is suggested by the verb, and the entire expression is specially strong, διὰ πάσης προσευχῆς καὶ δεήσεως προσευχόμενοι ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ ἐν πνεύματι, καὶ εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἀγρυπνοῦντες ἐν πάσῃ προσκατερήσει καὶ δεήσει κ.τ.λ. Cf. Col. ii. 4.

Κενός, ἡ, ὄν, empty, void, as against πλήρης, μεστός.—Strictly, (I.) relatively, void of something, either with a genitive, e.g. κενὸν δένδρων (πεδίου), Plat. Rep. x. 621 A, and so very frequently; or, where the thing to which the emptiness relates must be supplied from the context, cf. Luke i. 53, πεινῶντας ἐνέπλησεν ἀγαθῶν καὶ πλουτοῦντας ἐξάπείστειλεν κενούς. Cf. κενός as synonymous with πεινῶν, Ps. cvii. 9, the passage underlying Luke i. 53. Further, cf. Gen. xxxi. 42; Deut. xvi. 13; Mark xii. 3, ἀπέστειλεν κενόν—ver. 2, ἵνα παρὰ τῶν γεωργῶν λάβῃ ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν τοῦ ἀμπελώνος; Luke xx. 10, 11. This leads on to (II.) absolutely, empty, either where there is nothing, or where that is absent which is said to be present. Cf. Xen. Mem. iii. 16. 6, πότερον κενός, ἢ φέρων τι; So in Ecclus. xxxii. 6, μὴ ὀφθῆς ἐν προσώπῳ κυρίου κενός. Herewith is connected (III.)

its frequent application to non-sentient things, *e.g.* κενός κόπος, *fruitless, useless labour*, by which nothing is effected, 1 Cor. xv. 58; 1 Cor. xv. 10, χάρις, *cf.* 2 Cor. vi. 1. *Cf.* εἰς κενόν, *for nothing, in vain*, Gal. ii. 2; Phil. ii. 16; 1 Thess. iii. 5; Job xxxix. 16.—Acts iv. 25, ἐμελέτησαν κενά, *from* Ps. ii. 1. The words in 1 Thess. ii. 1, ἡ εἴσοδος ἡμῶν ἡ πρὸς ὑμᾶς . . . οὐ κενὴ γέγονεν, refers not so much to the effect, as to what the apostle brought with him, and the mode of his work, *cf.* vv. 2–12 = *has not been done under an empty pretence*; *cf.* above, Ecclus. xxxii. 4.—1 Cor. xv. 14, κήρυγμα κενόν = *without substance, without truth*; *cf.* κενοὶ λόγοι, *empty words*, whose import is not actually in them, which really say nothing, *vain talk*; Plat. *Lach.* 196 B. Deut. xxxii. 47, οὐχὶ λόγος κενὸς οὗτος ὑμῶν, ὅτι αὐτὴ ἡ ζωὴ ὑμῶν = פֶּה. Still stronger = רָצוֹן רָצוֹן, Ex. v. 9, μὴ μεριμνάτωσαν ἐν λόγοις κενοῖς. *Cf.* Job xxi. 34, παρακαλεῖτέ με κενά, לֹא יִשְׁמַחַנִּי; Hab. ii. 3, ὄρασις . . . οὐκ εἰς κενόν, בִּינָה לֹא. So Eph. v. 6, ἀπατᾶν κενοῖς λόγοις—*which cannot effect or give what the gospel gives*. Col. ii. 8, κενὴ ἀπάτη = *lying deceit*. *Cf.* κενὴ πρόφασις, κενὴν κατηγορεῖν, etc., in profane Greek.—1 Cor. xv. 14, κενὴ ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν, *cf.* Wisd. iii. 11, κενὴ ἡ ἐλπίς αὐτῶν; Ecclus. xxxi. 1, κεναὶ ἐλπίδες καὶ ψευδεῖς. So also in profane Greek, Aesch. *Pers.* 804, κεναῖς ἐλπίσιν πεπεισμένος; Dem. xviii. 150, κενὴ πρόφασις καὶ ψευδής. In this sense synonymously with μάταιος, ψευδής.—Of persons, as in Jas. ii. 20, ὦ ἄνθρωπε κενέ, it is rarely used so absolutely. In this passage the meaning puffed up answers best to the context, *cf.* Plut. *Mor.* 541 B, τοὺς ἐν τῷ περιπατεῖν ἐπαιρομένους καὶ ὑφανχενούοντας ἀνοήτους ἡγούμεθα καὶ κενούς (*in which there is nothing*). *Cf.* also the proverb κενοὶ κενὰ λογίζονται; Judg. ix. 4, ἐμισθώσατο ἑαυτῷ ἄνδρας κενούς καὶ δειλοὺς; xi. 3, συνεστράφησαν πρὸς Ἰεφθάε ἄνδρες κενοί, Hebrew עֲרֵי, can scarcely be identified with it. It seems more than doubtful whether Jas. ii. 20 corresponds to ῥακά (Matt. v. 22), the sign of contempt, because Jas. ii. 20 does not express a personal relation to him who is addressed.—Besides the derivatives that follow, we have in the N. T. κενόδοξος (Gal. v. 26), *full of empty imagination* (Polyb., Diod., *cf.* κενοδοξέω, *groundlessly to fancy oneself something*). κενοδοξία, *vain imagination*; Phil. ii. 3, *ambition* (Polyb., Plut., etc.; Suidas, ματάλα τις περὶ ἑαυτοῦ οἵησις).

Κενόω, *to make empty, to empty*;—(I.) relatively with genitive of the contents, *e.g.* Plat. *Conv.* 197 C, οὗτος δὲ (Ἔρως) ἡμᾶς ἀλλοτριότητος μὲν κενοί, οἰκειότητος δὲ πληροί. Also with the acc., *e.g.* Poll. ii. 62, κενοῦν ὀφθαλμούς.—(II.) Absolutely, either *to empty* of what is or is said to be in it, the object showing what the contents are; or = *to reduce to nothing*, κενός, II. The former, *e.g.* οἰκίαι κενοῦνται = *to die out*, in Thucyd.; Jer. xiv. 2, αἱ πύλαι ἐκενώθησαν; xv. 9, ἐκενώθη ἡ τίκτουσα ἔπτα. It is the antithesis of πληροῦν τινά, Plat. *Conv.* 197 C, *Phileb.* 35 E. So in Phil. ii. 7, ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν, by which is denoted the beginning of that act of Jesus Christ which in ver. 8 is termed ἐταπείνωσεν ἑαυτόν. In order to understand the import of the term, we must examine the entire passage, ver. 6 ff., ὃς ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων, οὐχ ἄρπαγμόν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ, ἀλλὰ ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσε, μορφὴν δούλου λαβὼν, ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος κ.τ.λ. The

relation between *ὁμοίωμα ἀνθρ.* and *μορφή δούλου* is like that between *ἴσα θεῷ* and *μορφή θεοῦ*, as between species and genus, between the logical sequence and the presupposition (cf. Heb. ii. 7–9 with Ps. viii. 5–7). Christ *declined*, by His own perfect power, *to give effect to, or by force to demonstrate*, the *εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ* that belonged to Him in virtue of His *μορφή θεοῦ* (the expression *οὐκ ἄρπαγμὸν ἤγ.* is selected with a view to *ἐχαρίσατο αὐτῷ ὁ θεός*, ver. 9. For this signification of *ἄρπαγμός*, see 1 Thess. iv. 17; 2 Cor. xii. 2, 4; Jude 23; Rev. xii. 5. According to its form, *ἄρπαγμός*, in the only place in which it occurs in profane Greek, Plut. *Mor.* 12 A, signifies the *actus rapiendi*, not *praeda*). With this renunciation He at the same time gave up that presupposition itself, the *μορφή θεοῦ*, stripped Himself of that by which His whole being had been distinctively determined, for the *μορφή δούλου* (see *δοῦλος*); and thus it came to pass that He was found *ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπου*. On the relation between *ἐκένωσε* and *λαβών*, cf. Krüger, § liii. 6, 7, 8; the former explains itself in the latter; on *ὑπάρχων* . . . *ἡγήσατο*, cf. Krüger, § lvi. 10; *ὑπάρχων* denotes, not something which was momentarily the case, but which is to be conceived as contemporary with the *ἡγήσατο*, cf. 2 Cor. viii. 9, *δι' ὑμᾶς ἐπώρχευσε, πλούσιος ὢν*. The *οὐχ ἄρπαγ. ἤγ.* is a fact belonging to history, like all that follows. But it is the fact of the incarnation which the apostle sets forth as an act of free, humiliative choice, so that no conclusion perhaps should be drawn from ver. 6 as to the relation of the two first-named things, the *μορφή θεοῦ* and the *εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ*, prior to the incarnation. Both the historical act (ver. 8), the beginning (ver. 7), and the presupposition (ver. 6) of the historical act apply to the same Subject, from which we are certainly warranted in drawing conclusions, according to the presuppositions of the apostle (*ἐν μ. θ. ὑπάρχων*), as to the pre-existence of Christ. (Perhaps *μορφή θεοῦ* and *εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ* stand to each other in the same relation as Gen. i. 27 to Gen. iii. 5, *i.e.* man's state as created in the image of God to the corresponding state after the temptation.) —(III.) Metaphorically = *to bring to nought*; cf. *κενός* (III.), Rom. iv. 14, *κεκένωται ἡ πίστις*, cf. 1 Cor. xv. 14. The emptiness, hollowness of faith, has reference to its working, and is = *fruitless, without effect*; whilst its objectlessness is further specially referred to in the following words, *καὶ κατήργηται ἡ ἐπαγγελία*. So also 1 Cor. i. 17, *ἵνα μὴ κενωθῇ ὁ σταυρὸς τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, cf. ver. 18, *μωρία . . . δύναμις θεοῦ*; Deut. xxxii. 47, *κενὸς . . . ζωή*.—1 Cor. ix. 15; 2 Cor. ix. 3, *τὸ καύχημα κενοῦται*. Ἐκκενοῦν, Song i. 2; Ps. lxxv. 8; Ezek. v. 2; Judith v. 19; Ps. cxxxvii. 7; Gen. xxiv. 20; 2 Chron. xxiv. 11.

Κενοφωνία, ἡ, empty, fruitless speaking (sometimes like *κενοφωνεῖν, κενοφώνημα* in patristic Greek; elsewhere very rare). In 1 Tim. vi. 20, 2 Tim. ii. 16, the apostle designates as *βέβηλοι κενοφωνοῦντες*, *discoursings* that are *destitute* (*βεβ.*) of any divine or spiritual character, that are *fruitless* (*κεν.*) for the satisfaction of man's need of salvation and for the moulding of the Christian life; 2 Tim. ii. 16, *ἐπὶ πλείον γὰρ προκόψουσιν ἀσεβείας*; 1 Tim. vi. 21, *περὶ τὴν πίστιν ἡστόχησαν*. Cf. 1 Tim. iv. 7. Further, Deut. xxxii. 47; as also *κενοὶ λόγοι*, Eph. v. 6; Col. ii. 9.

Κεφαλή, ἡ, head, פֶּה , Matt. v. 36, and often; κινεῖν τὴν κ. , Matt. xxvii. 39; Mark xv. 29 — פֶּה פֶּה ; Lam. ii. 15; Ps. xxii. 8; Job xvi. 4, cf. Eccles. xii. 18; Hom. *Il.* v. 285. 376. Life culminates in the head, cf. Gen. iii. 15; it is the goal of the vital movement proceeding from the heart; hence $\text{ἐπαίρειν τὴν κεφαλὴν}$, Luke xxi. 28, cf. Acts xxvii. 34, denotes *freshness of life, vital courage*, cf. Isa. xxxv. 10, $\text{εὐφροσύνη αἰώνιος ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς αὐτῶν}$; on the other hand, κλίνειν τὴν κ. , *decline of life, the end*, indicating an enfeeblement, a giving way of the vital energy, John xix. 30, cf. Matt. viii. 20; Luke ix. 58; Isa. vi. 5.—Zech. ii. 4; Ps. lxxv. 5, 6; Job x. 15; Ps. cxlv. 14, cxlviii. 14. For the correspondence between *head* and *heart*, cf. Isa. i. 5, 6. Hence in the case of a crime, by which life is forfeited, the head incurs the punishment, Acts xviii. 6, $\text{τὸ αἷμα ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν ὑμῶν}$, cf. Matt. xxiii. 35, $\text{ὅπως ἔλθῃ ἐφ' ὑμᾶς πᾶν αἷμα}$; 1 Sam. xxv. 39; Neh. iv. 4; Ps. vii. 17; Ezek. ix. 10, xi. 21, xvi. 43, xxii. 31; Lev. xx. 9, 11, 12; Josh. ii. 19; 2 Sam. i. 16; 1 Kings ii. 37; Ezek. xviii. 13, xxxiii. 4 sqq.; Hab. iii. 13. Herod. ii. 39; Luc. *Philop.* 25; Aristoph. *Nub.* 39; Prov. x. 6, $\text{εὐλογία κυρίου ἐπὶ κεφαλὴν δικαίου}$; xi. 26. Cf. Ex. ix. 14, $\text{ἐξαποστέλλω πάντα τὰ συναντήματά μου ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν σου}$.—Rom. xii. 20, $\text{ἄνθρακας πυρὸς σωρεύσεις ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ}$ (Prov. xxv. 21, 22), to be understood agreeably to Prov. xxiv. 17, 18; Ps. cxl. 10, 11; Ezek. x. 2 sqq., ver. 11. On account of this its position, the head is that part of the body which holds together and governs all the outgoings of life, cf. Col. i. 18, $\text{αὐτός ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλὴ τοῦ σώματος, τῆς ἐκκλ.}$; ii. 19, $\text{οὐ κρατῶν τὴν κεφαλὴν, ἐξ οὗ πᾶν τὸ σῶμα διὰ τῶν ὀφθῶν καὶ συνδέσμων ἐπιχορηγούμενον καὶ συμβιβαζόμενον αὔξει}$, and because of its vital connection stands in the relation of ruler to the other members. In this sense the word is figuratively used in 1 Cor. xi. 3, $\text{παντὸς ἀνδρὸς ἡ κεφαλὴ ὁ Χριστός ἐστιν, κεφαλὴ δὲ γυναικὸς ὁ ἀνὴρ, κεφ. δὲ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὁ θεός}$; Eph. v. 23, $\text{ἀνὴρ ἐστιν κεφ. τῆς γυναικὸς, ὡς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς κεφ. τῆς ἐκκλησίας, αὐτὸς σωτὴρ τοῦ σώματος}$; i. 22; cf. ver. 23, iv. 15, 16. Cf. *ἀνακεφαλαίου*. Hence figuratively *κεφαλὴ γωνίας*, פֶּה פֶּה , *corner-stone* in which the walls meet, and which connects and holds the walls together; of Christ, Matt. xxi. 42; Mark xii. 10; Luke xx. 17; 1 Pet. ii. 7, after Ps. cxviii. 22. As the overtopping part of the body, Rev. xvii. 9, $\text{αἱ ἐπτὰ κεφαλὰι ἐπτὰ ὄρη εἰσὶν}$.

Ἀνακεφαλαίω, to reduce to a *κεφάλαιον*,—a *final and principal thing*, Heb. viii. 1,—whence in Aristotle, Dion. Hal. = *to repeat*; Quintil., *rerum repetitio et congregatio, quae Graece ἀνακεφαλαίωσις dicitur*.—Accordingly in Rom. xiii. 9, $\text{τὸ γὰρ οὐ μοιχεύσεις . . . ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ ἀνακεφαλαίουται}$ is reduced to this word as the sum of the whole; it flows together into it. Chrys. Hom. 23, $\text{οὐκ εἶπε πληροῦται ἀπλῶς, ἀλλ' ἀνακεφαλαίουται· τουτέστι συντόμως καὶ ἐν βράχει ἀπαρτίζεται τῶν ἐντολῶν τὸ ἔργον, καὶ γὰρ ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος τῆς ἀρετῆς ἀγάπη}$; Plut. *de Puer. Educ.* 5 C, $\text{συνελὼν τοίνυν ἐγὼ φημι, ὅτι ἐν πρώτῳ καὶ μέσῳ καὶ τελευταίῳ ἐν τούτοις κεφάλαιον}$. Hence Luther = *to embrace under one head*, Eph. i. 10, $\text{ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι τὰ πάντα ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ}$. Cf. Dem. 570. 27, $\text{δύο ταῦτα ὥσπερ κεφάλαια ἐφ' ἅπασιν ἐπέθηκεν}$, according to which Chrys. on Eph. i. 10, μία

κεφαλὴν ἅπασιν ἐπέθηκεν. This, however, does not suffice, and therefore he further explains by συνάψαι.

Κήρυξ, υκος, ὁ, herald, crier, "a public servant of the supreme power, both in peace and in war;" one who summons the ἐκκλησία, conveys messages, etc. In Homer he had to provide whatever was necessary to the public sacrifices. Poll. viii. 103; Xen. *Hell.* ii. 4. 20, ὁ τῶν μυστῶν κήρυξ, κ. τῶν μυστικῶν, namely, of the Eleusinian mysteries. At a later time, the herald appears as the public crier and reader of state messages, as the conveyer of declarations of war, etc., *vid.* Xen., Dem., and others. Only poetically, in the general sense of *informant, one who communicates something*, Soph. *Oed. Col.* 1507; Eurip. *El.* 347. —In the LXX. Gen. xli. 43, כְּהֹרֵץ = ἐκήρυξεν κήρυξ; Dan. iii. 4, כְּהֹרֵץ כְּהֹרֵץ = ὁ κήρυξ ἐβόα (ἐκήρυξεν); Ecclus. xx. 15, ἀνοίξει ἄφρονος τὸ στόμα ὡς κήρυξ. In the N. T., except in 2 Pet. ii. 5, Νῶε δικαιοσύνης κήρυκα, the word denotes one who is employed by God in the work of proclaiming salvation; 1 Tim. ii. 7, cf. vv. 5, 6; 2 Tim. i. 11, εὐαγγέλιον εἰς ὃ ἐτέθη κήρυξ καὶ ἀπόστολος. Both designations interchange in Herod. i. 21; and whilst κήρυξ designates the herald according to his commission and work as proclaimer, ἀπόστολος points more to his relation to him by whom he is sent. The authority of the κήρυξ lies in the message he has to bring, cf. 2 Pet. ii. 5; the ἀπόστολος is protected by the authority of his Lord. For the distinction between κήρυξ and διδάσκαλος, 1 Tim. ii. 7, 2 Tim. i. 11, see κηρύσσω.

Κηρύσσω, originally, to discharge a herald's office; then, to cry out, to proclaim; the objects being *announcements, commands*, etc. Matt. x. 27, Mark i. 45, parallelized with διαφημίζειν τὸν λόγον, v. 20, vii. 36, Luke viii. 39, xii. 3; Acts xv. 21; Rev. v. 2; Rom. ii. 21, v. 11. In the N. T. it is the standing expression for the proclamation of the divine message of salvation, and differs from διδάσκειν (Matt. iv. 23, ix. 35) in that it means simply the making known, the announcement, whereas διδάσκειν denotes continuous instruction in the contents and connections of the message,—εὐαγγελίζειν (Luke viii. 1) again characterizes the contents. It is used (I.) in conjunction with an object; and, indeed, βάπτισμα μετανοίας, Mark i. 4; Luke iii. 3; cf. Acts x. 37; μετανοίαν καὶ ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, Luke xxiv. 47, cf. Luke iv. 19, Mark vi. 12; τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας, Matt. iv. 23, ix. 35, xxiv. 14, xxvi. 13; τὸ εὐ. τοῦ θεοῦ, Mark i. 14, 1 Thess. ii. 9; τὸ εὐαγγ., Mark xiii. 10, xiv. 9, xvi. 15; Gal. ii. 2; Col. i. 23. The combination with εὐ. does not occur in Luke, who writes instead κηρύσσειν καὶ εὐαγγελίζεσθαι τὴν βασ. τ. θ., viii. 1; κηρύσσω. τὴν βασ. τ. θ., ix. 2; Acts xx. 25, xxviii. 31; further, τὸν Ἰησοῦν, Acts xix. 13; 2 Cor. xi. 4; τὸν Ἰησοῦν ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, Acts ix. 20, cf. x. 42; τὸν Χριστόν, Acts viii. 5; 1 Cor. i. 23; 2 Cor. iv. 5; Phil. i. 15; cf. 1 Cor. xv. 12; 2 Cor. i. 19; 1 Tim. iii. 16; τὸ ῥῆμα τῆς πίστεως, Rom. x. 8; τὸν λόγον, 2 Tim. iv. 2. With a personal object, in the sense of to call hither or summon some one, it is not used in the N. T. The impersonal object either stands in the acc. or is connected by ἵνα, as in Mark vi. 12. The passive, in Matt. xxiv. 14, xxvi. 13; Mark xiii. 10, xiv. 9; Luke xii. 3,

xxiv. 47; 2 Cor. i. 19; Col. i. 23; 1 Tim. iii. 16. In profane Greek, the person to whom the proclamation is addressed is put in the dative, or else we have εἰς τινά, as also in the N. T., where also ἐν ἔθνεσιν, 1 Tim. iii. 16, cf. Col. i. 23; Gal. ii. 2; 2 Cor. i. 19; καθ' ὅλην τὴν πόλιν, Luke viii. 39, cf. Mark v. 20.—(II.) Without object = **to discharge a herald's functions**; only in Homer, e.g. *Il.* xvii. 325, whereas later writers do not use it independently till again we come to the N. T., where it designates **Christian preaching**, so far as it is a primary testifying of the message and facts of salvation, and not an introductory and continuous instruction therein; Matt. iv. 17, x. 7, xi. 1; Mark i. 38, 39, iii. 14, xvi. 20; Luke iv. 44; Rom. x. 14, 15; 1 Cor. ix. 27, xv. 11; 1 Pet. iii. 19.—Cf. κηρύσσειν . . . ἀκούειν . . . πιστεύειν, Rom. x. 14, 15; Col. i. 23; 1 Tim. iii. 16; 2 Tim. iv. 17; 1 Cor. xv. 14.—In ecclesiastical Greek it became a technical expression for the work of the deacons, whose duty it was to call upon the catechumens and unbelievers to leave the congregation at the commencement of the Eucharist. Cf. Suicer.—Προκηρύσσειν, **to proclaim beforehand**, Acts iii. 20, xiii. 24.

Κήρυγμα, τό, that which is cried by the herald, the command, the communication, etc., LXX. 2 Chron. xxx. 5 = לִּיר, of the summons to celebrate the passover; Jonah iii. 2 = מֵסֵר, the message of God to the Ninevites; cf. Matt. xii. 41; Luke xi. 32, μετενόησαν εἰς τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰωνᾶ. In the remaining passages it signifies the proclamation of the redeeming purpose of God in Christ; Rom. xvi. 25, κήρυγμα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, and, without this more definite limitation, in 1 Cor. i. 21, ii. 4, xv. 14; 2 Tim. iv. 17; Titus i. 3.

Κλάω, to break, in later Greek, especially of breaking off leaves, sprouts, tendrils, particularly of the vine, cf. κλῆμα, κλάδος, *vid.* Rom. xi. 20, Lachm., after B D F G; in the N. T. only ἄρτον or ἄρτους (because of the sort of bread among the Jews), to break bread, in order to offer and take food (cf. מִלֵּךְ פָּרֶס, Isa. lviii. 7, LXX., διαθρύπτειν τὸν ἄρτον; Lam. iv. 7, διακλῶν; Jer. xvi. 6, κλάω τὸν ἄρτ.), Acts (xx. 11) xxvii. 35.—(I.) By Christ, in connection with the miraculous feedings, Matt. xiv. 19, xv. 36; Mark viii. 6, 19 (for which Mark vi. 41, Luke ix. 16, κατέκλασεν; John vi. 11, διέδωκεν); at the institution of the Supper, Matt. xxvi. 26; Mark xiv. 22; Luke xxii. 19; 1 Cor. xi. 24. Both are combined with the word εὐλογεῖν, which is peculiar to Christ, Matt. xiv. 19, εὐλόγησεν καὶ κλάσας ἔδωκεν; xxvi. 26, εὐλόγησας ἔκλασε, as in Mark xiv. 22; or εὐχαριστεῖν in Matt. xv. 36, Mark viii. 6, Luke xxii. 19, εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν (cf. John vi. 11, εὐχαριστήσας διέδωκεν; Mark vi. 41; Luke ix. 16),—and characterized, Luke xxiv. 30, εὐλόγησεν καὶ κλάσας ἐπέδιδον, for which reason also the disciples of Emmaus narrate, ὡς ἐγνώσθη αὐτοῖς ἐν τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου, Luke xxiv. 35. Cf. also the significant omission of εὐχ. or εὐλ. in Mark viii. 19. This explains why (II.) κλᾶν τὸν ἄρτον became the designation for the celebration of the Supper, Acts ii. 46, κλῶντες κατ' οἶκον ἄρτον, cf. ver. 42; Acts xx. 7, συνηγμένων ἡμῶν κλάσαι ἄρτον (the meaning of xx. 11 is doubtful; in xxvii. 35 Paul follows the example of the Lord), although in 1 Cor. x. 16, τὸν ἄρτον ὃν κλῶμεν, as parallel with 16a, τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας ὃ εὐλογοῦμεν, it is used only of a part of the

act; always, as it would appear, so that *κλᾶν* = to break while blessing. (If τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν κλώμενον, 1 Cor. xi. 24, were genuine,—Luke xxii. 19, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον,—the word would seem to have been selected on account of the preceding *ἐκλασεν*.) It is worthy of note that the fellowship of the Lord with His people is described as a *table-fellowship* (Luke xxii. 30, cf. John xiii. 18), and the Lord's Supper is intended to sanctify the table-fellowships of men, and connect them with His table; hence in Acts ii. 46, *κλῶντες κατ' οἶκον ἄρτον μετελάμβανον τροφῆς ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει*.

Κλάσις, ἡ, the breaking, only *κλάσις τοῦ ἄρτου*, Luke xxiv. 35, Acts ii. 42, on which see *κλάω*.

Κλάσμα, τό, that which is broken off,—fragment, crumb, only of pieces of bread, crumbs, Matt. xiv. 20, xv. 37; Mark vi. 43, viii. 8, 19, 20, Luke ix. 17; John vi. 12, 13.—LXX. Judg. ix. 53, *κλάσμα ἐπιμύλων*; 1 Sam. xxx. 12, *κλάσμα παλάθης* = חֶבֶל; Lev. ii. 6, v. 21 = חֶבֶל, Ezek. xiii. 19 = חֶבֶל.

Κλήμα, τό, properly *that which is broken off a plant*; see *κλάω*, hence = shoot, young twig, as in Ezek. xvii. 3 = חֶבֶל, Mal. iii. 19 = חֶבֶל, mostly also in profane Greek, of the shoots of the vine, as in Ezek. xvii. 6, 7 = חֶבֶל; Ps. lxxx. 12 = חֶבֶל; Joel i. 7 = חֶבֶל. So John xv. 5, ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ἄμπελος, ὑμεῖς τὰ κλήματα; ver. 6, ἐὰν μὴ τις μείνῃ ἐν ἐμοί, ἐβλήθη ἔξω ὡς τὸ κλήμα; vv. 2, 4; Num. xiii. 23, ἔκοψαν κλήμα καὶ βότρον σταφυλῆς ἐπ' αὐτοῦ.

Κλήρος, ὁ (probably from *κλάω*, see the passive, *Pape*), lot, (I.) the lot that appor-tions, *that allots*, חֶבֶל; βάλλειν κλήρον, Matt. xxvii. 35; Mark xv. 24, βάλλοντες κλήρον ἐπ' αὐτὰ τίς τί ἄρῃ; Luke xxiii. 34; John xix. 24 = חֶבֶל חֶבֶל, quite usual in Greek and Hebrew; Acts i. 26, ἔδωκαν κλήρους αὐτῶν, חֶבֶל חֶבֶל; Lev. xvi. 8; Hebrew חֶבֶל, Josh. xviii. 8; חֶבֶל, Josh. xviii. 6, both = ἐκφέρειν κλήρον, LXX.; חֶבֶל, Prov. xvi. 33 = to cast lots; result of the action, ἔπεσεν ὁ κλήρος ἐπὶ Ματθίαν, Acts i. 26, cf. Ezek. xxiv. 6; Jonah i. 7; Hebrew חֶבֶל, cf. Num. xxxiii. 54, חֶבֶל; Lev. xvi. 9, חֶבֶל. Then (II.) the lot that is allotted, apportioned, Acts i. 17, ἔλαχε τὸν κλήρον τῆς διακονίας ταύτης, comp. κλήρω λαχεῖν, Il. xxiii. 862, xxiv. 400; Herod. iii. 83; Hesych., κλήρος τὸ βαλλόμενον εἰς τὸ λαχεῖν. For λαβεῖν τὸν κλήρον τῆς διακονίας, Acts i. 25, Lachm. and Tisch. read τὸν τόπον, cf. Suidas, κλήρος τόπος, κτήμα. In this sense = fallen to one by lot, allotted, Acts viii. 21, οὐκ ἔστιν σοι μερίς οὐδὲ κλήρος ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ, on which Bengel, "non est tibi pars pretio, nec sors gratis." Μέρις and κλήρος are thus combined further in Deut. x. 9, xii. 12, xiv. 27, 29, xviii. 1; Isa. lvii. 6. To distinguish more exactly,—μέρις is any limited portion; κλήρος is a special portion assigned by lot.—(III.) It is used of possessions which cannot be earned, but fall to one's lot, κατ' ἔξ, inheritance, hereditary portion or possession, Acts xxvi. 18; Col. i. 12 = חֶבֶל, cf. Ps. xvi. 6. (Cf. Delitzsch in loc., "The measuring lines (חֶבֶל) are cast (Mic. ii. 5), and fall to a man where and so far as his possession is assigned him, so that חֶבֶל חֶבֶל is applied in Josh. xvii. 5 to the assignment

of the measured out portions of land.") Josh. xiii. 23; Deut. iv. 38 (cf. *κληρονομία ἐν τοῖς ἡγιασμένοις*); Num. xxxiii. 54, לְיִשְׂרָאֵל יְרֵכָה וְיִשְׂרָאֵל יִרְכָה. In this sense, perhaps, 1 Pet. v. 3, κατακυριεύοντες τῶν κληρῶν, cf. with ver. 2, is to be explained agreeably to Deut. iv. 20, cf. Ex. xix. 5; whereas others explain—that which is assigned to the presbyters, which the churches assigned to them; cf. Theophanes, *Hom.* 12 in Suic. ii. 111, ὁ κλήρος ἐμός, addressed to his hearers. This view is favoured by the change of the reading into τοῦ κληρῶν, which was perhaps made in favour of the first explanation. For the plural is certainly not used to designate Israel as God's possession, nor can it be shown that the plural in post-apostolic times designated the particular churches assigned to the presbyters.

Κληρώω, to cast lots, to determine by lot, i.e. to determine something, or concerning some one, τινά, ἐπὶ τινί, or also with two accusatives, or with following infinitive; the passive also absolutely, to be taken by lot, the connection showing the import of the lot; e.g. to be chosen by lot, οἱ κεκληρωμένοι, those chosen by lot; 1 Sam. xiv. 41, κληροῦνται Ἰωνάθαν καὶ Σαούλ, Jonathan and Saul were hit upon by lot; ver. 42, κατακληροῦνται Ἴων = רָחַץ, in the Niphal; whereas Eur. *Hec.* 102, ἐκληρώθη δούλη, to be appointed a slave by lot. In the N. T. only in Eph. i. 11, ἐν ᾧ (sc. τῷ Χριστῷ) καὶ ἐκληρώθημεν, προορισθέντες . . . εἰς τὸ εἶναι κ.τ.λ., "in whom the lot has fallen upon us also, as foreordained thereto, . . . to be," etc. By the combination of the ἐκληρώθ. with εἰς τὸ εἶναι, which Hofmann also adopts, all difficulties in the explanation of the word are removed. The two expressions ἐκληρώθ. and προορ. require supplementing. If εἰς τὸ εἶναι be taken with προορ., the great difficulty arises that (as was done in edition 1) ἐκληρώθ. has to be taken as an independent conception, the connection not stating the import of the lot. In this case it would have to be supplemented with κλήρος θεοῦ, after Deut. iv. 20, Esth. iv. *additam.*, ἰλάσθητι τῷ κληρῷ σου; Zech. ii. 16, ἔσθ, with God as subject, κατακληρονομήσει κύριος τὸν Ἰούδαν . . . καὶ αἰρετιεῖ ἔτι τὴν Ἱερουσαλήμ. Thus Erasmus, *in sortem asciti*; Bengel, *eramus facti p̄nu*, *hereditas Domini*. It is incorrect to argue that the context treats of Israel, and thus suggests this rendering, for the context here really does not treat of Israel. If ἐν ᾧ καὶ ἐκληρ. was to refer to Israel or to Christians of Israel, it must at least have been said, ἐν ᾧ καὶ ἡμεῖς οἱ προσηλυτικοίτες κ.τ.λ., quite apart from the question whether Christians of Israel could so have been described. There is nothing warranting us to separate the subject of ἐκληρώθημεν from the ἡμεῖς of the foregoing sentences. Against the explanation advanced by Harless, ἐκληρώθημεν = ἔδωκε ἡμῖν κληρῶν, after Grotius, κληροῦν, *dicitur qui alteri dat possessionem*, κληροῦσθαι, *qui eam accipit*, two considerations tell: first, that this signification, possible in itself, must so far have been indicated by the context as to leave no doubt as to what "lot" was meant; and secondly, that it is the middle κληροῦσθαι, which signifies to receive something by lot, e.g. Philo, *Vit. Mos.* 3, τὸν γὰρ μέσον ταῦτα τοῦ κόσμου τόπον κεκληρώται; Lucian, *De Luct.* 2, κεκληρώσθαι γὰρ φησι τὸν Πλούτωνα ἄρχειν τῶν ἀποθανόντων; and in this case the accusative of the

object must follow if the statement is not to be meaningless, comp. Ammon. 86, λαγχάνειν καὶ κληρώσασθαι διαφέρει· λαγχάνει μὲν εἰς, οὗ ἂν ὁ κλῆρος ἔλθῃ . . . κληροῦνται δὲ οἱ καθιέντες εἰς τὸν κλῆρον. Καὶ λαγχάνειν μὲν ἐστὶ τὸ ἐκ τῶν κληρουμένων τοῦ προκειμένου τυχεῖν, κληρώσασθαι δὲ τῷ κληρῷ χρήσασθαι; thus κληροῦσθαι is = *to draw lots*. Thus, as the absolute construction of the passive κληροῦσθαι is without parallel, the only possible construction is to combine ἐκληρώθημεν . . . εἰς τὸ εἶναι, and thence to supply a similar defining expression to προορισθέντες. Thus the necessary progress of the thought appears, “*in whom the lot has fallen upon us also, as foreordained thereto, to be,*” and so on. We need not, with Hofmann, take ἐκληρώθ. as referring to pre-temporal predestination, as if the participle προορισθ. stated wherein the κληρωθῆναι was accomplished. The logical connection tells against this grammatically possible import of the aorist participle (cf. vv. 5, 9). The aorist participle stands here, as in vv. 13, 14, to indicate in what connection and in conjunction with what the act expressed by the finite verb is accomplished, Krüger, liii. 6. 7, 8. But that ἐκληρώθ. does not designate a pre-temporal act is clear from the following εἰς τὸ εἶναι κ.τ.λ., according to which it has to do with a present state and its distinctive accomplishment, namely, that it took place without our help, just as the lot falls to any one. Ἐκληρώθ. cannot mean the historical bringing about of this previously arising state. In this case we should have to join προορισθέντες . . . εἰς τὸ εἶναι, taking it as further defining the ἐκληρώθ.; and in this case the participle present or perfect would have been more correct. Besides, the entire course of the thought demands a declaration referring to the present Christian state of those addressed and its actual accomplishment. “We now have been so interwoven into the divine decree to be administered in the fulness of times, and aiming at the final reunion of all things in the world’s Saviour (ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ), that—in accordance with the predestination (προορ. κατὰ προθ. τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐνεργούντος κατὰ κ.τ.λ.) bearing in itself the guarantee of its realization—the lot has fallen upon us, now before the fulfilment of all, to be those who,” etc. With this what follows regarding the answering experience of those addressed appropriately corresponds.

Ὁ λόκληρος, *in entire portion, i.e. intact, integer, e.g. with ὑγίης, γνήσιος*, Plat., Polyb., *et al.* In the N. T. Jas. i. 4; 1 Thess. v. 23; cf. ὀλοκληρία, *entirety, intactness*, of the state of the lame man healed, Acts iii. 16; Isa. i. 6, ἀπὸ ποδῶν ἕως κεφαλῆς οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν αὐτῷ ὀλοκληρία, *δίηψ.*

Κληρονόμος, ὁ, *one who has a κλῆρος*; from νέμω, *to hold, to have in one’s power* (not one to whom a κλῆρος is allotted, because it is derived from the active), like οἰκονόμος, *one who holds a house*; ἀγορανόμος, *the master of the market*. Cf. Plat. Rep. i. 331 D, ὁ τοῦ λόγου κληρονόμος, *he who has the κλῆρος τοῦ λόγου*, whose turn it is to speak; Heb. xi. 7, δικαιοσύνης κληρονόμος, *he who has the κλῆρος τῆς δικαιοσύνης*. In the N. T., as also mostly in later Greek, κλῆρος thus compounded is used *always of inherited possessions*; hence κληρονόμος, *he who has the inheritance = the heir*, against which Heb. vi. 17,

κληρονόμοι τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, cf. with vv. 12, 15, does not tell. In the LXX. 2 Sam. xiv. 7, Jer. viii. 10 = עֲרִי, cf. Ecclus. xxiii. 22. The stress to be laid on *the possession* may be seen from Gal. iv. 1, ἐφ' ὅσον χρόνον ὁ κληρονόμος νηπιός ἐστιν, οὐδὲν διαφέρει δούλου κύριος πάντων ὧν; Jas. ii. 5, κληρονόμους τῆς βασιλείας ἧς ἐπηγγείλατο; Titus iii. 7, κληρονόμοι κατ' ἐλπίδα ζωῆς αἰωνίου. It is used, however, proleptically in Matt. xxi. 38, Mark xii. 7, Luke xx. 14, οὗτος ἐστὶν ὁ κληρονόμος; Gal. iv. 1; Rom. viii. 17. In the N. T. it is only used to describe the peculiar relation of divine redemption to man, and *vice versa*, as a divine possession bestowed on man by virtue of the filial relation into which he is introduced (cf. Eph. i. 18, ὁ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τῆς κληρονομίας αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις). Hence κληρονόμοι θεοῦ, Rom. viii. 17, cf. συγκληρονόμοι τοῦ Χριστοῦ, and of Christ Himself, Heb. i. 2, ἔθηκε κληρονόμον πάντων; cf. Rom. iv. 13, of Abraham and his seed, τὸ κληρονόμον αὐτὸν εἶναι τοῦ κόσμου. In this sense it is used absolutely, Rom. iv. 14, Gal. iii. 29, κατ' ἐπαγγελίαν κληρονόμοι; Gal. iv. 7, εἰ δὲ υἱὸς, καὶ κληρονόμος διὰ θεοῦ.

Κληρονομία, ἡ, that which constitutes *one* a κληρονόμος, the inheritance, Matt. xxi. 38; Mark xii. 7; Luke xii. 13, xx. 14; heritage, Acts vii. 5. Divine salvation, considered both as promised and as already bestowed, is thus designated in the N. T., so far as man, the κληρονόμος, gets possession of it. As to the divine origin of this κληρ., cf. Eph. i. 18, ὁ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τῆς κληρονομίας αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις, where respect is also had to the circumstance that the saints (Israel, ver. 11) are God's κληρονομία; cf. Theodoret on Ps. xxxiii. 12, ἐκλεκτὸς λαὸς (see Eph. i. 4) κληρονομία θεοῦ προσαγορευόμενος, πάλοι μὲν ὁ ἰουδαϊκὸς, μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ὁ ἐκ τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐκλεγείς καὶ τῆς πίστεως τὰς ἀκτῖνας δεχόμενος. In distinction from profane Greek, we find here what Aristot. *Pol.* v. 8 denies, τὰς κληρονομίας μὴ κατὰ δόσιν εἶναι, ἀλλὰ κατὰ γένος; see Acts xx. 32, δοῦναι κληρ. ἐν τοῖς ἡγιασμένοις. (For the combination with ἐν, cf. xxvi. 18; Num. xviii. 23; Job xlii. 15; Wisd. v. 5, πῶς κατελογίσθη ἐν υἱοῖς θεοῦ καὶ ἐν ἁγίοις ὁ κλῆρος αὐτοῦ ἐστίν.) Eph. v. 5; Col. iii. 24, ἀπὸ κυρίου ἀπολήψεσθε τὴν ἀνταπόδοσιν τῆς κληρ.; Acts vii. 5, οὐκ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ κληρ. (On οὐκ ἔδ., cf. Heb. xi. 9, παρῴκησεν εἰς γῆν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας ὡς ἀλλοτρίαν.)—Hence Gal. iii. 18. At the same time, its peculiar aspect as an inheritance becomes prominent in 1 Pet. i. 4, ἀναγεννήσας ἡμᾶς . . . εἰς κληρονομίαν . . . τετηρημένην ἐν οὐρανοῖς.—Eph. v. 5, οὐκ ἔχει κληρ. ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ; Heb. xi. 8, ὃν (*sc.* τόπον) ἐμελλεν λαμβάνειν εἰς κληρονομίαν.—LXX. = נַחֲלָה, נַחֲלָה, נַחֲלָה. For the connection with the O. T., see κλῆρος, κληρώ, κληρονόμος, κληρονομεῖν.

Κληρονομέω, to be a κληρονόμος, an heir, Gal. iv. 30, οὐ μὴ κληρονομήσῃ ὁ υἱὸς τῆς παιδείας μετὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἐλευθέρως. Hence with the genitive of the thing in the Attic orators, and only in later Greek with the accusative (*vid.* Lobeck, *Phryg.* 129; Matthiae, § 329), sometimes also with the accusative of the person from whom the inheritance comes, LXX. Gen. xv. 3, ἧς ἐστὶν, κληρονομήσει με. The N. T. use of the

word to denote *entering on the possession of the blessings of God's salvation*, which takes place in the manner of a κληρονόμος, Matt. xxv. 34, 1 Cor. xv. 50b, is based upon the redemptive gift of the Old Covenant, Num. xxxiii. 54, in which לָקַח and לָוֶה are united; see κληρος, Lev. xx. 24. Cf. Heb. xii. 17, of Esau, θέλων κληρονομήσαι τὴν εὐλογίαν ἀπεδοκιμάσθη; Rev. xxi. 7. We find also the combinations, κληρον. τὴν γῆν, Matt. v. 5, cf. Ps. xxv. 13, xxxvii. 9; Ex. xxiii. 30; κλ. θεοῦ βασιλείαν, 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10, xv. 50; Gal. v. 21; Matt. xxv. 34, cf. 1 Macc. ii. 57; τὰς ἐπαγγελίας, Heb. vi. 12; εὐλογίαν, 1 Pet. iii. 9. Declared of Christ, Heb. i. 4, κεκληρονόμηκεν ὄνομα, where groundlessly (cf. already Ecclus. vi. 3) the explanation is adopted, "the idea of inheritance recedes to the background, and, like ὦν and ἔσθ, it has the general meaning *possidere* and *possidendum accipere*;" cf. Isa. liii. 12; Phil. ii. 9, 10.

Συγκληρονόμος, ὁ, *he who participates in the same κληρος*, used only of the joint heir. Rom. viii. 17, εἰ δὲ τέκνα, καὶ κληρονόμοι· κληρονόμοι μὲν θεοῦ, συγκληρονόμοι δὲ Χριστοῦ. A personal equality based on an equality of possession is thus designated (cf. Ecclus. xxii. 23, *ἵνα ἐν τῇ κληρονομίᾳ αὐτοῦ συγκληρονομήσῃς*). In Heb. xi. 9, of Isaac and Jacob in their relation to Abraham, συγκληρονόμοι τῆς ἐπαγγελίας τῆς αὐτῆς; 1 Pet. iii. 7, of women in relation to their husbands, συγκληρονόμοι χάριτος ζωῆς. The mystery of Christ is, according to Eph. iii. 6, εἶναι τὰ ἔθνη συγκληρόνομα, namely, with Israel, cf. Eph. i. 11.

Κατακληρονομέω,—(I.) Only in the LXX.=to inherit completely, Deut. i. 8 = ὦν; Zech. ii. 12 (16) = ἔσθ. The aorist passive is used in Ecclus. xxiv. 8, Deut. xix. 14, in the sense which alone occurs in profane Greek, (II.) to constitute any one heir, to bequeath, to give over as an inheritance, Num. xxxiv. 18 = ἔσθ; Jer. iii. 18, with two accusatives = ἔσθη; Josh. xviii. 2 = ἔσθη; 2 Sam. vii. 1 = ἔσθη. In the N. T. only Acts xiii. 19, κατεκληρονόμησεν αὐτοῖς τὴν γῆν. (This change of meaning seems to be grounded on the twofold use of the Kal of ἔσθ, and, indeed, both ἔσθ and κατακλ. are employed in both senses in Josh. xiv. 1, to be explained by the two significations of κληρος as the lot allotting and allotted.) In later Greek, κατακληρουχεῖν is usually employed in its stead; also, though less frequently, the word κατακληροδοτεῖν (whose presence in Acts xiii. 9 is but poorly warranted). Κατακληρόω embraces in like manner the two meanings, *to distribute or receive by lot*.

Κοινός, ἡ, ὅν,—(I.) Common, in common, Tit. i. 4, Τίτω γησιῶ τέκνω κατὰ κοινὴν πίστιν, cf. ver. 1; Jude 3, σπουδὴν ποιούμενος γράφειν ὑμῖν περὶ τῆς κοινῆς σωτηρίας (cf. 2 Pet. i. 1, τοῖς ἰσότημον ἡμῖν λαχοῦσιν πίστιν), cf. Xen. Anab. iii. 2. 32, εἰ δέ τι ἄλλο βέλτιον ἢ ταύτῃ, πολμάτω καὶ ὁ ἰδιώτης διδάσκειν· πάντες γὰρ κοινῆς σωτηρίας δεόμεθα; Joseph. Antt. v. 1. 27, θεὸν τὸν Ἑβραίοις ἅπασιν κοινόν; Acts ii. 44, εἶχον ἅπαντα κοινά, opposed to ἴδιος, cf. Plat. Rep. i. 133 D, ἡ δικαιοσύνη χρήσιμος καὶ κοινῇ καὶ ἰδίᾳ, see Acts iv. 32, οὐδὲ εἰς τι τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐτῷ ἔλεγεν ἴδιον εἶναι, ἀλλ' ἦν αὐτοῖς ἅπαντα κοινά. This is the only meaning in profane Greek, except in later writers, where it is also used in a

moral sense; see below. On the other hand, (II.) in biblical Greek, starting from the sense *general, usual, what stands in connection with everything, what does not distinguish or separate itself from anything else*, Mark vii. 2, *κοιναῖς χερσὶν τουτέστιν ἀνίπτους*, in ver. 7 it denotes what is opposed to the divine ἅγιος (cf. Acts xxi. 28, "Ἐλληνας εἰσήγαγεν εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ κεκοίνωκεν τὸν ἅγιον τόπον τοῦτον"), corresponding to Hebrew לֵחַ, which, however, the LXX. always render βέβηλος. Βέβηλος, as used in the LXX., was cast aside, as the N. T. usage shows, in the language of Jewish life, in favour of the word κοινός, which expressed the consciousness of the ἐκλογὴ of Israel, of their antagonism to the ἔθνη. See βέβηλος, which is the profane equivalent of the biblical κοινός. Further, see ἅγιος. Cf. Delitzsch on Heb. ix. 13a, "לֵחַ, from לָחַץ, to be loose, is that which is not bound, not forbidden, open for general use, 1 Sam. xxi. 5 (שָׁרֵב וְלֵחַ and לֵחַ וְשָׁרֵב)," cf. also Ezek. xlii. 20, לֵחַ וְשָׁרֵב בֵּין הַבְּרִיתִּים. That it corresponds to לֵחַ, and then in consequence to שָׁרֵב, is evident from Acts x. 14–28, xi. 8, where κοινὸς καὶ ἀκάθαρτος are conjoined, comp. also Lev. x. 10, וְהָיָה בֵּין הַקֹּדֶשׁ וּבֵין הַחֵץ בֵּין הַקֹּדֶשׁ וּבֵין הַחֵץ. Cf. Heb. ix. 13, τοὺς κεκοινωνημένους ἀγιάζει πρὸς . . . καθαρότητα. It is worthy of note that κοινωνόν, in its theocratic sense, as opposed to ἅγιος, is ἀκαθ., precisely because of this antagonism, which in itself is not necessary and not identical, *vid.* Rom. xiv. 14, οὐδὲν κοινωνόν δι' αὐτοῦ, εἰ μὴ τῷ λογιζομένῳ τι κοινωνόν εἶναι, ἐκείνῳ κοινωνόν. Hence Heb. x. 29, τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης κοινωνόν ἡγασάμενος, ἐν ᾧ ἡγιάσθη, by regarding the blood as ordinary blood of a life that is not holy. In Rev. xxi. 27 we find, as opposed to κοινωνόν (co-ordinated with ὁ ποιῶν βδέλυγμα καὶ ψεῦδος), οἱ γεγραμμένοι ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τῆς ζωῆς; parallel thereto is Isa. lii. 1, לֵחַץ, on which cf. Gen. xxxiv. 14; Ex. xii. 48. In the Apocrypha, κοινός is thus used only where the laws relating to food and sacrifices are referred to (1 Macc. i. 47, 62); elsewhere always in the first sense. Scarcely any but the later profane writers used it in the moral sense—*low, debased*. From (I.) are derived in the N. T. the significations of κοινωνεῖν, κοινωνία, κοινωνός, κοινωνικός; from (II.), that of κοινωνόω.

Κοινωνόω, to make anything κοινωνόν. In the N. T. only of κοινός in the sense of (II.), as opposed to ἀγιάζειν, Heb. ix. 13, τοὺς κεκοινωνημένους ἀγιάζει πρὸς καθαρότητα, which explains also the relation between κοινωνοῦν and καθαρίζειν. Acts x. 15, xi. 9, ἃ ὁ θεὸς ἐκαθάρισεν, σὺ μὴ κοινοῦ; Acts xxi. 28, κεκοίνωκεν τὸν ἅγιον τόπον τοῦτον. Without this contrast, in the same sense, in Matt. xv. 11, 18, 20; Mark vii. 15, 18, 20, 23, *vid.* κοινός; cf. לֵחַץ, Ezek. vii. 24, xxv. 3; Isa. xlviii. 11; Lev. xix. 8, 12; Ezek. xiii. 19; Gen. xlix. 4; Lev. xix. 29; LXX., βεβηλοῦν, μαινέειν.

Κοινωνέω, from κοινωνόν, ὁ, ἡ, the same as κοινός, like θέραψ, θεράπων, *participator, companion*, hence to be a κοινωνόν, Heb. ii. 14, parallel with μετέχειν, with the distinction arising out of the context.—Hence with the dative, both of the person and of the thing, Gal. vi. 6, κοινωνοῦντι ὁ κατηχούμενος . . . τῷ κατηχούντι ἐν πάσιν ἀγαθοῖς; Phil. iv. 15, οὐδεμία μοι ἐκκλησία ἐκοινώνησεν εἰς λόγον δόσεως καὶ λήψεως (on εἰς, cf. Plat. *Rep.* iv. 453 A, ἡ θήλεια τῇ τοῦ ἄρρενος κοινωνεῖ εἰς ἅπαντα); Rom. xii. 13, ταῖς χρείαις τῶν

ἀγίων κοινωνοῦντες; xv. 27, τοῖς πνευματικοῖς αὐτῶν ἐκοινώνησαν τὰ ἔθνη; 1 Tim. v. 22, μηδὲ κοινωνεῖ ἀμαρτίαις ἀλλοτρίαις; 2 John 11, κοινωνεῖ τοῖς ἔργοις αὐτοῦ τοῖς πονηροῖς (cf. Job xxxiv. 8, οὐ κοινωνήσας μετὰ ποιούντων τὰ ἄνομα, כִּי לֹא יִשְׁתַּחֲוֶה עִם הַפְּעֻלִּים). As the personal fellowship of several is implied in the word, it is followed by the genitive of the thing, to be common participators in a thing, to have anything in common; Heb. ii. 14, τὰ παιδία κεκοινώνηκεν αἵματος καὶ σαρκός.—Used and construed in the same way in profane Greek, not, however, with the genitive of the person, as in Job xxxiv. 8.

Κοινωνία, ἡ, fellowship with, participation in anything; with genitive of object, κοιν. τῆς διακονίας, 2 Cor. viii. 4; κοιν. τοῦ αἵματος, τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, 1 Cor. x. 16; 1 Cor. i. 9, ἐκλήθητε εἰς κοιν. τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ; Phil. iii. 10, κοινωνία τῶν παθημάτων τοῦ Χριστοῦ; Phil. ii. 1, κοινωνία πνεύματος.—With subject in the genitive, the object subjoined by means of εἰς, Phil. i. 5, κοιν. ὑμῶν εἰς τὸ εὐαγγ.; cf. Rom. xv. 26, εὐδόκησαν Μακεδονία καὶ Ἀχαΐα κοινωνίαν τινὰ ποιήσασθαι εἰς τοὺς πτόχους τῶν ἀγίων, more precisely defined ver. 27; 2 Cor. ix. 13, κοινωνία εἰς αὐτοὺς (εἰς τὰ ὑστερήματα τῶν ἀγίων, ver. 12) καὶ εἰς πάντας, on which cf. 2 Cor. viii. 4, κοινωνία τῆς διακονίας τῆς εἰς τοὺς ἀγίους. In Philem. 6, ἡ κοινωνία τῆς πίστεώς σου, the genitive is variously viewed, as the genitive of the object by Bengel, *fides tua, quam communem nobiscum habes et exeres*. Better, however, as the genitive of the subject, *the fellowship to which thy faith impels*, cf. ver. 4. So ἡ κοιν. τοῦ ἀγίου πν. . . μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν, 2 Cor. xiii. 13; so of personal fellowship, 1 John i. 3, κοιν. ἔχhte μεθ' ἡμῶν, ἡ δὲ κοιν. ἡμετέρα μετὰ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ μετὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ; ver. 6, κοιν. μετ' αὐτοῦ; ver. 7, μετ' ἀλλήλων. In classical Greek we find πρὸς, c. acc., cf. Plat. *Conv.* 188 C, used also of impersonal fellowship, Plat. *Vir. Civ.* 283 D, κατὰ τὴν πρὸς ἄλληλα μεγέθους καὶ σμικρότητος κοιν., for which 2 Cor. vi. 14, τίς κοιν. φωτὶ πρὸς σκότος.—Absolutely, in Gal. ii. 9, δεξιὰς ἔδωκεν ἐμοὶ κοινωνίας; Acts ii. 42, ἦσαν προσκαρτεροῦντες . . . τῇ κοιν.; Heb. xiii. 16, τῆς δὲ εὐποιίας καὶ κοιν.—The mode in which the fellowship appears is determined by the context; nowhere, however, does κοιν. pass into the active meaning of *communication*, or the passive of *communicated*, i.e. *alms*, but always denotes a relation which, between persons, is based on Christian unity, Eph. iv. 4 sqq.; John i. 3 sqq.; Acts ii. 42. The allusion made to the carrying into effect of this relation, in Rom. xv. 26, is one ground for rejecting the meaning “manifestation of fellowship,” see 2 Cor. ix. 13, cf. viii. 4. The εὐποιία, in Heb. xiii. 16, is an outcome of κοινωνία. In consequence, however, of attention being concentrated on the manifestation of κοινωνία, to the neglect of the relation on which this manifestation was based, the word acquired in patristic Greek the meaning, *something communicated*, ἐλεημοσύνη, Oecum., Phav.; but, as applied to the Lord's Supper, and in opposition to heresies, it retained its original force. *Vid.* Suicer, *Thes.*; syn. μετοχή.

Κοινωνός, ὁ, companion, Philem. 17; 2 Cor. viii. 23 (2 Kings xvii. 11); Matt. xxiii. 20, αὐτῶν κοινωνοὶ ἐν τῷ αἵματι τῶν προφητῶν, cf. συνεργὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν τῷ εὐαγγ. τοῦ Χριστοῦ, 1 Thess. iii. 2, cf. 2 Cor. viii. 23, κοινωνὸς ἐμὸς καὶ εἰς ὑμᾶς συνεργός.

Instead of *ἐν*, Plat. *Legg.* vii. 810 C has *περί τινος*, cf. *Eccclus.* xli. 16, *κοινωνὸς καὶ φίλος περὶ ἀδικίας*; Heb. x. 23, *κοινωνοὶ τῶν οὕτως ἀναστρεφόμενων*. With the dative of the person, Luke v. 10, *κοινωνοὶ τῷ Σίμωνι*, cf. Eur. *El.* 637, *ὅθεν γ' ἰδὼν σε δαιτὶ κοινωνὸν καλεῖ*, see *κοινωνεῖν*. With the genitive = *participator in something*, 1 Cor. x. 18, *κοιν. τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου*; ver. 20, *τῶν δαιμονίων*; 2 Cor. i. 7, *κοιν. τῶν παθημάτων, τῆς παρακλήσεως*; 1 Pet. v. 1, *ὁ τῆς μελλούσης ἀποκαλύπτεσθαι δόξης κοιν.*; 2 Pet. i. 4, *θείας κοιν. φύσεως*. Hebrew, כִּנְיָן, Prov. xxviii. 24; Isa. i. 23; חֲבִיבִי, ἡ κοιν., Mal. ii. 4.

Κοινωνικός, 1 Tim. vi. 18, *τοῖς πλουσίοις παράγγελλε . . . εὐμεταδότους εἶναι, κοινωνικούς*, a combination like *εὐποιεῖα* and *κοινωνία*, Heb. xiii. 6, see *κοινωνία*.—Social, in the double sense of *belonging to society* and *inclined to society*, i.e. *cultivating and loving fellowship*; cf. Polyb. xviii. 31. 7, *κοινωνικῶς χρῆσθαι τοῖς εὐτυχήμασιν*.

Συνκοινωνέω, to participate in something with some one; with the genitive of the thing (Dem.) and the dative of the person (Dio Cass.). In the N. T. only with the dative of the thing, as a strengthened form of *κοινωνεῖν*; *vid.* Phil. iv. 14, comp. ver. 15. — Eph. v. 11, *μὴ συνκοινωνεῖτε* (cf. ver. 12, *τὰ κρυφῇ γινόμενα ὑπ' αὐτῶν*) *τοῖς ἔργοις τοῖς ἀκάρποις τοῦ σκότους*; Rev. xviii. 4, *ἵνα μὴ συνκοινωνήσητε ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις αὐτῆς* (cf. *κοινωνεῖν*, 1 Tim. v. 22; 2 John 11); Phil. iv. 14, *καλῶς ἐποιήσατε συνκοινωνήσαντες μοῦ τῇ θλίψει*, where the genitive depends on *θλίψει*, cf. i. 7.

Συνκοινωνός, *ὁ*, partaker. Peculiar to the N. T. and patristic Greek; Rom. xi. 17, *συνκοινωνὸς τῆς ρίζης καὶ τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐλαίας ἐγένου* (on *συνκοιν.*, cf. *τινές* 17a); 1 Cor. ix. 23, *ἵνα συνκοινωνὸς αὐτοῦ* (sc. *τοῦ εὐαγγελίου*, cf. Rom. i. 17, see *εὐαγγ.*) *γένομαι*; Phil. i. 7, *συνκοινωνός μου τῆς χάριτος*; Rev. i. 9, *ὁ ἀδελφὸς ὑμῶν καὶ συνκοινωνὸς ἐν τῇ θλίψει καὶ βασιλείᾳ καὶ ὑπομονῇ*, cf. *ἐν*, Matt. xxiii. 20, under *κοινωνός*.

Κόσμος, *ου, ὁ*, according to Schenkl, *Griech. Schulwörterb.*, from the root *καδ*, as it occurs, e.g., in *καίνυμαι*, to *polish*; so also Passow, *Et. M.* — (I.) Ornament, LXX. Ex. xxxiii. 5, Isa. xlix. 18, Jer. iv. 30, Ezek. vii. 20 = כֶּסֶף; Prov. xx. 29, Isa. iii. 18 = תְּכֵלֶת, a synonym with *δόξα*. In the N. T. 1 Pet. iii. 3, *ὁ ἔξωθεν ἐμπλοκῆς τριχῶν . . . κόσμος*. — (II.) Order, synonymous with *τάξις*, e.g. *οὐδενὶ κόσμῳ*, in Herodotus, *without order*; opposed to *ἀκοσμία*, *disorder*. Plat. *Gorg.* 504 A, *τάξεως καὶ κόσμου τυχούσα οἰκία*. Metaphorically, in Herodot., Thucyd., etc., to denote *legal order, constitution*, etc., e.g. *κόσμος τῆς πολιτείας*. Not thus used in *bibl. Greek*. — (III.) The order of the world, the ordered universe. According to Plutarch's testimony (*Mor.* 886 B), Pythagoras was the first to use the word in this sense, *Πυθαγόρας πρῶτος ὠνόμασε τὴν τῶν ὅλων περιοχὴν κόσμον ἐκ τῆς ἐν αὐτῷ τάξεως*. According to other accounts, however, Pythagoras did not apply the expression to the universe, but only to the heavens, i.e. to the ordered totality of the heavenly bodies; Diog. L. viii. 48, *τοῦτον ὁ Φαβωρίνός φησι . . . τὸν οὐρανὸν πρῶτον ὀνομάσαι κόσμον*. So also Phot. *Bibl.* 440. 27. Herewith harmonizes the usage which, at first it would seem predominantly, but also down to later times, thus designated

the heavens; cf. Xen. *Mem.* i. 1. 11, σκοπῶν ὅπως ὁ καλούμενος ὑπὸ τῶν σοφιστῶν κόσμος ἔχει καὶ τίσιν ἀνάγκαις ἕκαστα γίγνεται τῶν οὐρανίων; Isocr. iv. 179 (78 C), γῆς ἀπάσης τῆς ὑπὸ τῷ κόσμῳ κειμένης; Plat. *Tim.* 28 B, ὁ δὲ πᾶς οὐρανὸς ἢ κόσμος ἢ καὶ ἄλλο ὃ τίποτε ὀνομαζόμενος. It was used, however, at the same time, even before Aristotle, though primarily in works of science, to denote *the universe*, Plat. *Gorg.* 508, φασὶν οἱ σοφοὶ καὶ οὐρανὸν καὶ γῆν καὶ θεοὺς καὶ ἀνθρώπους τὴν κοινωνίαν συνέχειν καὶ φιλίαν καὶ κοσμιότητα καὶ σωφροσύνην καὶ δικαιοσύνην καὶ τὸ ὅλον τοῦτο διὰ ταῦτα κόσμον καλοῦσιν; *Phaedr.* 246 C, and other places. In Aristotle the usage seems fixed, to denote both *the universe and the mundane order*; *De mund.* 2, κόσμος μὲν οὖν σύστημα ἐξ οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς καὶ τῶν ἐν τούτοις περιεχομένων φύσεως. λέγεται δὲ ἐτέρως ἢ τῶν ὅλων τάξις τε καὶ διακόσμησις, ὑπὸ θεῶν καὶ διὰ θεῶν φυλαττομένη. ταύτης δὲ τὸ μὲν μέσον, ἀκίνητόν τε ὄν καὶ ἐδραῖον, ἢ φερέσβιος εἶληχε γῆ, παντοδαπῶν ζῶων ἐστία τε οὔσα καὶ μητήρ. τὸ δ' ὑπερθεὶς αὐτῆς πᾶν τε καὶ πάντῃ πεπερατωμένον ἥς τὸ ἀνωτάτω θεῶν οἰκητήριον οὐρανὸς ὠνόμασται. So also, e.g., in the epigrammatists Meleager, Antipater of Sidon (about 100 B.C.).

It is worthy of remark that in the LXX. κόσμος is never used to denote the world. The Seventy translate עֲוֹלָם עֲוֹלָם by κόσμος τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, Deut. iv. 19, xvii. 3, Isa. xxiv. 21, xl. 26, and that not, as is assumed, on the ground of a false derivation of עֲוֹלָם from עֲוֹלָם, as עֲוֹלָם, *ornament*,—such an idea is inconsistent with their elsewhere translating the expression by δυνάμεις τοῦ οὐρ.,—but on the ground of the above-mentioned use of κόσμος to denote the ordered totality of the heavenly bodies. The transference of the expression in Gen. ii. 1 to the earthly sphere, συνετελέσθησαν ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ καὶ πᾶς ὁ κόσμος αὐτῶν, was suggested by the Hebrew, which applied עֲוֹלָם also in the same way, although we do not elsewhere find עֲוֹלָם עֲוֹלָם. This passage gives us the biblical expression for *the universe*, namely, *heaven and earth*. To the question why, in the Bible, there is not one designation for the entire universe, we should probably be justified in referring to the torn and sundered relationship between heaven and earth, which influenced the usage even of particular words. See γῆ, οὐρανός. This, too, is the reason why, in the N. T., κόσμος is restricted to τὰ κάτω and is opposed to τοῖς ἄνω, John viii. 23.

Κόσμος is first used, as far as the biblical sphere is concerned, in the apocryphal books of Wisdom and 2 Macc. to denote the universe, and, indeed, with definite reference, here necessary, to the entire creation; for which reason also the κόσμος is mainly viewed in the relation between God and it arising out of the creation, cf. 2 Macc. vii. 9, ὁ τοῦ κ. βασιλεὺς; ver. 23, ὁ τοῦ κ. κτιστής; xii. 15, ὁ μέγας τοῦ κ. δυνάστης; xiii. 14, viii. 18; Wisd. i. 14, v. 21, vii. 17, ix. 9, xi. 18, 23, xiii. 2, xvi. 17, xvii. 19, xviii. 24. Comp. v. 21, συνεκπολεμήσει τῷ κυρίῳ ὁ κόσμος ἐπὶ τοὺς παραφρόνας; xvi. 17, ὑπέρμαχος γὰρ ὁ κόσμος ἐστὶ δικαίων. Considered as a whole, and in its laws and order, the world bears a divine character; not merely as the N. T. teaches, the marks of its divine origin. Man stands at its centre; Wisd. x. 1, πρωτόπλαστος πατὴρ κόσμου μόνος κτισθεὶς; ix. 2, 3, κατεσκεύασας ἄνθρωπον, ἵνα δεσπόζη τῶν ὑπὸ σου γενομένων κτισμάτων, καὶ διέπη

τὸν κόσμον ἐν ὁσιότητι καὶ δικαιοσύνῃ. Through the conduct of man, that which in itself is foreign thereto has penetrated into the mundane order, namely, θάνατος, πορνεία, Wisd. ii. 24, xiv. 14.

The N. T., however, fills this expression also with a new force. It, too, regards the κόσμος as the ordered entirety of God's creation; Acts xvii. 24, ὁ θεὸς ὁ ποιήσας τὸν κόσμον καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτῷ; and as bearing the divine stamp, Rom. i. 20, τὰ ἀόρατα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου τοῖς ποιήμασιν νοούμενα καθορᾶται. But it is only spoken of agreeably to the fundamental biblical view of it laid down in the account of the creation in its relation to man, who occupies the central place therein. The world is the abode of mankind (see below), and accordingly the divorced or torn relation between heaven and earth, between God and His creation, finds its expression in the summary designation of the latter as κόσμος; and this throughout the N. T., but most distinctly in the writings of John, where, however, the word serves at the same time to characterize the divine work of redemption as a whole. The N. T. usage may be classified as follows:—

(I.) Κόσμος denotes the ordered sum-total of what God has created (according to profane view, τὸ πᾶν, the universe), Acts xvii. 24; Rom. i. 20; John xvii. 5, πρὸ τοῦ τὸν κόσμον εἶναι; xxi. 25; 1 Cor. iv. 9. Cf. the expression, ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου (ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κ., Matt. xxiv. 21), Matt. xiii. 35; Luke xi. 50; Eph. i. 4; Heb. iv. 3, ix. 26; 1 Pet. i. 20; Rev. xiii. 8; John xvii. 24. This expression, however, involves—cf. Matt. xxiv. 21, and see καταβολή—a reference to the fact that the world is (II.) the abode of man, or that order of things within which humanity moves, of which man is the centre. John xvi. 21, ἐγεννήθη ἄνθρωπος εἰς τὸν κόσμον; 1 Tim. vi. 7, οὐδὲν εἰσηνέγκαμεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον. Cf. John xii. 25, ὁ μισθὸν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ κ. τούτῳ; Wisd. ix. 2, 3, x. 1. In this sense it is said of Abraham in Rom. iv. 13, κληρονόμον αὐτὸν εἶναι κόσμον. Thus, as the abode of mankind, Mark xvi. 15, πορευθέντες εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἅπαντα κ.τ.λ.; Eph. ii. 12, ἄθεοι ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ; Col. i. 6; Rom. i. 8; Mark xiv. 9; Matt. iv. 8; 1 Cor. v. 10, ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου ἐξελεῖν; Matt. xiii. 38, ὁ δὲ ἀγρός ἐστιν ὁ κόσμος, τὸ δὲ καλὸν σπέρμα οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ υἱοὶ τῆς βασιλείας, τὰ δὲ ζιζανία εἰσιν οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ πονηροῦ; 1 Cor. xiv. 10, γένη φονῶν ἐστιν ἐν κόσμῳ. It presents itself to man for possession and enjoyment, Matt. xvi. 26; Mark viii. 36; Luke ix. 25, κερδήσας τὸν κόσμον ὄλον; 1 Cor. vii. 31, οἱ χρώμενοι τὸν κόσμον ὡς μὴ καταχρώμενοι; iii. 22, εἴτε κόσμος εἴτε ζωὴ . . . πάντα ὑμῶν; 1 John iii. 17, ὃς δ' ἂν ἔχῃ τὸν βίον τοῦ κόσμου; John xiv. 27; Jas. ii. 5 (1 Cor. viii. 4?). Cf. 1 John ii. 15–17. As the order of things within which humanity moves, sin and death have intruded into it (Rom. v. 12, 13); and influenced in this manner by man, it is in its present notorious state ὁ κόσμος οὗτος (cf. Krüger, § li. 7), John viii. 23, xii. 25, 31, xiii. 1, xvi. 11, xviii. 36; 1 John iv. 17; 1 Cor. i. 20 (Received text), iii. 19, v. 10, vii. 31; Eph. ii. 2, included in the αἰὼν οὗτος, cf. 1 Cor. i. 20; Eph. ii. 2, ἐν ἁμαρτίαις περιπατήσατε κατὰ τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, but not like this set in antithesis with a κόσμος μέλλον, but with the βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, τῶν οὐρανῶν, cf. John xviii. 36, ἡ βασιλεία ἣ ἐμὴ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου κ.τ.λ.; Jas.

ii. 5, ὁ θεὸς ἐξελέξατο τοὺς πτωχοὺς τῷ κόσμῳ . . . κληρονόμους τῆς βασιλείας, with a higher order of things, John viii. 23, ὑμεῖς ἐκ τῶν κάτω ἐστέ, ἐγὼ ἐκ τῶν ἄνω εἰμί· ὑμεῖς ἐκ τούτου τοῦ κόσμου ἐστέ, ἐγὼ οὐκ εἰμί ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου; John xi. 9, τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, cf. xii. 46, ἐγὼ φῶς εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἐλήλυθα; Matt. v. 14; Phil. ii. 15. In this aspect above quoted, no longer (as in 2 Macc.) is God the King and Lord of the world, but Satan has risen up in opposition to Him, John xiv. 30, ὁ τοῦ κόσμου (Received text, τούτου) ἄρχων; John xii. 31, νῦν κρίσις ἐστὶν τοῦ κόσμου τούτου· νῦν ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου ἐκβληθήσεται ἔξω; xvi. 11, cf. Eph. ii. 2, 3, and not till the close of the history of redemption is it said in Rev. xi. 15, ἐγένετο ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ κόσμου τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ. This leads us to the more precise definition of the conception, to be referred to under IV. — As κόσμος is regarded as that order of things whose centre is man, attention is directed chiefly to him, and κόσμος denotes (III.) **mankind within that order of things, humanity as it manifests itself in and through such an order**, Matt. xviii. 7, οὐαὶ τῷ κόσμῳ ἀπὸ τῶν σκανδάλων; 2 Pet. iii. 6, ὁ τότε κόσμος ἀπώλετο; ii. 5, ἀρχαῖον κόσμου οὐκ ἐφείσατο . . . κατακλυσμὸν κίσμῳ ἀσεβῶν ἐπάξας; Rom. iii. 6, πῶς κρινεῖ ὁ θεὸς τὸν κόσμον; ver. 19, ὑπόδικος πᾶς ὁ κόσμος τῷ θεῷ; 1 Cor. iv. 13, ὡς περικαθάρματα τοῦ κόσμου, πάντων περίφημα, which belong not to such order; also in John xii. 19, ὁ κόσμος ὅλος ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ ἀπῆλθεν; cf. 1 John iv. 1, 3. — The way would thus seem sufficiently prepared for the usage which by κόσμος denotes (IV.) **that order of things which is alienated from God**, as manifested in and by the human race, in which mankind exists; in other words, humanity as alienated from God, and acting in opposition to Him and to His revelation. In this sense the word is used everywhere except in Acts (where it occurs only in xvii. 24), 1 and 2 Thess., 2 Tim., Titus, Philemon, Jude, 3 John, where it does not occur at all. Also κερδαίνειν τὸν κ. ὅλον, Matt. xvi. 26 and parallel passages, is tinged by this view; further, Matt. v. 14, ὑμεῖς ἐστέ τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου; Jas. i. 27, ἄσπιλον ἑαυτὸν τηρεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ κόσμου; iv. 4, ἡ φιλία τοῦ κόσμου ἐχθρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστὶν κ.τ.λ.; 1 Pet. v. 9, ἡ ἐν κόσμῳ ἀδελφότης; 2 Pet. i. 4, ἀποφυγόντες τῆς ἐν κόσμῳ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθορᾶς; ii. 20, ἀποφυγόντες τὰ μιάσματα τοῦ κοσμοῦ ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ κυρίου κ.τ.λ. Also Heb. xi. 7, κατέκρινεν τὸν κόσμον; ver. 38, ὧν οὐκ ἦν ἄξιος ὁ κ. This use, however, is specially Pauline, and still more completely Johannine.

Paul regards that which belongs to the world as at the same time part of αἰὼν οὗτος, 1 Cor. i. 20, ποῦ συνζητητῆς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου; οὐχὶ ἐμώρανεν ὁ θεὸς τὴν σοφίαν τοῦ κ.; iii. 20, i. 21; Eph. ii. 2, 3; and what is in conformity with God and springs from Him is essentially different from that which belongs to the world, 1 Cor. ii. 12, τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ κόσμου . . . τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ; 2 Cor. vii. 10, ἡ κατὰ θεὸν λύπη . . . ἡ τοῦ κόσμου λύπη. Cf. 1 Cor. i. 27, 28, vii. 33, 34, τὸ τοῦ κόσμου . . . τοῦ κυρίου. For this reason the world is exposed, not merely to God's judgment (Rom. iii. 6, 19), but also to the sentence of condemnation; 1 Cor. xi. 32, ἵνα μὴ σὺν τῷ κόσμῳ κατακριθῶμεν. So much the more emphatic, therefore, is what we read in 2 Cor. v. 19, θεὸς ἦν ἐν Χριστῷ κόσμον καταλλάσσων ἑαυτῷ; 1 Tim. iii. 16, ἐπιστεύθη ἐν κόσμῳ; i. 15. The relation

thus existing between God and the world necessarily determines the relation of the children of God, of believers, to the world, Phil. ii. 15, τέκνα θεοῦ ἀμώμητα μέσον γενεᾶς σκολίας καὶ διεστραμμένης, ἐν οἷς φαίνεσθε ὡς φωστῆρες ἐν κόσμῳ (cf. Matt. v. 14); Gal. vi. 14, δι' οὗ ἐμοὶ κόσμος ἐσταυρῶται καὶ γὰρ τῷ κόσμῳ (cf. καινὴ κτίσις, ver. 15); 1 Cor. vi. 2, οἱ ἄγιοι τὸν κόσμον κρινούσιν (cf. John x. 36).—The expression τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου, Gal. iv. 3, Col. ii. 8, 20 (comp. Gal. iv. 9), denotes elements as they are conditioned by the state of mankind alienated from God, that is, *rudiments* of a life related to God in the manner described in the context. Paul's usage may be shown to have suggested the Talmudic use of κόσμος. For example, to the parallel drawn by Paul between κόσμος and ἔθνη, Rom. xi. 12, τὸ παράπτωμα αὐτῶν πλοῦτος κόσμου καὶ τὸ ἥττημα αὐτῶν πλοῦτος ἐθνῶν,—cf. ver. 15, ἡ ἀποβολὴ αὐτῶν καταλλαγὴ κόσμου, so that κόσμος is thus the abode of the ἔθνη (see ἔθνος),—corresponds the rabbinical expression עֲלִיּוֹת הָעוֹלָם, τὰ ἔθνη τοῦ κόσμου, Luke xii. 30, in opposition to Israel. But a glance at the passages quoted above suffices to show that Paul's idea of κόσμος does not apply merely to humanity outside of Israel, or even, as some fancy they are logically warranted in concluding, outside of Christianity. With regard to κόσμος, Paul's horizon narrowed itself so as no longer to include in that conception all mankind outside the pale of Israel; John's horizon widened itself so as to include the sphere of Israel in the conception of κόσμος.

As employed by John, κόσμος may be deemed one of those words in which (particularly in its use in the connection of the exposition) the chief features of a writer's circle of thought are concentrated. It denotes the ordered entirety of God's creation, John xvii. 5, 24; that order of things into which man is born, xvi. 21; within which humanity lives and moves, xiv. 27, οὐ καθὼς ὁ κ. δίδωσιν. 1 John iv. 1, 3, 17; John iii. 19, τὸ φῶς ἐλήλυθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον καὶ ἡγάπησαν οἱ ἄνθρωποι μᾶλλον τὸ σκότος ἢ τὸ φῶς; vi. 14, xi. 27; humanity itself, as it presents itself within this order, John vii. 4, φανέρωσον σεαυτὸν τῷ κ., cf. xii. 19, ὁ κόσμος ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ ἀπήλθεν; i. 29; 1 John ii. 2. But the world is an order of things characterized by the ungodly conduct of mankind, by sin and by estrangement from God. 1 John v. 19, ὁ κ. ὅλος ἐν τῷ πονηρῷ κεῖται; John i. 10, ὁ κόσμος δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο καὶ ὁ κόσμος αὐτὸν οὐκ ἔγνω; xvii. 25, vii. 7, τὰ ἔργα τοῦ κόσμου πονηρά ἐστιν; xvi. 20; 1 John iv. 4, 5. Accordingly, as a punitive consequence, the world lacks life, John vi. 33, 51, 1 John ii. 15–18, and it lies under condemnation, xii. 31, cf. iii. 17, xii. 47. But this world is an object of divine love, John iii. 16. Into such an order of things the Saviour entered, John i. 9, 10, iii. 19, viii. 12, ix. 5, xii. 46, ix. 39, xvi. 28, xviii. 37, iii. 17, x. 36, xvii. 18, 1 John iv. 9, 14, but not as one who originated within, and took His rise from, this order, and had a corresponding character, viii. 23, xvii. 14, 16 (cf. xviii. 36); therefore He also quitted it again, xiii. 1, xvi. 28, xvii. 11, not, however, without having broken its power, xvi. 33, ἐγὼ νενίκηκα τὸν κόσμον, cf. 1 John iv. 4, 5, having become the propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the whole world, 1 John ii. 2, ἱλασμός περὶ ὅλου τοῦ κόσμου; cf. John i. 29, ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ

θεοῦ ὁ αἴρων τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου, in order to save it, iii. 17, iv. 42, ὁ σωτὴρ τοῦ κ. ὁ Χριστός, xii. 47. Cf. further, John viii. 26, xiv. 17, 19, 31, xvi. 8, xvii. 9, 12, 13, 21, 23. By this, too, was determined the relation of the disciples of Jesus to the world, xv. 19, ἐξελεξάμην ὑμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ κ.; cf. xvii. 11, οὗτοι ἐν τῷ κ. εἰσὶν; 1 John iv. 17; John xvii. 14, οὐκ εἰσιν ἐκ τοῦ κ., ver. 16; 1 John iv. 5, 6, οὓς δέδωκάς μοι ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου; and the relation of the world to the disciples, xvii. 14, ὁ κ. ἐμίσησεν αὐτούς; cf. xv. 18, 19; 1 John iii. 1, 13.—John's usage, like Paul's, appears to have suggested a Rabbinical expression, only a different and more vulgar one. Cf. John xiv. 22, xviii. 20, xii. 19, with the post-biblical term עַלְמָא applied to the entire people; John vii. 4, φανέρωσον, σεαυτὸν τῷ κόσμῳ. "Innumeris vocibus occurrunt כִּלְי עַלְמָא מִדִּי totus mundus fatetur, et פְּלִינִי לֹא עַלְמָא כִּלְי totus mundus non dissentit," etc., Lightfoot.

Κοσμικός, worldly, what belongs to the world, Arist. Phys. ii. 4, τὰ κοσμικὰ πάντα. In the N. T. corresponding to the N. T. idea of κόσμος, and indeed, in Heb. ix. 1, τό τε ἄγιον κοσμικόν, in opposition perhaps to ἐπουράνιον, ἀχειροποίητον (ver. 11); cf. Ignat. ad Rom. 4. Tit. ii. 12, κοσμικὰ ἐπιθυμίαι, pertaining to the world in its estrangement from God, cf. Eph. ii. 1, 2.

Κοσμοκράτωρ, ὁ, world-ruler. By Paul only, in Eph. vi. 12, οἱ κοσμοκράτορες τοῦ σκότους τούτου.—Compare Eph. ii. 2, ὁ ἄρχων τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ αἵρος; 2 Cor. iv. 4; John xii. 31, xiv. 30. Harless warns against laying too strong an emphasis on the idea of κόσμος in this conception taken from the Rabbis, e.g. according to a passage quoted by Schöttgen from Beresch. Rabba, "Abraham persecutus est quatuor מְלָכִים, i.e. reges." On the other hand, however, we might compare the expression παντοκράτωρ applied to God, 2 Cor. vi. 18; Rev. i. 8, iv. 8, xi. 17, xv. 3, xvi. 7, 14, xix. 6, 15, xxi. 22; cf. in the LXX. 2 Sam. v. 10; 1 Chron. xi. 9; Jer. v. 14; Amos iii. 13; Zech. i. 3; Mal. i. 4 = אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, יְהוָה יִשְׂרָאֵל. For the thing meant, see ἐξουσία.

Κρίνω, κρίνω, κέκρικα κ.τ.λ., to divide, to separate; akin to the Latin cernere, to sift. To make a distinction, to come to a decision. Hence (I.) to separate from, to select; so not unfrequently in Homer; also in Herodotus, e.g. vi. 129, κρίνειν τινα ἐκ πάντων. Cf. here-with, Plat. Rep. iii. 399 E, κρίνοντες τὸν Ἀπόλλω πρὸ Μαρσύου = to prefer, and in the same sense without carrying out the comparison, e.g. Aesch. Ag. 458, κρίνω δ' ἄφθονον ὄλβον = to prefer, to choose, to decide for anything. Thus may be explained Rom. xiv. 5, κρίνειν ἡμέραν παρ' ἡμέραν . . . κρίνειν πᾶσαν ἡμέραν, cf. Gal. iv. 10. So also 1 Cor. ii. 2, οὐ γὰρ ἔκρινά τι εἰδέναι; 2 Cor. ii. 1, ἔκρινα τοῦτο, τὸ μὴ πάλιν ἐν λυγῇ ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς; 1 Cor. vii. 37, τοῦτο κέκρικεν ἐν τῇ ἰδίᾳ καρδίᾳ, τηρεῖν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἀρτίαν; Rom. xiv. 13, τοῦτο κρίνατε μᾶλλον τὸ μὴ τιθέναι πρόσκομμα τῷ ἀδελφῷ ἢ σκάνδαλον. Hence = to resolve, Acts xx. 16, κεκρίκει παραπλεῦσαι; xxvii. 1; xvi. 4, δόγματα τὰ κεκριμένα; xxi. 25, κρίναντες μηδὲν τοιοῦτον τηρεῖν αὐτούς; xxv. 25; Tit. iii. 12. Cf. Isoer. iv. 46, τὰ ὑφ' ὑμῶν κριθέντα; Pol. v. 52. 6, πρᾶξαι τὸ κριθέν.—Then = (II.) to come to a

decision, to judge; so *e.g.* Xen. *Cyrop.* iv. 1. 5, ἵνα παρ' ὑμῖν αὐτοῖς αἰεὶ κρίνητε, πότερον ἢ ἀρετὴ μᾶλλον ἢ ἡ φυγὴ σώζει τὰς ψυχάς; *Anab.* i. 9. 5, 20, 28, etc.; Plat. *Gorg.* 452 C, κρίνεις σὺ μέγιστον ἀνθρώποις ἀγαθὸν εἶναι πλούτον; so Luke xii. 57, ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν οὐ κρίνετε τὸ δίκαιον. Cf. Acts iv. 19, εἰ δίκαιόν ἐστιν . . . κρίνατε; 1 Cor. iv. 5, μὴ πρὸ καιροῦ τι κρίνετε; x. 15, κρίνατε ὑμεῖς ὃ φημι; xi. 13. The object is either the matter to be judged, or the decision in question, as in the passages quoted and in Jas. iv. 11, νόμον κρίνειν, or the decision arrived at, the judgment itself, as *e.g.* in Acts xv. 19, 20, κρίνω μὴ παρενοχλεῖν . . . ἀλλὰ ἐπιστεῖλαι αὐτοῖς τοῦ ἀπέχεσθαι κ.τ.λ. (cf. Winer, § xliv. 4 b); 2 Cor. v. 15, κρίναντας τοῦτο, ὅτι εἰ εἰς ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀπέθανεν, ἄρα οἱ πάντες ἀπέθανον; Acts iii. 13, xvi. 15, κεκρίκατέ με . . . πιστὴν εἶναι, cf. Xen. *Anab.* i. 9. 20; Acts xxvi. 8; Luke xix. 22; John vii. 24, μὴ κρίνετε κατ' ὄψιν ἀλλὰ τὴν δικαίαν κρίσιν κρίνατε. Cf. John viii. 15, κατὰ τὴν σάρκα κρίνετε; Luke vii. 43, ὁρθῶς κρίνεις. It is especially applied (III.) to judicial decisions, and is = to judge, with a personal object, to pronounce final judgment, to give a verdict, not = κατακρίνειν, cf. δικαίως κρίνεις, 1 Pet. ii. 23; ἀπροσωπολήμπτως, 1 Pet. i. 17; ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, Acts xvii. 31; Rev. xix. 11; Rom. xiv. 4, σὺ τίς εἰ ὁ κρίνων ἀλλότριον οἰκέτην; τῷ ἰδίῳ κυρίῳ στήκει ἡ πίστις. Cf. Delitzsch on Heb. x. 30, κύριος κρινεῖ τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ (Deut. xxxii. 35), "The LXX. by no means use it merely of a sentence of condemnation, but also of a helpful decision in any one's favour, *e.g.* Ps. liv. 3; nor merely of legal administration of a cause for others, but also of administrative rule in general, *e.g.* Ps. lxxii. 2, κρίνεις τὸν λαόν σου ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ." So also in Matt. xix. 28; Luke xxii. 30; Acts vii. 7. In this sense—without implying the nature of the judgment—κρίνεις is used of seeking a judicial decision ("to find out the right," used of the judge), *e.g.* Acts xxiii. 6, περὶ ἐλπίδος καὶ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν κρίνομαι; xxiv. 21 = they sit in judgment on me; xxv. 9, 10, 20, xxvi. 6, ἐπ' ἐλπίδι τῆς ἐπαγγελίας ἔστηκα κρινόμενος. Herewith is connected the use of the Middle in the sense of to dispute upon (at law), Matt. v. 40, τῷ θέλοντί σοι κριθῆναι, cf. Eurip. *Med.* 609; 1 Cor. vi. 6, ἀδελφὸς μετὰ ἀδελφοῦ κρίνεται; vi. 1. So also probably in Rom. iii. 4, ὅπως νικήσης ἐν τῷ κρίνεσθαί σε; LXX. Ps. li. 6 = קרינני (cf. Isa. xliii. 26; Jer. xxv. 31; Judg. iv. 5; Jer. ii. 9). For if the LXX. had used κριν. here passively, we should have to assume that they read קרינני.—Κρίνεις further stands for coming to a decision, and that primarily with subjoinment of the result, as in Acts xiii. 46, οὐκ ἀξιόους κρίνετε ἑαυτοὺς τῆς αἰωνίου ζωῆς; xvi. 15, εἰ κεκρίκατέ με πιστὴν τῷ κυρίῳ εἶναι; xxvi. 8, ἀπιστον κρίνεται παρ' ὑμῖν; Rom. iii. 7, ὡς ἁμαρτωλὸς κρίνομαι. But where the result is not added, as *e.g.* in Matt. vii. 1, μὴ κρίνετε, ἵνα μὴ κριθήτε, Acts xiii. 27, and other places, it is (IV.) taken for granted that such a judicial procedure is based on real or supposed guilt, and constitutes the premiss of a judicial punitive act, cf. 1 Cor. xi. 32, κρινόμενοι δὲ ὑπὸ κυρίου παιδεύομεθα, ἵνα μὴ σὺν τῷ κόσμῳ κατακριθῶμεν; Rev. vi. 10, οὐ κρινεῖς καὶ ἐκδικεῖς; John xvi. 11, ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου κέκριται, cf. xii. 31, νῦν κρίσις ἐστὶν τοῦ κόσμου τούτου· νῦν ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κ. τ. ἐκβληθήσεται ἔξω; Acts xxiii. 3; John xviii. 31; Rom. ii. 27, xiv. 3, 4, 10, xiii. 22, μακάριος ὁ μὴ κρίνων

ἐαυτὸν ἐν ᾧ δοκιμάζει; 1 Cor. v. 12, 13, vi. 2, 3, xi. 31; Col. ii. 16; 2 Thess. ii. 12; Heb. xiii. 4; Jas. iv. 11, 12; John viii. 26, vii. 51, cf. Luke xi. 31. In this sense it is applied to the final sentence of God, in Rom. ii. 12, 16 (cf. 1 Cor. iv. 5), iii. 6; 1 Cor. v. 13; 2 Thess. ii. 12; 2 Tim. iv. 1; Heb. xiii. 4. As the *premiss to a punitively judicial procedure*, it is always used in the Gospel of John (it does not occur in the Epistles, and in the Rev. only in vi. 10, xi. 18, xvi. 5, xviii. 8, 20, xix. 2, 11, xx. 12, 13), John iii. 18, ὁ πιστεύων οὐ κρίνεται, ὁ δὲ μὴ πιστεύων ἤδη κέκριται. In ver. 17 contrasted with σωθῆναι, v. 22, 30, vii. 51, viii. 15, 16, 26, 50, xii. 47, 48.—This usage is connected with the meaning in profane Greek, *to call any one to account, to accuse, to impeach, to begin a lawsuit*; ὁ κρινόμενος, *the accused, reus*. See Passow, *Wörterb.*

Κρίσις, ἡ, separation, sundering, and indeed (I.) judgment, sentence, Herodian, iv. 5. 5, ὁρθῇ κρίσει λογίζεσθαι; Polyb. xvii. 14. 10, κρίσει πραγμάτων διαφέρεισθαι, *to adjudge things differently*; John vii. 24, τὴν δικαίαν κρίσιν κρίνατε.—(II.) Specially of judicial procedure, *act of judgment*; and primarily without particular regard to the character of the decision, e.g. Xen. *Hell.* iv. 2. 6, κρίσιν ποιεῖν, “to institute an inquiry.” Then of a definite accusation or prosecution, guilt of some sort being presupposed by the judicial procedure, Lys. xiii. 35, κρίσιν ποιεῖν τι. This precise use of the term as = *judicial process*, judgment directed against the guilty, and leading on to condemnation, is comparatively rare in profane Greek, whereas it is almost the only one in the N. T. Compare Matt. v. 21, 22, ἔνοχος τῇ κρίσει; Mark iii. 29, ἔνοχος . . . αἰωνίου κρίσεως; Heb. ix. 27, ἀπόκειται τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἅπαξ ἀποθανεῖν, μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο κρίσις, as against ver. 28, σωτηρία. So also cf. John v. 29, ἀνάστασις κρίσεως, as against ἀν. ζωῆς; Luke xi. 31, ἐγερθήσεται ἐν τῇ κρίσει καὶ κατακρινεῖ, ver. 32; Matt. xii. 41, 42; Heb. x. 27, φοβερά ἐκδοχὴ κρίσεως; Jas. ii. 13, ἡ γὰρ κρίσις ἀνέλεος τῷ μὴ ποιήσαντι ἔλεος κατακαυχᾶται ἔλεος κρίσεως. Cf. Jas. v. 12, ἵνα μὴ ὑπὸ κρίσιν πέσῃτε (Received text, εἰς ὑπόκρισιν); 2 Pet. ii. 4, εἰς κρίσιν τηρεῖσθαι, cf. Jude 6; Jude 15, ἦλθεν κύριος . . . ποιῆσαι κρίσιν κατὰ πάντων καὶ ἐλέγχει πάντας τοὺς ἁσεβεῖς κ.τ.λ. It is characteristic of the judicial procedure, especially of the divine judgment, to which κρίσις mostly relates, that it is directed against the guilty; accordingly this element is made prominent even in 1 John iv. 17, ἵνα παρρησίαν ἔχωμεν ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς κρίσεως, where κρ. is in and by itself a *vox media*, as in 2 Thess. i. 5, ἐνδευγμὰ τῆς δικαίας κρίσεως τοῦ θεοῦ . . . εἴπερ δίκαιον παρὰ θεῷ ἀνταποδοῦναι τοῖς θλίβουσιν ὑμᾶς θλίψιν, καὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς θλιβομένοις ἄνεσιν κ.τ.λ. Therefore John v. 24, εἰς κρίσιν οὐκ ἔρχεται, ἀλλὰ μεταβέβηκεν ἐκ τοῦ θανάτου εἰς ζωὴν Comp. John xvi. 8, 11 with xii. 31; and also in v. 22, οὐδὲ γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ κρίνει οὐδένα, ἀλλὰ τὴν κρίσιν πᾶσαν δέδωκεν τῷ υἱῷ, κρίσις, as is clear from οὐδὲ γάρ, is used in a certain contrast to ζωοποιεῖν, ver. 21; v. 27, ἐξουσίαν ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ καὶ κρίσιν ποιεῖν; ver. 29, ἀνάστασις κρίσεως. But if κρίσις is up to this point used in this special sense, its application in ver. 30 will be the same, ἡ κρίσις ἢ ἐμὴ δικαία ἐστίν, and the predicate is only the more emphatic when it is implied that condemnation will follow on

judgment; viii. 16, ἐγὼ οὐ κρίνω οὐδένα, καὶ ἐὰν κρίνω δὲ ἐγώ, ἡ κρίσις ἡ ἐμὴ ἀληθινή ἐστίν. There only remains, of the usage of the Gospel of John, iii. 19, αὕτη δὲ ἐστίν ἡ κρίσις, ὅτι τὸ φῶς ἐλήλυθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον, καὶ ἠγάπησαν οἱ ἄνθρωποι μᾶλλον τὸ σκότος ἢ τὸ φῶς· ἦν γὰρ αὐτῶν πονηρὰ τὰ ἔργα. The fact of men's excluding themselves from the fellowship of the light, and thus of life,—a consequence of their evil works,—is described by Christ as the judgment; cf. ver. 18, ὁ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτὸν οὐ κρίνεται· ὁ δὲ μὴ πιστεύων ἤδη κέκριται; ver. 16, ἵνα πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτὸν μὴ ἀπόληται ἀλλ' κ.τ.λ. This is to be explained, according to the spirit of St. John's teaching, as denoting judgment by anticipation, i.e. an anticipation of the state which judgment involves; just as life is said to be already possessed in anticipation, see ζωή. In Rev. xiv. 7, xvi. 7, xix. 2, the word likewise denotes the judgment, or the act of judging which discerns and condemns the guilty, cf. xix. 2, καὶ ἐξεδίκησεν τὸ αἷμα κ.τ.λ. In Pauline usage κρίσις occurs only in 2 Thess. i. 5 (see above), and 1 Tim. v. 24, τινῶν ἀνθρώπων αἱ ἁμαρτίαι πρόδηλοί εἰσιν προάγουσαι εἰς κρίσιν; open sins are here represented as the accusers which bring the sinner on to judgment; cf. Thuc. i. 34, προκαλεῖν εἰς κρίσιν. Here, as in Matt. v. 21, 22, the reference is to man's judgment; elsewhere, always to God's. Ἡμέρα κρίσεως, Matt. x. 15, xi. 22, 24, xii. 36; Mark vi. 11; 2 Pet. ii. 9, iii. 7; 1 John iv. 17; see Jude 6, κρίσις μεγάλης ἡμέρας, and Matt. xii. 41, 42; Luke x. 14, xi. 31, 32, κρίσις denotes the final judgment of the world which is to bring destruction upon the guilty. — Further, κρίσις (III.) signifies the judgment pronounced, the sentence, *sententia*, Plat. *Gorg.* 523 E, ἵνα δίκαια ἡ κρίσις ᾖ; *Legg.* vi. 757 B, Διὸς κρίσις ἐστί. So Jude 9, οὐκ ἐτόλμησεν κρίσιν ἐπενέγκειν βλασφημίας; 2 Pet. ii. 11, κρίσις βλάσφημος; Rev. xvi. 7, xix. 2, δίκαιαι αἱ κρίσεις σου.—(IV.) Condemnation, Xen. *Anab.* i. 6. 5, ἐξήγγειλε τοῖς φίλοις τὴν κρίσιν τοῦ Ὀρόντου ὡς ἐγένετο; Acts viii. 33, ἡ κρίσις αὐτοῦ ἦρθη; Rev. xviii. 10, οὐαὶ οὐαὶ, ἡ πόλις ἡ μεγάλη . . . ὅτι μία ὥρα ἦλθεν ἡ κρίσις σου (Matt. xxiii. 33, φυγεῖν ἀπὸ τῆς κρίσεως τῆς γέεννης?).—(V.) There are still a few passages in which κρίσις is apparently used in a sense which it does not possess in classical Greek, viz. Matt. xxiii. 23, ἀφήκατε τὰ βαρύτερα τοῦ νόμου, τὴν κρίσιν καὶ τὸ ἔλεος καὶ τὴν πίστιν; Luke xi. 42, παρέρχεσθε τὴν κρίσιν καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην τοῦ θεοῦ. Here the true rendering seems to make κρίσις = *ὑπερίαι*, right or justice, such as is specially incumbent on a judge; e.g. *ὑπερίαι* *ἡ* *ἡ*, Mic. vii. 9, Gen. xviii. 19, to act justly; *ὑ* *ἡ*, Ex. xxiii. 6; *ὑ* *ἡ*, Job viii. 3, to pervert justice. Cf. Matt. xxiii. 14; Mark xii. 40; Luke xx. 47. — Jer. xvii. 11, ποιῶν πλοῦτον αὐτοῦ οὐ μετὰ κρίσεως; Isa. xxxii. 1, μετὰ κρίσεως ἄρχειν; Jer. xxiii. 5, ποιήσει κρίμα καὶ δικαιοσύνην ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς; Isa. x. 2, ἐκκλίνοντες κρίσιν πτωχῶν. Thus also Matt. xii. 18, κρίσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἀπαγγελεῖ; ver. 20, ἐκβάλῃ εἰς νίκος τὴν κρίσιν, from Isa. xlii. 1 sqq., God's righteous order. Cf. ἀπαγγέλλω.

Κρίμα, τό (often accented κρίμα), the result or issue of κρίνειν = the decision arrived at, (I.) decree, Rom. xi. 33, ὡς ἀνεξερευνήτα τὰ κρίματα αὐτοῦ; *vid.* κρίνω (I.). Cf. LXX. = *ἡ*, Ezek. xxxvii. 24. — Ex. xviii. 4, the parallels κρίματα . . . προστάγματα = *ὑπερίαι* and

קִרְיָה; Lev. xx. 22, Deut. iv. 1 = קִרְיָה, where קִרְיָה = δικαίωμα, cf. xxvi. 16, 17; 2 Chron. xxx. 16, ἔστησαν ἐπὶ τὴν στάσιν αὐτῶν κατὰ τὸ κρίμα αὐτῶν κατὰ τὴν ἐντολὴν Μωϋσῆ, קִרְיָה קִרְיָה קִרְיָה קִרְיָה.—(II.) Decision, determination, John ix. 39, εἰς κρίμα ἐγὼ εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἦλθον, ἵνα οἱ μὴ βλέποντες βλέπωσιν καὶ οἱ βλέποντες τυφλοὶ γένωνται, which side by side with xii. 47, οὐκ ἦλθον ἵνα κρίνω τὸν κόσμον, can only mean, “it depends upon me what becomes of man,” cf. Luke ii. 34. Then in particular (III.) the decision of a judge, judgment, Rev. xx. 4, ἐδόθη κρίμα αὐτοῖς—the judgment concerning them is given in what follows. Cf. Heb. x. 30; see κρίνειν; Matt. vii. 2, ἐν ᾧ κρίματι κρίνετε, κριθήσεσθε. Elsewhere in the N. T. throughout, as in later Greek, the word always denotes a judgment *unfavourable* to those concerned, a punitive judgment, involving punishment as a matter of course; cf. 2 Pet. ii. 3, οἷς τὸ κρίμα ἔκπαλαι οὐκ ἀργεῖ, καὶ ἡ ἀπόλεια αὐτῶν οὐ νυστάζει; Rom. iii. 8, ὃν τὸ κρίμα ἔνδικόν ἐστι, cf. ver. 6; Rom. v. 16, τὸ γὰρ κρίμα ἐξ ἑνὸς εἰς κατάκριμα, where κρίμα is related to κατάκριμα, as δώρημα to χάρισμα or δικαίωμα. For the cognizance of the judge, to say nothing of his judgment, implies a coming short. Hence κρίμα λαμβάνειν, περισσότερον κρ. λαμβάνειν, μείζον κρίμα, Matt. xxiii. 13; Mark xii. 40; Luke xx. 47; Jas. iii. 1; Rom. xiii. 2, τὸ κρίμα βαστάζειν; Gal. v. 10, always *in malam partem*. Rom. ii. 2, 3; Jude 4; Heb. vi. 2; 1 Cor. xi. 29, 34; 1 Pet. iv. 17; 1 Tim. iii. 6, v. 12; Luke xxiii. 40, ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ κρίματι εἶναι; xxiv. 20, παραδίδοναι εἰς κρίμα θανάτου; Rev. xvii. 1, δείξω σοι τὸ κρίμα τῆς πόρνῃς; Rev. xviii. 20, ἔκρινεν ὁ θεὸς τὸ κρ. ὑμῶν ἐξ αὐτῆς, either = *what ye have adjudged her*, cf. vi. 10; or with reference to τὸ αἷμα ἡμῶν, vi. 10, xiii. 10, *what she had adjudged you*; or again, analogous to Mic. vii. 9, ποιήσει τὸ κρίμά μου, קִרְיָה קִרְיָה קִרְיָה, and therefore = *what is your due*; and this seems the most appropriate rendering.—(IV.) With the signification legal proceedings, lawsuit, as in 1 Cor. vi. 7, κρίματα ἔχετε μεθ’ ἑαυτῶν, cf. Job xxxi. 13; Ex. xxiii. 6 (Rev. xviii. 20), it seems not to occur in classical Greek.

Κριτής, ὁ, he who decides, Acts xviii. 15, κριτὴς τούτων—sc. ζητημάτων περὶ λόγον κ.τ.λ.—οὐ βούλομαι εἶναι; Jas. ii. 4, οὐ διεκρίθητε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς καὶ ἐγένεσθε κριταὶ διαλογισμῶν πονηρῶν. Κριτής is said to differ from δικαστής in this, that the latter decides according to law and justice, but the former in all other relations according to equity and common sense. See δικαστής. In the N. T., however, κριτής is often used in the sense of δικ. Only in Luke xii. 14, Griesb. and Tisch. read δικ. for κριτής; and in Acts vii. 27, 35 we find δικ. as = קִרְיָה, Ex. ii. 14, to which in xiii. 20 κρ. answers. As to Jas. iv. 12, εἰς ἐστὶν νομοθέτης καὶ κριτὴς ὁ δυνάμενος σῶσαι καὶ ἀπολέσαι, see δικαστής. Acts x. 42, ὁ ὠρισμένος ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ κριτὴς ζώντων καὶ νεκρῶν; Luke xviii. 2, 6; Matt. v. 25; Luke xii. 58; Jas. iv. 11; Matt. xii. 27; Luke xi. 19. With the genitive of quality, in Luke xviii. 6, ὁ κριτὴς τῆς ἀδικίας (cf. 2 Tim. iv. 8, ὁ δίκαιος κρ.); Jas. ii. 4, κριταὶ διλογισμῶν πονηρῶν. Instead of the genitive of the object κρ. τινός (Matt. xii. 27; Luke xi. 19; Acts x. 42, xviii. 15; Heb. xii. 23), we have in Acts xxiv. 10 the dative, ὄντα σε κριτὴν

τῷ ἔθνει τούτῳ; see Krüger, § xlvi. 12, 1. Of God, Heb. xii. 23; Jas. v. 9. Of Christ, 2 Tim. iv. 8; Acts x. 42.

Κριτήριον, τό, an instrument of κρίνειν, used of various kinds of discernments; touchstone (Plato, Plutarch), and as a *nomen loci* = court of justice. This is most frequently perhaps its meaning in later Greek (Polybius, Diodorus, already also in Plato); Jas. ii. 6, οἱ πλούσιοι καταδυναστεύουσιν ὑμῶν καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔλκουσιν ὑμᾶς εἰς κριτήρια, cf. Susannah 49. 1 Cor. vi. 2, εἰ ἐν ὑμῖν κρίνεται ὁ κόσμος, ἀνάξιοί ἐστε κριτηρίων ἐλαχίστων; = "if you are to judge the world, are you then unworthy of (*i.e.* not good enough for) the lowest seat of justice (*i.e.* to pronounce judgment in the most trifling matters)?" Ver. 4, βιωτικὰ κριτήρια = where right or justice can be found in matters of the outward life. (No example can be adduced of the meaning, *affair of right or law*, that some here adopt.) Diod. i. 72, προετίθησαν τῷ τετελευτηκότι κριτήριον τῶν ἐν τῷ βίῳ πραχθέντων. LXX. = court of justice, judgment-seat, 1 Kings vii. 7; Dan. vii. 10, κρ. καθίζειν, to institute a judgment, Polyb. ix. 33. 12; Ex. xxi. 6; cf. Hesych., κριτήριον δοκιμαστήριον, δικαστήριον.

Κριτικός, one whose business and special gift is to judge, Plato, Lucian, Strabo. In Heb. iv. 12, of the λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, κριτικὸς ἐνθυμήσεων καὶ ἐννοιῶν καρδίας; Basil. M. ὀφθαλμοὶ κριτικοὶ τοῦ κάλλους.

Ἀποκρίνω, to separate, to divide from, *e.g.* of the purification of metals; to choose out, Herod. vi. 130. 1, ἐνα ὑμέων ἐξαίρετον ἀποκρίνων; also in a bad sense = to deprive of by a judicial sentence, to reject, *e.g.* κρίνειν καὶ ἀποκρίνειν τοὺς ἀξίους, Plato, Legg. vi. 751 D; Dio Cass. lvii. 18, τὰ μὲν ὡς οὐδενὸς ἄξια ἀπέκρινε, τὰ δὲ ἐνέκρινε. In biblical Greek in the middle only, with the 1st aorist and 1st future passive as = to answer, in which sense also it is for the most part used in Attic Greek from Thucydides downwards (Herodotus always uses ὑποκρίνεσθαι, seemingly even in v. 49, viii. 101, where ἀποκρ. is usually read). Its root-meaning corresponds with the German *bescheiden*, *Bescheid geben* (to appoint, to give an answer or decision), cf. Acts xxv. 4; the import of the middle is perhaps = to divide in judgment, cf. Aristoph. Ach. 607 (632), διαβαλλόμενος . . . ἀποκρίνεσθαι δεῖται νυνὶ πρὸς Ἀθηναίους μεταβούλους, where it is = to vindicate or answer for oneself. The use of the 1st aorist passive in a middle sense in later Greek tells in favour of this as the fundamental representation (not in the Attic writers, cf. Phryn. ed. Lob. 108, ἀποκριθῆναι . . . τὸ διαχωρισθῆναι σημαίνει, ὥσπερ οὖν καὶ τὸ ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ, τὸ συγκριθῆναι, εἰς ἐν καὶ ταῦτόν ἐλθεῖν. Εἰδὼς οὖν τοῦτο ἐπὶ μὲν τοῦ ἀποδοῦναι τὴν ἐρώτησιν, ἀποκρίνεσθαι λέγε, ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ διαχωρισθῆναι ἀποκριθῆναι), comp. Krüger, § lii. 6; Curtius, Gr. § 478. This will account for a peculiarity of N. T. diction, namely, that ἀποκρίνεσθαι, answering to the Hebrew נָשָׁב, Song ii. 10, Isa. xiv. 10, Zech. iii. 4, Deut. xxi. 7, cf. ἀνθολογεῖσθαι, Luke ii. 38, Ps. lxxix. 13, Ezra iii. 2, Ecclus. xvii. 22, is also used where no answer is introduced; Bengel, *respondet non modo qui rogatus est, sed cui causa loquendi est data* (on Matt. xxii. 1). So Matt. xi. 25, xvii. 4, xxii. 1, xxvi. 63, xxviii. 5; Mark ix. 5, x. 51, xi. 14, xii. 35, xiv. 48; Luke i. 60, vii. 22, xiii. 14, xiv. 3, 5; John v. 17, 19, x. 32; Acts

iii. 12, v. 8, viii. 34, x. 46; Rev. vii. 13; comp. ἀνταποκρίνεσθαι τῷ θεῷ, *to dispute with God*, Rom. ix. 20. Elsewhere it stands after a foregoing question, Matt. xv. 3, 13, xvi. 16, xvii. 11, and often; after a request, Matt. xv. 23, 24, 26, xvi. 2, xx. 22, xxv. 9, 12; Mark xv. 9, 12; Luke xv. 29; Acts xxv. 4; after a demand or warning, etc. Usually with the dative of the person, in Luke also πρὸς τινα, v. 22, vi. 3, xiv. 5; Acts iii. 12, xxv. 16. The object stands (*a.*) in the accusative, Matt. xxii. 46; Mark xiv. 40; Matt. xxvi. 62, xxvii. 12; Mark xiv. 60, 61, xv. 4, 5; Luke xxiii. 9; (*b.*) in the infinitive, Luke xx. 7, ἀπεκρίθησαν μὴ εἰδέναι. The accusative with the infinitive, Acts xxv. 4, ἀπεκρίθη τηρεῖσθαι τὸν Παῦλον; (*c.*) with ὅτι following, Acts xxv. 16; (*d.*) it is found included in direct address in John and the Acts; on the other hand, in Matthew and Luke we find in this case generally ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν; in Mark, in like manner, ἀπεκρίθη λέγων (comp. Matt. xxv. 9, 44, 45); in John (excepting i. 26), only ἀπεκρίθη καὶ εἶπεν, ἔλεγεν. The present, in Matt. xxvi. 62; Mark xiv. 60, xv. 4; John xviii. 22; Col. iv. 6. The 1st aorist middle, Matt. xvii. 12; John v. 17, 19; Acts iii. 12. The 1st future passive, Matt. xxv. 37, 44. In all other places, the 1st aorist passive.

Ἀπόκρισις, ἡ, decision, answer. LXX. = אַפְקִיט, Deut. i. 22; אַפְקִיט, Job xxxii. 5; Prov. xv. 1.—In the N. T. Luke xx. 47, 26.—ἀπόκρισιν διδόναι, John i. 22, xix. 9. LXX. = אַפְקִיט, Job xxxiii. 5, xl. 4; = אַפְקִיט, Job xxxv. 4; = אַפְקִיט, Job xv. 4.

Ἀπόκριμα, τό, unused in profane Greek, and where it occurs = answer; so Josephus, *Antt.* xiv. 10. 6; in Suidas; elsewhere also isolatedly, e.g. ἀποκρίματα ἐννέα σοφῶν. In the N. T. 2 Cor. i. 9, αὐτοὶ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς τὸ ἀπόκριμα τοῦ θανάτου ἐσχέκαμεν, cf. ver. 8; Hesych., as synonymous with κατάκριμα, from ἀποκρίνω in the sense *to reject, to give a verdict against*; Chrysostom, τὸ ἀπόκριμα, τὴν ψήφον, τὴν προσδοκίαν, τὴν κρίσιν . . . τοιαύτην ἀπόκρισιν ἐδίδου τὰ συμβάντα ὅτι ἀποθανούμεθα πάντως; *vid.* Cramer, *caten. Graec. pater*.

Ἀνταποκρίνομαι, *to answer against*, τινί, Luke xiv. 6; πρὸς τινα, Luke xiv. 5; τί, *to reply to something*, Job xxxii. 12, οὐκ ἦν τῷ Ἰὼβ ἐλέγχων ἀνταποκρινόμενος ῥήματα αὐτοῦ ἐξ ὑμῶν = *to make a declaratory and argumentative reply, to dispute*, Job xvi. 8, κατὰ πρόσωπόν μου ἀνταπεκρίθη; Rom. ix. 20, σὺ τίς εἶ ὁ ἀνταποκρινόμενος τῷ θεῷ; comp. ἀντιλοιδορεῖν, 1 Pet. ii. 23.

Διακρίνω, (I.) *to separate one from another, to divide, to part*, 1 Cor. iv. 7, τίς σε διακρίνει, cf. ver. 6. Bengel, *discernit, vel, discrimine aliquo eximie distinguit*. The signification *to separate from* is quite enough; = *to distinguish*, Acts xv. 9, οὐδὲν διέκρινεν μεταξὺ ἡμῶν τε καὶ αὐτῶν; Thucyd. i. 49, οὐδὲν διεκέκριτο ἔτι.—Jude 22.—(II.) *to decide by discrimination*, Matt. xvi. 3, τὸ πρόσωπον τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, τὰ σημεῖα τῶν καιρῶν; 1 Cor. xi. 29, τὸ σῶμα τοῦ κυρίου. The apostle uses the same word with great nicety in ver. 31, εἰ δὲ ἑαυτοὺς διεκρίνομεν, οὐκ ἂν ἐκρινόμεθα = *to determine, to direct*, 1 Cor. vi. 5, δε δυνήσεται διακρίναι ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ; Xen. *Hell.* v. 2. 10, εἰ δέ τι ἀμφίλογον

πρὸς ἀλλήλους γίγνεται, δίκη διακριθῆναι . . . ἐψηφίσαντο (v. 3. 10, διαδικάζεσθαι); 1 Cor. xiv. 29, οἱ ἄλλοι διακρινέτωσαν.—(III.) Passive = **to be separated**, of combatants; accordingly, e.g. Herod. vii. 206, πολεμὸς διακριθήσεται = *to be settled or ended*. But also = *to be in conflict, to contend*, μάχη πρὸς τινα, Herod. ix. 58. So in Acts xi. 12, διακρίνονται πρὸς αὐτόν; Jude 9, τῷ διαβόλῳ διακρινόμενος. Akin to this is the signification peculiar to the N. T.—(IV.) = **to doubt**, literally, *to be in conflict, to be divided* with reference to anything. So Jas. ii. 4, οὐ διεκρίθητε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς; Rom. iv. 20, εἰς δὲ τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ θεοῦ οὐ διεκρίθη τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ; Matt. xxi. 21, ἐὰν ἔχητε πίστιν, καὶ μὴ διακριθῆτε; Mark xi. 23; Acts x. 20 (xi. 12, Received text); Rom. xiv. 23; Jas. i. 6.

Διάκρισις, ἡ, (I.) separation, discrimination, Heb. v. 14, τὰ αἰσθητήρια γεγυμνασμένα . . . πρὸς διάκρισιν καλοῦ τε καὶ κακοῦ.—(II.) Discernment, judgment, Plato, *Legg.* xi. 937 B, δ. ψευδομαρτυριῶν; 1 Cor. xii. 10, διακρίσεις πνευμάτων.—(III.) Conflict, doubt, answering to διακρίνεσθαι (IV.), like ἀπόκρισις . . . ἀποκρίνεσθαι; Rom. xiv. 1, μὴ εἰς διακρίσεις διαλογισμῶν. The explanation, *non eo consilio, ut judicetis opinioniones, ultra utri sit verior praeferenda* (Grimm, *Lex.*), is quite out of keeping with the expressions of the apostle elsewhere, cf. 1 Cor. viii. 7, 9; Rom. xiv. 13–15; and as he here is urging that the weak should be borne with, that they should not be perplexed (cf. ver. 5, ἕκαστος ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ νοτὶ πληροφορεῖσθω), εἰς διακρίσεις διαλογισμῶν must denote something which is not to occur in the weak, comp. xiii. 14, τῆς σαρκὸς πρόνοιαν μὴ ποιεῖσθε εἰς ἐπιθυμίας; in other words, εἰς διακρ. διαλ. has reference not to the subject, but to the object of προσλαμβάνειν. Cf. 1 Cor. viii. 10. The κρίνειν of the weak must not become διακρίνεσθαι, comp. vv. 22, 23, and therefore διάκρισις here must be = *doubt*, “so that no conflict or doubt of thoughts ensues.”

Ἀδιάκριτος, undistinguishable, e.g. φωνή, Polyb. xv. 12. 9; Lucian, *Jur. Trag.* 25, ἀδιάκριτος λόγος, *non judicatus, adhuc dubius* (Steph. *Thes.* s.v.). In the N. T. only in Jas. iii. 17 predicated of the ἄνωθεν σοφία as against the quarrelling and strife of the σοφία ἐπίγειος, vv. 14–16, and therefore to be taken actively, as is often the case with verbal adjectives compounded with *a* privative (cf. Krüger, xli. 11. 26), which is facilitated here through the signification of the passive διακρίνεσθαι, *to be in conflict*, see διακρίνεσθαι. Accordingly = **unbiassed, impartial**. Bengel, *non facit discrimen, ubi non opus est*; Wetstein, *non duplex*.

Ἐνκρίνω, opposed to ἀποκρίνω, ἐκκρίνω, literally, *to divide into, i.e. to place in a series, in numerum inserere*; Suet., *insertus familiae*; Sturz, *Lex. Xen.*, “ἐγκρίνεσθαι proprio verbo dicuntur ii, qui post examen ab Hellanodicis de aetate et populo, an Graeci essent, habitum, in certamen admittuntur.”—Plato, *Legg.* vi. 755 D, εἰς τὴν αἵρεσιν ἐγκρινέσθω; Dem. *Lept.* 107, ἐὰν τις τὴν γερουσίαν ἐγκριθῇ; Apoll. *Rh.* i. 48. 227, ἐγκριθῆναι ὁμίλῳ, *tc mix in the crowd*. So = **to reckon with**, 2 Cor. x. 12, οὐ τολμῶμεν ἐνκρίναι ἢ συγκρίναι ἑαυτοὺς τισιν τῶν ἑαυτοὺς συνιστανόντων. Bengel, “*aequiparare veluti consortes ejusdem muneris, aut comparare veluti participes ejusdem laboris* . . . ἐγκρίνονται, aequiparantur invicem quae sunt

ejusdem generis; συγκρίνονται, comparantur, quae cum differant genere, rationem saltem eandem habere judicantur." In later Greek also, in a derived sense = to approve, to esteem as up to the standard, and therefore admissible.

Κατακρίνω, to decide, to judge, to pronounce condemnation against any one. In classical Greek κατακρίνειν τινός τι, but in biblical Greek κατακρ. τινά, Wisd. iv. 16; Esth. ii. 1; Matt. xii. 41, 42; Luke xi. 31, 32; John viii. 10, 11; Rom. ii. 8, viii. 3; Heb. xi. 7; 2 Pet. ii. 6. Also κ. τινά τι, Matt. xx. 18, κατακρινούσιν αὐτὸν θανάτῳ; Mark x. 33; cf. θανάτῳ καταδικάζεσθαι, Diod. xiii. 101; Joseph. Antt. ix. 7. 525; καταγινώσκεσθαι θανάτῳ, Aelian, V. H. xii. 49 (Lob. Phryg. 475). With Mark xiv. 64. κατέκριναν αὐτὸν ἔνοχον εἶναι θανάτου, cf. Susannah 41, κατέκριναν αὐτὴν ἀποθανεῖν; Herod. ix. 93, ὑπαγαγόντες μιν ὑπὸ δικαστήριον κατέκριναν, ὡς τὴν φυλακὴν κατακοιμήσαντα, τῆς ὀφείας στερηθῆναι; vi. 85. The passive, to be condemned, as in profane Greek, Matt. xxvii. 3; Mark xvi. 16; Rom. xiv. 23; 1 Cor. xi. 32 (Jas. v. 9, Received text). In a specially biblical sense, it denotes the opposite of God's saving work, and, indeed, is used in contrast with σώζεσθαι, Mark xvi. 16. Rom. viii. 34, τίς ὁ κατακρίνων; cf. ver. 33; 1 Cor. xi. 32; 2 Pet. ii. 6; not simply, as elsewhere always in profane Greek, to pronounce condemnation, but to express at the same time the action of the judge as executive = to accomplish the condemnatory judgment, answering to the reality of the σώζεσθαι, comp. Rom. viii. 3, κατέκρινεν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἐν τῇ σαρκί,—God accomplished the judgment of condemnation pronounced against sin, and He did this in sin's appropriate sphere, viz. in the flesh (vid. σάρξ), in that He sent His Son ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμ.—i.e. God completed this condemnation of sin through His Son in His earthly manifestation; cf. 2 Cor. v. 21; Gal. iii. 6.

Κατάκριμα, τό, what is decided against any one, a condemnatory judgment; a word occurring but rarely, and in later Greek (Dion. Hal. Antt. vi. 61, κατακριμάτων ἀφέσεις); and in biblical Greek only in Rom. v. 16, 18, viii. 1 (in Ecclus. xliii. 10 the true reading is κατὰ κρίμα). In Rom. v. 16 it stands in contrast with δικαίωμα, and in ver. 18 with the more definite δικαίωσις ζωῆς, and therefore = judgment of condemnation, in the sense of the economy of redemption; Rom. viii. 1, οὐδὲν κατάκριμα τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ; Greg. Naz., ἵνα πρὸς ἐαντὸν ἐνώσας τὸ κατακριθέν, ὅλον λύσῃ τοῦ κατακρίματος. Cf. Gal. v. 23, κατὰ τῶν τοιούτων οὐκ ἔστι νόμος.

Κατάκρισις, ἡ, doom, condemnation; a word apparently belonging to biblical and ecclesiastical Greek only; 2 Cor. vii. 3, οὐ πρὸς κατάκρισιν λέγω; iii. 9, ἡ διακονία τῆς κατακρίσεως; of the province of the law as ministered by Moses, ver. 7, ἡ διακονία τοῦ θανάτου ἐν γράμματι κ.τ.λ., as against the διακονία τῆς δικαιοσύνης; cf. v. 18.

Αὐτοκατάκριτος, self-condemned, Tit. iii. 11, ἁμαρτάνει ὧν αὐτοκατάκριτος. Not in profane Greek. Chrys. Hom. 1 de Lazar., περιέρχεται πικρὸν κατήγορον περιφέρων τὸ συνειδός, αὐτοκατάκριτος ὢν.

Εἰλικρινής, *és*, to be derived from *εἴλη*, *εἴλησις*, the sun's heat, comp. *ἀλέα*; hence, as in the Mss. of Plato frequently, properly *εἰλικρ.* = tested or judged by the sun, by the light, *i.e.* spotless, pure, clear; comp. Plato, *Phileb.* 53 A, where the purest white is designated τὸ ἀκρατέστατον, ἐν ᾧ χρώματος μηδεμία μοῖρα ἄλλη μηδενὸς τὸ μάλιστ' εἰλικρινές. In combination with καθαρός, ἄμικτος, *e.g.* Plato, *Phileb.* 52 D, *Conv.* 211 E; Polyb. viii. 33. 1, ὄντος φωτὸς εἰλικρινοῦς; Wisd. vii. 25, ἀπόρροια τῆς τοῦ παντοκράτορος δόξης εἰλικρινής; Xen. *Mem.* ii. 2. 3, εἰλικρινής τις ἂν ἀδικία ἢ ἀχαριστία = manifest. — In a moral sense in Plato, where it oftenest occurs, *e.g.* Plato, *Phaed.* 66 A, εἰλικρινεῖ τῇ διανοίᾳ χρώμενος; 81 C, ψυχῇ εἰλικρινής. So in the N. T. 2 Pet. iii. 1, διεγείρειν . . . τὴν εἰλικρινῆ διάνοιαν; Phil. i. 10, ἵνα ᾗτε εἰλικρινεῖς καὶ ἀπρόσκοποι εἰς ἡμέραν Χριστοῦ.

Εἰλικρινεῖα, *ή*, purity, sincerity; rare in profane Greek; in Sext. Emp. and Theophrastus in a physical sense only; Stob. *Floril.* ciii. 28, ἡ εἰλικρινεῖα τοῦ καλοῦ. In the N. T. 2 Cor. i. 12, ἐν ἀγιότητι (Received text, ἀπλότητι) καὶ εἰλικρινεῖα τοῦ θεοῦ . . . ἀνεστράφημεν; ii. 17, οὐ γὰρ ἔσμεν ὥς οἱ πολλοὶ καπηλεύοντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀλλ' ὥς ἐξ εἰλικρινείας κ.τ.λ.; 1 Cor. v. 8, ἐν ἀζύμοις εἰλικρινείας καὶ ἀληθείας, as against κακία καὶ πονηρία. See above, εἰλικρινής.

Πρόκριμα, τό, a rare word of later Greek, from the classical προκρίνειν, with reference to place and time = to decide beforehand, to prefer before, another being put aside. Galen, *Rat. Med.* 8, Ἵποκράτει ἑαυτοὺς προκρίνοντες; 1 Tim. v. 21, ἵνα ταῦτα φυλάξῃς χωρὶς προκρίματος, μηδὲν ποιῶν κατὰ πρόσκλισιν. Πρόκριμα includes an unfavourable prejudgment against one; πρόσκλισις, nothing but positive favour, partiality. The latter is presupposed in πρόκριμα. Προσκλίνειν is to side with, to incline towards, to agree with, Polyb. iv. 51. 5, v. 86. 10; 2 Macc. xiv. 24; Thuc. iii. 53, δέδιμεν οὐχὶ μὴ προκαταγνόντες ἡμῶν τὰς ἀρετὰς ἥσσους εἶναι τῶν ὑμετέρων ἔγκλημα αὐτὸ ποιήτε, ἀλλὰ μὴ ἄλλοις χάριν φέροντες ἐπὶ διεγνωσμένην κρίσιν καθιστώμεθα; Suid., πρόσκλισις· ἑτερομέρεια. Cf. Ex. xxiii. 2.

Συνκρίνω, to separate and arrange together (I.) = to combine, to unite, opposed to διακρίνειν, Aristot. *Metaph.* i. 4, ἡ μὲν φίλια διακρίνει, τὸ δὲ νεῖκος συγκρίνει; *ibid.*, εἰς ἐν συγκρίνεσθαι. Cf. Ecclus. xxxii. (xxxv.) 4, σύνκριμα μουσικῶν. — (II.) to compare, 2 Cor. x. 12, οὐ τολμῶμεν ἐνκρίναι ἢ συνκρίναι ἑαυτοὺς τισιν τῶν ἑαυτοὺς συνιστανόντων· ἀλλ' αὐτοὶ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἑαυτοὺς μετροῦντες καὶ συνκρίνοντες ἑαυτοὺς ἑαυτοῖς οὐ συνιδῶσιν. — (III.) to measure, to estimate (by combination and comparison), thus = *ῥη*, Gen. xl. 8, 16, 22, xli. 12, 13, 15; cf. Dan. v. 13, 17; of interpreters of dreams, as σύνκρισις ἐνυπνίου, Dan. ii. 16, 26, iv. 3, 21, v. 17; Polyb. xii. 9. (10.) 1, τὰς ἀποφάσεις συγκρινώμεν ἐκ παραθέσεως . . . ἵνα γνῶμεν πότερος ἄξιος ἔσται τῆς τοιαύτης κατηγορίας. So 1 Cor. ii. 13, πνευματικοῖς πνευματικὰ συνκρίνοντες. — Also = to resolve upon, Num. xiv. 34, cf. σύνκριμα, Dan. iv. 21; 1 Macc. i. 57.

Ἵποκρίνω, in Homer and Herodotus in the middle instead of ἀποκρίνεσθαι = to

answer, and also as meaning to distinguish, or to inquire, e.g. ὑποκρίνειν τοὺς ἀντιδίκους, to institute an inquiry against, etc. (Bekk. *Anecd.* 449. 25), though this perhaps is to be attributed to the force of the preposition ὑπό in composition, as = *secretly*; cf. for example, ὑποκρούω, to knock gently or unobservedly. In its primary meaning, to inquire, to distinguish, the word is used of expounding or interpreting of dreams, etc., *Od.* xix. 535. 555. It is difficult to explain the use of ὑποκρίνεσθαι to denote the appearing of actors upon the stage. Comparing the use of the word as denoting the coming forward of speakers, orators, rhapsodists (e.g. *Plut. Dem.* 11, τοῖς πολλοῖς ὑποκρινόμενος ἤρεσκε θαυμαστῶς; *Timaeus, Lex. Plat.* 191, 'Ομηρίδαι' οἱ τὰ 'Ομήρου ὑποκρινόμενοι), we must allow that the signification, to represent, to act, or simulate anything as an actor, arose from the application of the word in Attic Greek to persons carrying on a dialogue in a play; otherwise one might be tempted to resort for an explanation to the primary meaning of the word to divide secretly. However this may be, ὑποκρίνεσθαι is generally applied to actors, and then means generally to act a part, to give oneself out for what one is not, e.g. *Lucian, Nigr.* 11, ὑποκρίνεσθαι ἡρῶα; *Polyb.* xv. 26. 2, τὸν οὐ δυνάμενον, to act as if one could not; *2 Macc.* v. 21, τὸν εἰρηνικόν, to act the peacemaker; vi. 21, ὑποκριθῆναι ὡς ἐσθλόντα. In the LXX. only in *Isa.* iii. 6 = to answer; in the Apocrypha = to represent oneself, to simulate, to disguise oneself. Lastly, with reference to the moral and religious life, *Ecclus.* xxxv. 15, xxxvi. 2. In the N. T. *Luke* xx. 20, ὑποκρινομένους ἑαυτοὺς δικαίους εἶναι.

Ἑπόκρισις, ἡ, the acting of the player, the declamation of the orator, etc. Thence = pretence, hypocrisy, e.g. *Schol. Hom. Il.* xv. 101, γέλως πρὸς ὑπόκρισιν γενόμενος; *Phalaris, Epist.* lxii. 192, ὑποκρίσει . . . καὶ οὐκ ἀληθεῖα χρηστὸς γεγονέναι. First, with reference to particular acts, *Gal.* ii. 13, Βαρνάβας συναπήχθη αὐτῶν τῇ ὑπόκρισει; *2 Macc.* vi. 25, διὰ τὴν ἐμὴν ὑπόκρισιν πλανᾶσθαι; *Mark* xii. 15, εἰδὼς αὐτῶν τὴν ὑπόκρισιν; *1 Pet.* ii. 1, ἀποθέμενοι οὖν πᾶσαν κακίαν καὶ πάντα δόλον καὶ ὑποκρίσεις. Then, as a habit or character, *Matt.* xxiii. 28, ὑμεῖς ἔξωθεν μὲν φαίνεσθε τοῖς ἀνθρώποις δίκαιοι, ἔσωθεν δέ ἐστε μεστοὶ ὑποκρίσεως καὶ ἀνομίας. *Luke* xii. 1, ἡ ζύμη τῶν φαρισαίων ἐστὶν ὑπόκρισις. It is a special quasi-religious bias of character, a description of which is given in *Matt.* xv. 8; *vid. καρδιά*. With this religious reference ὑποκριτής is generally used. With the expression ἐν ὑποκρίσει ψευδολόγοι, *1 Tim.* iv. 2, cf. *Plat. Soph.* 229, ἡ ἐν τοῖς λόγοις διδασκαλική; *Eur. Or.* 754, ἐν γυναιξὶν ἄλκιμος; *Hesych.*, ὑπόκρισις· εἰρωνεία, ὑπουλότης, δόλος. The LXX. render the corresponding Hebrew word רֶחַק by δολοῦν, δολοῦν.

Ἑποκριτής, ὁ, an expounder or interpreter of dreams. *Plat. Tim.* 72 B, τῆς δι' αἰνιγμάτων φήμης καὶ φαντάσεως ὑποκριταί. Hence usually an actor, *Hesych.*, ὁ ἐν τῇ σκηνῇ ὑποκρινόμενος. In a derivative sense, a hypocrite, *Eustath.* 687. 27, ὑποκρινόμενος καὶ ὑποκριτής παρὰ τοῖς ὑστερογενέσι ρήτορσιν ὁ μὴ ἐκ ψυχῆς λέγων ἢ πράττων μηδὲ ἄπερ φρονεῖ, ὅποιοι πρῶτως καὶ μάλιστα οἱ τῆς θυμέλης, οἱ σκηνικοί. In the N. T. only in the synoptical Gospels, *Matt.* vi. 2, 5, 16, vii. 5, xv. 7, xvi. 3, xxii. 18, xxiii. 13, 14, 15,

23, 25, 27, 29, xxiv. 51; Mark vii. 6; Luke vi. 42, xi. 44, xii. 56, xiii. 15. Theophylact's formal definition, ἵποκριταὶ εἰσιν οἱ ἄλλο μὲν ὄντες, ἄλλο δὲ φαινόμενοι, is inadequate. The hypocrite seeks to appear before men as he ought to be but is not before God, comp. Matt. vi. 1, 2, 5. It answers to δόλφος in Jas. iv. 8, cf. Matt. xxiv. 51, διχοτομεῖν.

Ἄνυπόκριτος, little used in classical Greek = inexperienced in the art of acting. In biblical Greek, Wisd. xviii. 16, ξίφος ὃξὺ τὴν ἀνυπόκριτον ἐπιταγὴν σου φέρων; v. 19, ἐνδύσεται θώρακα δικαιοσύνης, καὶ περιθήσεται κόρυθα κρίσιν ἀνυπόκριτον. In this last text ἀνυπόκρ. stands contrasted with the judgment of the προσωποληψία (cf. Rom. ii. 11). In the former passage the divine command (Ex. xi. 1, 2) is thus designated as *seriously meant*; cf. Hab. ii. 3; 2 Pet. iii. 9-11. Otherwise used only in the N. T. and in ecclesiastical Greek as = *unfeigned, genuine*; thus ἀγάπη ἀνυπόκριτος, Rom. xii. 9; 2 Cor. vi. 6, cf. φιλαδελφία ἀνυπόκριτος, 1 Pet. i. 22; πίστις ἀν., 1 Tim. i. 5; 2 Tim. i. 5. Cf. John i. 48, ἐν ᾧ δόλος οὐκ ἔστι. *Unskilled in simulation*, Jas. iii. 17, ἡ ἄνωθεν σοφία . . . ἀδιάκριτος καὶ ἀνυπόκριτος, where ἀδιάκριτος, like ii. 4, is correctly rendered by Luther *impartial*, see Wisd. v. 19. (Ἀδιάκρ. is not used in an active sense in classical Greek.) Hesych., ἄδολος, ἀπροσωπόληπτος.

Κτίζω, ἔκτισα, κέκτισμαι, ἐκτίσθην (with euphonistic σ), literally, to make habitable, to build, to plant a colony (according to Curtius, p. 144, from the root κτι, cf. εὐκτίμενος, "well built," περικτίονες, ἀμφικτίονες, "dwellers around," Sanskrit, *kshi, kshijámi*, "to dwell," *kshitis*, "a dwelling"). Thus Homer, *Od.* xi. 263, οἱ πρῶτοι Θήβης ἔδος ἔκτισαν. So, too, Herodotus, who also uses the expression κτίζειν χώραν, νῆσον, to make a settlement, to furnish with settlers. Generally, to be the first in setting up anything, to be the founder, e.g. κτίσει ἑορτάν, Pind. *Ol.* vi. 116; to invent, Soph. *O. C.* 715, ἵπποισι τὸν χαλιδὸν κτίσας. Then, in general, to set up, to establish, to effect anything.

In the LXX. it answers mainly to the Hebrew בָּרָא, though this word in Genesis is always rendered by ποιεῖν, and afterwards by either ποιεῖν or κτίζειν, and, indeed, more rarely by ποιεῖν, but not (as has been said) exclusively by κτίζειν, "when the doctrine of creation out of nothing arose" (Fürst, *Hebr. Wörterbuch*). בָּרָא = ποιεῖν, Gen. i. 1, 21, 27, v. 1, 2, vi. 7; Isa. xlii. 5, xliii. 1, xlv. 7, 12, et al.; = κτίζειν, first in Deut. iv. 32, then in Ps. li. 12, lxxxix. 13, 48, cii. 19, civ. 30, cxlviii. 5; Isa. xxii. 11, xlv. 8; Ezek. xxviii. 13, 15; Amos iv. 13. Κτίζειν differs from its synonym ποιεῖν, inasmuch as the latter denotes a making or preparation, and the former the first making, the beginning or origin. Cf. Eph. ii. 10, αὐτοῦ γὰρ ἔσμεν ποίημα, κτισθέντες. Cf. בָּרָא = ἀρχεσθαι, Gen. ii. 3. בָּרָא occurs only with God as its subject.

In the Apocrypha, κτίζειν perfectly corresponds with the Hebrew בָּרָא, as signifying God's creative activity, and so also in the N. T. side by side with ποιεῖν. Judith xiii. 24; Wisd. i. 14, ii. 23, xiii. 3; Eccles. x. 22, xv. 14, xvii. 1, xxiii. 29, xxxiii. 11, and elsewhere. With the classical use of the word, 1 Esdr. iv. 53, κτίζειν πόλιν, corresponds, cf. Lev. xvi. 16, ἡ σκίνη ἣ ἐκτισμένη αὐτοῖς (a misunderstanding of the Hebrew בִּנְיָ).

Ecclus. vii. 16, γεωργία ὑπὸ ἰφρίστου ἐκτισμένη. In the N. T. κτίζειν denotes (a.) God's world-creating activity, with object, Mark xiii. 19; Eph. iii. 9; Rev. iv. 11, x. 6; cf. 1 Cor. xi. 9; Col. i. 16; 1 Tim. iv. 3; without object, Rom. i. 25. (b.) Man's re-creation in the economy of grace, the restoration of his original but lost purity, Eph. iv. 24, ἐνδύσασθαι τὸν καινὸν ἄνθρ. τὸν κατὰ θεὸν κτισθέντα ἐν κ.τ.λ., cf. Col. iii. 10, ἐνδυσάμενοι τὸν νέον τὸν ἀνακαινούμενον . . . κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτόν; Eph. ii. 10, αὐτοῦ γὰρ ἔσμεν ποίημα, κτισθέντες ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ἐπὶ ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς. Cf. Eph. ii. 15, ἵνα τοὺς δύο κτίσῃ . . . εἰς ἓνα καινὸν ἄνθρ.

Κτίσις, ἡ, founding, e.g. τῆς πόλεως. Also colonization, in a passive sense, in Polyb. ix. 1. 4. Establishment or ordinance, cf. ἐροτὴν κτίζειν. Thus in 1 Pet. ii. 13, ὑποτάγητε οὖν πάσῃ ἀνθρωπίνῃ κτίσει. Cf. Pind. Ol. xiii. 118.—Not in the LXX. In the Apocrypha as = creation in a passive sense—(I.) What is created, Judith ix. 12, βασιλεὺ πάσης κτίσεώς σου; Ecclus. xliii. 25.—(II.) The sum-total of what is created, the creation, Judith xvi. 12, σοὶ δουλεύσάτω πάντα ἡ κτίσις σου; Wisd. v. 17, xvi. 24, xix. 6; Ecclus. xlix. 16. So also in the N. T., excepting 1 Pet. ii. 13, e.g. Mark xiii. 19, ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως ἧς ἔκτισεν ὁ θεός; Mark x. 6. And here in like manner it denotes (a.) what is created, i.e. the individual creature. Rom. i. 25, ἐλάτρευσαν τῇ κτίσει παρὰ τὸν κτίσαντα; viii. 39, οὔτε τις κτίσις ἐτέρα; Col. i. 15, πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως; Heb. iv. 13. (b.) The sum-total of what God has created, the creation, Mark xiii. 19, x. 6; 2 Pet. iii. 4; Rev. iii. 14; Heb. ix. 11; Rom. i. 20, cf. Ecclus. xliii. 25. (c.) Specially mankind (cf. Ecclus. xlix. 16, ὑπὲρ πάντων ζῶων ἐν τῇ κτίσει ἐδοξάσθη Ἀδάμ), Mark xvi. 15, κηρύξατε τὸ εὐαγγ. πάσῃ τῇ κτίσει. So also Col. i. 23, εὐαγγελίου κηρυχθέντος ἐν πάσῃ κτίσει τῇ ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανόν; cf. 1 Tim. iii. 16, ἐκηρύχθη ἐν ἔθνεσιν. But it is doubtful whether, as some think, κτίσις signifies mankind in Rom. viii. 19, ἀποκαταδοκία τῆς κτίσεως, vv. 20–22. On this supposition, the word here must denote, not mankind, but mankind with the exception of, and in contrast with, the children of God, cf. αὐτὴ ἡ κτίσις, ver. 21. But when κτίσις denotes mankind, mankind without any exception are meant. Ἀυτὴ ἡ κτίσις (ver. 21) can be contrasted with the τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ only by taking κτίσις to mean the creation as distinct from mankind, as in Wisd. v. 17, xvi. 24, xix. 6. Of what is said concerning this, συστενάζει καὶ συνωδίνει, cf. Isa. xxxv. 4; Hos. ii. 21, 22; Amos ix. 13; Isa. lv. 12; Ps. xcvi. 8; Hab. ii. 11; Ezek. xxxi. 15. (d.) Καινὴ κτίσις, a new creation or creature, of the renewed man, 2 Cor. v. 17; Gal. vi. 15.—The Greek Fathers distinguish (1) πρώτη κτίσις . . . ἡ ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ὄντος εἰς τὸ εἶναι παραγωγή; (2) ἡ ἐκ τοῦ ὄντος ἐπὶ τὸ βέλτιον μεταβολή . . . δευτέρα, καινὴ κτίσις; (3) τρίτη κτίσις, like Isa. lxv. 17, lxvi. 22, corresponding with the ἐξανάστασις τῶν νεκρῶν. Chrys., Basil. M.

Κτίσμα, τό, in Strabo, a place founded, built, colonized, the founding of towns, e.g. Φάρος, Παρίων κτίσμα. Not in the LXX. In the Apocrypha, on the other hand, that which is created, creature, Wisd. ix. 2, xiii. 5, xiv. 11; 3 Macc. v. 11; Ecclus. xxxviii. 24.

Of the children of Israel, Ecclus. xxxvi. 20, δὸς μαρτύριον τοῖς ἐν ἀρχῇ κτισμασί σου In the N. T. = creature, created thing, 1 Tim. iv. 4; Rev. v. 13, viii. 9; Jas. i. 18.

Κτίστης, ὁ, settler, founder, inventor, in later Greek. LXX. 2 Sam. xxii. 32 = creator (a misunderstanding of the Hebrew text, or a different reading). In the Apocrypha, Judith ix. 12; Ecclus. xxiv. 8; 2 Macc. i. 24, vii. 23, xiii. 14, of God. In the N. T. 1 Pet. iv. 19.

Κύριος, properly an adjective, from κύρος, *might* = *mighty*, e.g. Arist. Pol. iii. 10, τὸ κύριον τῆς πόλεως, *the ruling power*. Further = *decisive, valid, having the force of law, rightly established*, e.g. κυρία ἡμέρα, ἐκκλησία. Then, as a substantive, ὁ κύριος, *lord, owner, ruler*, cf. Matt. x. 24, 25, xii. 8, xv. 27, xviii. 25, 27, 31, 32, 34, xx. 8, etc. It is distinguished from δεσπότης, as he who really has the strength from him who assumes and exercises it.

In the LXX. it is first used as the translation of אֲדֹנָיִם, Gen. xviii. 12, xlii. 33; in addressing any one, e.g. xlii. 10, just as in classical Greek, and like the Latin *dominus*, cf. Seneca, Ep. 3, *obvius si nomen non succurrit, dominos appellamus*. Next in a special sense, as = אֲדֹנָיִם, of GOD, Gen. xviii. 3, 27, Ex. iv. 10, and often, and especially as a substitute for יהוה, which, through a misunderstanding of Lev. xxiv. 16, was never uttered, and for the corresponding אֲדֹנָיִם, which was read in its stead. (Sometimes also as = אֱלֹהִים.)

In the N. T., accordingly, κύριος appears (I.) as a name for God; (a.) as predicated of Him = אֲדֹנָיִם, אֲדֹנִי, e.g. Acts x. 36, οὗτός ἐστιν πάντων κύριος; Rom. x. 12, ὁ γὰρ αὐτὸς κύριος πάντων. Cf. Matt. xi. 25, κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς; Luke x. 21; (b.) generally as a name of God when He is addressed or spoken of; this besides אֲדֹנָיִם with suffixes, as in Rev. xi. 15, especially as = אֲדֹנִי, as used to represent יהוה. So also in such combinations as ἄγγελος κυρίου, Matt. i. 20, 24, ii. 13, 19, xxviii. 2; Luke i. 11; Acts v. 19, vii. 30, viii. 26, xii. 23. τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπὸ [τοῦ] κυρίου, Matt. i. 22, ii. 15; cf. Acts xi. 16, etc. πνεῦμα κυρίου, Luke iv. 18, Acts viii. 39; ὁδὸς κυρίου, Matt. iii. 3; νόμος κυρίου, ἡμέρα κυρίου, and others; κύριος ὁ θεός, Rev. i. 8, xxii. 5; cf. κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ (תְּשֻׁבָּה), Rev. iv. 8, xi. 17, xv. 3, xvi. 7, xxi. 22; κύριος ὁ θεὸς τινος, Matt. iv. 7, 10; Luke xx. 37; Rev. xxii. 6, and often; lastly, standing by itself as a name for the God of salvation, יהוה, e.g. Acts xii. 11, 17.

(II.) As a name for *Christ*, because the same relationship to us is attributed to Him as that of God to us, cf. John xx. 28, ὁ κύριός μου καὶ ὁ θεός μου (not = יהוה, which never appears with suffixes); Acts ii. 36, καὶ κύριον αὐτὸν καὶ Χριστὸν ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός. That κύριος, as used of Christ, answers only to the O. T. אֲדֹנָיִם, אֲדֹנִי, and not to יהוה, is evident, not only on internal grounds, but by several differences in the use of the latter word. While, on the one hand, such expressions as κύριός τινος, —μου, —ἡμῶν, very often occur in reference to Christ, so often that κύριος standing alone cannot be distinguished from them, יהוה, on the other hand, as a proper name never has suffixes; and

in the N. T., accordingly, *κύριος* when used of God very rarely occurs with the genitive of the person, and when it does it answers to אֲדֹנָיִם with suffixes. Again, while *κύριος* = יהוה, joined with אֱלֹהִים and יהוה אֱלֹהִים, is one of the most frequent designations of God, Christ the *κύριος* is *never* called *κύριος ὁ θεός*, which would be quite unaccountable if יהוה were applied to Christ. It would be unaccountable, moreover, that even where mention is made of the revelation of God in Christ, 2 Cor. iv. 6, John i. 18, the defective supplement (*God*) to the distinctive name of God is used instead of that name (*Jehovah*) itself. We may compare also Χριστὸς κύριος (which, if *κύριος* meant *Jehovah*, must be = מְשִׁיחַ הַיְהוָה), Luke ii. 11 with ii. 26, Χριστὸς κυρίου, הַיְהוָה מְשִׁיחַ, where, on the contrary, the former answers to Χριστὸς βασιλεύς, Luke xxiii. 42, comp. with Acts ii. 36. (Cf. τὸ κυριακόν, a name for fiscal ownership, synonymous with τὸ βασιλικόν.) Further, comp. Luke i. 76, προπορεύσῃ γὰρ πρὸ προσώπου κυρίου, as parallel with προφήτης ὑψίστου κληθήσῃ, where *κύριος* is not a designation of Jesus Christ, but has regard to the O. T. promise of the coming of *Jehovah*. (In like manner compare ἡμέρα τοῦ κυρίου, הַיּוֹם הַהוּא, with ἡμ. τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν, under ἡμέρα.) It is also noticeable that *κύριος* as = יהוה when applied to God in the N. T. occurs almost always in O. T. quotations or references alone; whereas, in strictly N. T. diction, another designation supplies the place of this distinctive name, and stands related to it as fulfilment does to prophecy, ὁ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ or ὁ πατήρ (in Rev., ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ᾔν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος), cf. e.g. Zech. xiv. 7 with Matt. xxiv. 46. Lastly, for the designation of Christ as *κύριος*, there is a special point of connection and explanation in the O. T., viz. in Ps. cx. 1, אֲדֹנָיִם הַיְהוָה, εἶπεν ὁ κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου; cf. Matt. xxii. 43–45, πῶς οὖν Δαυὶδ ἐν πνεύματι καλεῖ αὐτὸν κύριον; cf. Mark xii. 36, 37 with Luke ii. 11; Acts ii. 36. Stress accordingly is laid upon the authority and kingship belonging to Christ as expressed by this appellation (Luke ii. 11, xxiii. 2; Acts ii. 36); *vid.* Luke vi. 46, τί με καλεῖτε, κύριε, κύριε, καὶ οὐ ποιεῖτε ὃ λέγω; John xiii. 13, 14, ὑμεῖς φωνεῖτέ με ὁ διδάσκαλος καὶ ὁ κύριος, καὶ καλῶς λέγετε· εἰμὶ γάρ; 1 Cor. viii. 6, ἡμῖν εἰς θεὸς ὁ πατὴρ . . . καὶ εἰς κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, cf. Eph. iv. 5. — In St. Matthew *κύριε* very often occurs as a term of address; but ὁ κύριος is not used as a *name* of Christ (except in Matt. xxi. 3, ὁ κύριος αὐτῶν χρεῖαν ἔχει) until after the resurrection, Matt. xxviii. 6, ἵπου ἔκειτο ὁ κύριος. In St. Mark, on the contrary, we find it as early as chap. v. 19, and in Luke, John, and Acts far oftener; cf. Luke ii. 11, v. 17, vii. 13, x. 1, xi. 39, xii. 42, xvii. 5, 6, xix. 8, xxii. 31, 61, xxiv. 3, 34; John iv. 1, vi. 23, xi. 2, xx. 2, 18, 20, etc.; cf. Bengel on Luke vii. 13, *Sublimis haec appellatio jam Luca et Joanne scribente usitatior et notior erat, quam Matthaeo scribente; Marcus medium tenet. Initio doceri et confirmari debuit hoc fidei caput, deinde praesupponi potuit.* What Bengel thus explains by a reference to the time of writing will be better accounted for by a consideration of the readers, for whom primarily each Gospel was prepared.

Applied to Christ, we find the term ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς first in Acts i. 21, then in iv. 33, ix. 28, xi. 20, xv. 11, xix. 5, and other places; Rom. xiv. 14; 1 Cor. xi. 23; 2 Cor. i. 14, iv. 14, etc. κύρ. Ἰησοῦς, Ἰησοῦς κύρ., 1 Cor. xii. 3; Rom. x. 9. ὁ κύρ. Ἰησοῦς

Χριστός, Acts xi. 17, xvi. 31, xx. 21; 1 Cor. xvi. 22, 23; Jas. i. 1. More frequently ὁ κύρ. ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, or Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ κύρ. ἡμῶν, cf. Ἰησοῦς ὁ κύρ. ἡμῶν, Rom. iv. 24; 2 Pet. i. 2 (Received text). Then simply, ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν, e.g. 2 Tim. i. 8; and lastly, ὁ κύριος and κύριος, in the Pauline Epistles and elsewhere. In the Revelation, only xxii. 20, 21, cf. xix. 16. Not at all in 1 and 3 John, Jas. v. 11. It is further to be observed that κύριος is sometimes used without any defined and *particular* reference to God or Christ, and according to the context either includes both, or, as in e.g. Rom. xiv. 1–12, finally concentrates itself upon Christ; 2 Tim. ii. 14, 15, 19, 22 sqq.; 1 Thess. iii. 11–13, iv. 1–6. Comp. Hofmann upon the last-named passage.

The expression ἐν κυρίῳ is peculiar to the Pauline writings (elsewhere only in Rev. xiv. 13, οἱ ἐν κ. ἀποθνῆσκοντες). Rom. xvi. 11, τοὺς ὄντας ἐν κυρίῳ; 1 Cor. xi. 11, οὔτε γυνὴ χωρὶς ἀνδρὸς, οὔτε ἀνὴρ χωρὶς γυναικὸς ἐν κυρίῳ; ix. 1, τὸ ἔργον μου ὑμεῖς ἐστέ ἐν κυρίῳ, ver. 2, ἡ σφραγὶς μου τῆς ἀποστολῆς ὑμεῖς ἐστέ ἐν κυρίῳ; Rom. xvi. 8, ὁ ἀγαπητός μου ἐν κ.; xvi. 13, ὁ ἐκλεκτός ἐν κ.; 1 Cor. iv. 17, ὅς ἐστίν μου τέκνον ἀγαπητὸν καὶ πιστὸν ἐν κ.; vii. 22, ἐν κ. κληθεὶς δοῦλος; Eph. iv. 1, ἐγὼ ὁ δέσμιος ἐν κ.; v. 8, νῦν δὲ φῶς ἐν κ.; vi. 21, πιστὸς διάκονος ἐν κ.; Phil. i. 14, οἱ ἀδελφοὶ ἐν κ.; Col. iii. 20, εὐάρεστος ἐν κ.; iv. 7, σύνδουλος ἐν κ.; Eph. ii. 21, ναὸς ἁγ. ἐν κ.; 1 Thess. v. 12, προϊστάμενοι ὑμῶν ἐν κ.; Philem. 16, ἀδελφὸς ἀγαπητὸς καὶ ἐν σαρκὶ καὶ ἐν κ.; Rom. xvi. 2, κοπιᾶν ἐν κ.; xvi. 22, ἀσπάξασθαι ἐν κ.; 1 Cor. xvi. 19, i. 31, ἐν κ. καυχᾶσθαι; 2 Cor. x. 17.—1 Cor. vii. 39, γαμηθῆναι ἐν κ.; Eph. iv. 17, μαρτύρεσθαι ἐν κ.; 1 Thess. iv. 1, παρακαλεῖν ἐν κ.; vi. 1, ὑπακούειν ἐν κ.; vi. 10, ἐνδυναμοῦσθαι ἐν κ.; Phil. ii. 19, ἐλπίζειν ἐν κ. Ἰησοῦ; ii. 24, πεποιθέναι ἐν κ.; Gal. v. 10, comp. Rom. xiv. 14; Phil. iii. 1, χαίρειν ἐν κ.; iv. 4, 10.—iv. 1, στήκειν ἐν κ.; 1 Thess. iii. 8; iv. 2, φρονεῖν ἐν κ.—Rom. xvi. 2, προσδέχεσθαι ἐν κ.; Phil. ii. 29.—Col. iv. 17, παραλαμβάνειν ἐν κ.; Philem. 20, ὄνασθαί τινος ἐν κ., and in the same verse, ἀναπαύειν τινὰ ἐν κ.—1 Cor. xv. 58, ὁ κόπος ὑμῶν οὐκ ἔστιν κενὸς ἐν κυρίῳ. In like manner the expression ἐν Χριστῷ is almost exclusively Pauline, Rom. viii. 1, οἱ ἐν Χριστῷ; 1 Cor. i. 30, ἐξ αὐτοῦ δὲ ὑμεῖς ἐστέ ἐν Χριστῷ; Rom. xvi. 7, πρὸ ἐμοῦ γεγόνασιν ἐν Χριστῷ; Gal. iii. 28, εἰς ἐστέ ἐν Χριστῷ; comp. Phil. iii. 9, εὑρεθῆναι ἐν Χριστῷ; Eph. ii. 12, 13, ἦτε τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ χωρὶς Χριστοῦ... νυνὶ δὲ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ... ἐγγὺς ἐγενήθητε κ.τ.λ.; Rom. vi. 11, ζῆν ἐν Χριστῷ; 2 Tim. ii. 12.—1 Cor. xv. 18, κοιμηθῆναι ἐν Χριστῷ; Col. ii. 6, περιπατεῖν ἐν Χριστῷ. Thus, in various combinations, Rom. viii. 39, ix. 1, xii. 5, xv. 17, xvi. 3, 9, 10; 1 Cor. i. 2, iii. 1, iv. 10, 15, 17, xv. 19, 31, xvi. 24; 2 Cor. ii. 17, v. 17, xii. 2, 19; Gal. i. 22, ii. 17, vi. 17; Eph. i. 1, ii. 10, iii. 21; Phil. i. 1, 13, ii. 1, 19, iii. 3, iv. 7, 21; Col. i. 2, 28; 1 Thess. ii. 14, iv. 16; 1 Tim. ii. 7; Philem. 8, 23. Besides Paul's writings, only in 1 Pet. v. 14, iii. 16. In all these places a peculiar union of the Christian *subject* with the Lord is treated of. Next, we must refer to the passages in which the blessings of redemption, God's saving purpose, etc., are represented *objectively* as all included in Christ, as objects at hand and made present in Him and with Him, Rom. vi. 23, vii. 2, 39; 1 Cor. i. 4; 2 Cor. v. 19; Gal. ii. 4, iii. 14; Eph. i. 3, ii. 6, 7, iii. 11, iv. 32; Phil. ii. 5; 2 Tim.

ii. 10; 1 Pet. v. 10, to which may perhaps be added *θύρα ἀνεφγμένη ἐν κυρίῳ*, 2 Cor. ii. 12. This mode of expression denotes the union with Christ which he possesses who has found and laid hold upon his life in Christ, and possesses it in Him, who therefore resorts continually to Him, and draws supplies from Him in life, in conduct, and in experience,—in a word, who can or would no more separate Christ from himself than he could separate his salvation from Christ; thus the statements made concerning the Christian *subject* who is in Christ coincide with those concerning the object, *i.e.* the salvation, the life which is in Christ, *e.g.* *ζῆν ἐν Χριστῷ*, Rom. vi. 11; *ζωὴ ἐν Χριστῷ*, vi. 23, viii. 2, and other places. For him who is *in the Lord*, or who is anything in Him, and for that likewise which is done *in the Lord*, Christ is the foundation and the spring, the strength and stay, or in the fullest sense *the sphere* in which both he (subject) and it (object) exist; and thus the significance of this mode of expression is not to be understood simply as linguistic, but as involving a fact, the verbal parallels of profane Greek only approximately embodying the thing itself. Comp. Matthiae, *Gramm.* § 577; Soph. *Aj.* 519, *ἐν σοὶ πᾶς ἔγωγε σώζομαι*; Herod. vi. 109, *ἐν σοὶ νῦν ἐστὶ ἡ καταδουλώσαι Ἀθήνας ἢ ἐλευθερώσαι*; Hom. *Il.* vii. 102, *νίκης πείρατ' ἔχονται ἐν ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι*; Soph. *Oed. Col.* 247, *ἐν ὑμῖν, ὡς θεῷ, κείμεθα τλάμονες*. Comp. Acts xvii. 28, *ἐν αὐτῷ γὰρ ζῶμεν καὶ κινούμεθα καὶ ἐσμέν*.

Κυριακός, belonging to a lord or ruler, *e.g.* *τὸ κυριακόν*, *state- or fiscal-property*, synonymous with *τὸ βασιλικόν* (seldom used). In the N. T. and ecclesiastical Greek as = belonging to Christ, to the Lord, having special reference to Him, *e.g.* 1 Cor. xi. 20, *κυριακὸν δεῖπνον* of the Holy Supper. Rev. i. 10, *κυριακὴ ἡμέρα* seems to be analogous to this; in the early church it was universally understood to denote Sunday, the day kept in commemoration of Christ's resurrection, cf. John xx. 24–29; Acts xx. 7; 1 Cor. xvi. 2. Observe also the prominence given to the resurrection, Rev. i. 5, 18; Barnab. *Ep.* 15, *ἄγομεν τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ὀγδοὴν εἰς εὐφροσύνην, ἐν ᾗ καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνέστη ἐκ νεκρῶν*; Ignat. *ad Magnes.* 9, *μηκέτι σαββατίζοντες, ἀλλὰ κατὰ κυριακὴν ζῶντες*. That *κυριακὴ ἡμέρα* = *ἡμέρα τοῦ κυρίου* is by no means indicated by the context.

Κυριότης, ἡ, dominion; Eph. i. 21; Col. i. 16, with *ἀρχαί, δυνάμεις, ἐξουσία*, of angelic powers, and in Eph. i. 21, seemingly of evil powers (cf. *ἐξουσία* and *ἀρχή*). This reference seems inadmissible in Col. i. 16. To explain the word in 2 Pet. ii. 10, *κυριότητος καταφρονεῖν*, and Jude 8, *κυριότητα ἀθετεῖν* (in both places used synonymously with *δόξαι*), as denoting evil angelic powers, seems necessary according to 2 Pet. ii. 11, though not according to Jude 9 (for there the argument is *a minori ad majus*); yet the connection with *δόξαι* seems to render this difficult, inasmuch as it would be at least very strange for *δόξαι* to denote evil powers (see *δόξα*). The word is peculiar to N. T. and patristic Greek, in which latter it is used to denote *the kingly glory of Christ*.

Δ

Δαμβάνω, to take, to take hold of, to seize. The usually received Alexandrine method of writing this word as stated by Tisch. is to be observed, viz. λήμφομαι, ἐλήμφθην, λήμψις, etc.

Ἀντιλαμβάνω, to receive in return for. Used especially in the middle as = to lay hold upon something before one, e.g. to take part in the affairs of state, πραγμάτων (Xen. Dem.); to seize upon or take possession of a place (Thuc.), to carry on a trade or prosecute a study, e.g. ὀρχήσεως, Plat. Legg. vii. 815 B; ἐπιστήμης, Baruch iii. 21. To attain something, Thuc. iii. 22, πρὶν σφῶν οἱ ἄνδρες οἱ ἐξιόντες διαφύγοιεν καὶ τοῦ ἀσφαλοῦς ἀντιλάβουτο; 1 Tim. vi. 2, οἱ τῆς εὐεργεσίας ἀντιλαμβανόμενοι. To lay hold of a person or thing helpfully, Plut. Pyrrh. 25; Diod. xi. 13, ὥστε δοκεῖν τὸ θεῖον ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι τῶν Ἑλλήνων. In this sense mostly in the LXX., e.g. = ἤν, Ps. cxviii. 13; 1 Chron. xxii. 17; 2 Chron. xxviii. 23; פִּיחַ, Piel and Hiphil, Ps. lxxxix. 42; Lev. xxv. 35; 2 Chron. xxviii. 15; Isa. xli. 9, li. 18; Ezek. xvi. 48, and often. (Seldom in other combinations, such as, e.g., 2 Chron. vii. 22; 1 Kings ix. 9, ἐγκατέλιπον κύριον θεὸν αὐτῶν . . . καὶ ἀντελάβοντο θεὸν ἄλλοτριῶν.) So always in the Apocrypha = to hold helpfully, to help, Wisd. ii. 18; Ecclus. ii. 6, iii. 12, xii. 4, 7, xxix. 6, 20; Judith xiii. 5; 2 Macc. xiv. 15; 1 Macc. ii. 48. So in the N. T. Acts xx. 35, ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι τῶν ἀσθενούντων; Luke i. 54, ἀντελάβετο Ἰσραὴλ παιδὸς αὐτοῦ. Cf. συναντιλαμβάνεσθαι, mainly peculiar to biblical Greek, Ps. lxxxix. 21; Ex. xviii. 22; Num. xi. 17; Luke x. 40; Rom. viii. 26.

Ἀντίληψις, ἡ (ἀντίλημψις, thus often), literally, the receiving of remuneration. Then a laying hold of anything, the hold which one has, e.g. Diod. i. 30, οὐδεμίαν ἀντίληψιν βοηθείας ἔχειν, perception, apprehension, etc. In biblical Greek it is used (like the verb), in a sense unknown in classical Greek, to denote a rendering assistance, help. So in the LXX. = ἤν, Ps. xxii. 20, εἰς τὴν ἀντίληψίν μου πρόσχες; = ἤν, Ps. lxxxiv. 6, μακάριος ἄνθρωπος οὗ ἐστὶν ἀντίληψις αὐτοῦ παρὰ σοῦ, κύριε; = ἤν, Ps. cviii. 9, ἀντίληψις τῆς κεφαλῆς μου; = ἤν, Ps. lxxxix. 19, ὅτι τοῦ κυρίου ἡ ἀντίληψις; = ἤν, Ps. lxxxiii. 9, ἐγενήθησαν εἰς ἀντίληψιν τοῖς υἱοῖς Δάτ. So also in the Apocrypha, cf. Ecclus. xi. 12, li. 7; 2 Macc. xv. 7; 1 Esdras viii. 27; 2 Macc. viii. 19. Thus we must understand the word in 1 Cor. xii. 28 also, where, among the institutions appointed by the Lord for the edification of the church, ἀντιλήμψεις, κυβερνήσεις are named, and ἀντ. are taken by the Greek expositors uniformly as answering to deacons (implying the duties towards the poor and sick, Theophylact, τὸ ἀντέχεσθαι τῶν ἀσθενῶν (?), vid. διάκονος), as κυβερν. as answering to presbyters. In patristic Greek the word also denotes help.

Εὐλαβής, ἐς = ὁ εὖ τῶν πραγμάτων ἐπιλαμβανόμενος, Suid.; prudent, cautious, circumspect, thoughtful, considering well. Thus Demosthenes meets the reproach of

cowardice (ἄτολμος καὶ δειλὸς πρὸς ὄχλους) by describing himself as εὐλαβής (405. 19). Often in Plut. = *thoughtful*. Aristotle, *Rhet.* i. 12, καὶ τοὺς μὴ εὐλαβεῖς μηδὲ φυλακτικούς ἀλλὰ πιστευτικούς. Also = *timid*, e.g. Philo, *Vit. Mos.* 1, καὶ ἅμα τὴν φύσιν εὐλαβὴς ὧν ὑπεστέλλετο. It corresponds with the Latin *religiosus*. Plato sometimes joins it with δίκαιος = *conscientious, morally careful*; *Polit.* 311 B, τὸ δίκαιον καὶ εὐλαβές, as attributes of character; *ibid.* A, τὰ σωφρόνων ἀρχόντων ἦθη σφόδρα μὲν εὐλαβῇ καὶ δίκαια καὶ σωτήρια. The word, therefore, is not inappropriately used to denote religious conduct, as e.g. the adj. εὐλαβῶς is joined by Demosth. with εὐσεβῶς. In classical Greek, however, εὐλάβεια and εὐλαβεῖσθαι only are used expressly in a religious sense. The LXX. in one case render ἸϞϞ (synon. ἸϞϞ), Mic. vii. 2, by εὐλαβής (cf. Prov. ii. 8), *vid.* ὅσιος. It also occurs in Num. xv. 31, εὐλαβεῖς ποιήσετε τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραὴλ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀκαθαρσιῶν αὐτῶν = *וַיִּשְׁמְרוּ*, Hiphil, *to warn*. In the N. T. εὐλαβής, εὐλάβεια, εὐλαβεῖσθαι occur only in Luke's writings and in the Hebrews; Luke ii. 25, of Simeon, ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος δίκαιος καὶ εὐλαβής; Acts ii. 5, viii. 2, ἄνδρες εὐλαβεῖς. In Acts xxii. 12, Lachm. reads, ἀνὴρ εὐλαβὴς κατὰ τὸν νόμον; Griesb. εὐσεβής; Tisch. ἀν. κατὰ τὸν νόμον. Perhaps this use of the word by St. Luke was determined by a reference to the Latin *religiosus*, to which no word in Greek better corresponds. Comp. also the construction εὐλαβεῖσθαι ἀπὸ, under εὐλαβεῖσθαι.

Εὐλάβεια, ἡ, foresight, caution. Aristoph. *An.* 377, ἡ γὰρ εὐλάβεια σώζει πάντα. Also = *fear, timidity*, Dem. 635. 13, εἰς φόβον καὶ συκοφαντίας εὐλάβειαν καθιστάντες; Themistius, *Or.* iv. 49 B, ἡ πρὸς τὸ πλεῖν εὐλάβεια; Herodian, v. 2. 5, εἰ δέ τινες ἔλαθον δι' εὐλάβειαν ἡσυχάζοντων; *vid.* εὐλαβεῖσθαι; LXX. = *נִיִּיִּה*, *care*, Josh. xxii. 24, ἐνεκεν εὐλαβείας ῥήματος ἐποιήσαμεν τοῦτο. In Prov. xxviii. 14 it is inserted by the LXX. = *carefulness, prudence*, μακάριος ἀνὴρ ὃς καταπτήσσει πάντα δι' εὐλάβειαν, ὃ δὲ σκληρὸς τὴν καρδίαν κ.τ.λ.; Wisd. xvii. 8 = *fear*. It has been taken to denote *fear* or *terror*, in Heb. v. 7, ὃς . . . δεήσεις τε καὶ ἱκετηρίας πρὸς τὸν δυνάμενον σώζειν αὐτὸν ἐκ θανάτου . . . προσενέγκας καὶ εἰσακουσθεὶς ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας, καίπερ ὧν υἱὸς, ἔμαθεν ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθεν τὴν ἵπακοήν κ.τ.λ. This of course is linguistically possible,—comp. for εἰσακ. ἀπὸ, x. 22,—but this dread would be a limitation in the hearing of the prayer, and instead of the two participial clauses being united by καί, μὲν and δέ should have been used. It is, moreover, inconsistent with the connection, for such a limitation would have no meaning. The εἰσακουσθεὶς denotes the unconditioned hearing of the prayer, and thus serves to introduce vv. 8, 9. Σώζειν ἐκ τοῦ θαν., indeed, does not merely mean preservation from death, but deliverance out of death, see Jude 5, and εἰσακουσθεὶς has reference to the resurrection, cf. ver. 9. The same holds true in reference to Tholuck's rendering of εὐλάβεια as = *a doubtful delaying*; besides, εὐλαβ. does not mean *doubtful*, but *circumspect delaying*, cf. Plut. *Mor.* 1038 A, ἡ εὐλάβεια . . . λόγος ἐστὶν ἀπαγορευτικὸς τῷ σοφῷ· τὸ γὰρ εὐλαβεῖσθαι σωφῶν ἴδιον, οὐ φαύλων ἐστίν. The agony in Gethsemane cannot be described as a doubting delay. Εὐλάβεια must therefore be taken to denote a religious bearing, religious

solicitude, the fear of God, for which cf. Diod. Sic. xiii. 12, ἡ πρὸς τὸ θεῖον εὐλάβ.; Plut. Camill. 21, Id. Aemil. Paul. 3, ἡ περὶ τὸ θεῖον εὐλάβ.; Plut. Num. 32. In Prov. xxviii. 14 also εὐλάβ. must refer to religious character, cf. the second clause, σκληρὸς τὴν καρδίαν; see also εὐλαβεῖσθαι. Εἰσακουσθεῖς ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλ. must mean *in conformity with, in consequence of, the fear of God*, cf. Krüger, § lxviii. 16. 8. In favour of this view, we may refer to the other places where the word occurs in the N. T., Heb. xii. 28, λατρεύομεν τῷ θεῷ μετὰ εὐλαβείας καὶ δέους, and εὐλαβεῖσθαι in Heb. xi. 7; here εὐλ. clearly expresses a feature of religious behaviour, and the following καὶ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν πῦρ καταναλίσκον, so far from telling against this rendering, really confirms it; it enforces the admonition to *holy anxiety* of behaviour and *godly fear*, and not (as Hofmann) to εὐλ., in the sense of *horror*. So also εὐλαβεῖσθαι in Heb. xi. 7. It is an important confirmation of our view that all the Greek commentators agree in the meaning "fear of God" in Heb. v. 7 (εὐλαβείας γὰρ ἦν τὸ λέγειν· πλὴν οὐχ ὡς ἐγὼ θέλω, ἀλλ' ὡς σύ, see Delitzsch *in loc.*). Εὐλάβεια is, as Delitzsch says, the mildest term that could be used for the fear of God; *vid.* the passages from classical writers quoted, and Plutarch's explanation of εὐλάβεια in its general sense.

Εὐλαβεέομαι, to be cautious, thoughtful, circumspect, with μή following, or the accusative; in biblical Greek also with ἀπό; Soph. Tr. 1119, εὐλαβοῦ δὲ μὴ φανῆς κακός; Plat. Rep. ii. 372 C, πενίαν ἢ πόλεμον. In Attic Greek synonymous with φυλάττεσθαι, in later Greek synonymous with φοβεῖσθαι. Cf. Plut. Mor. 706 A, διὸ δεῖ μάλιστα ταύτας εὐλαβεῖσθαι τὰς ἡδονάς; 977 A. So in the LXX. and Apocr. in many places, 1 Sam. xviii. 15, 29; Jer. xxii. 25; Job xiii. 25; Deut. ii. 5; Wisd. xii. 11; Ecclus. vii. 6, xxii. 22, xxvi. 5, xli. 3, εὐλ. κρίμα θανάτου; xxix. 7; 1 Macc. iii. 20, xii. 42; 2 Macc. viii. 16; Ecclus. xxxi. 16, ὁ φοβούμενος τὸν κύριον οὐ μὴ εὐλαβηθήσεται.—Then εὐλαβεῖσθαι also denotes a religious bearing, to fear God, Plat. Legg. ix. 879 E, τὸν ξενικὸν θεόν. So in the LXX. not only Jer. v. 22, μὴ ἐμέ οὐ φοβηθήσεσθε, λέγει κύριος, ἡ ἀπὸ προσώπου μου οὐκ εὐλαβηθήσεσθε = 𐤀𐤏, Hiphil (cf. Ex. iii. 6, εὐλαβεῖτο γὰρ κατεμβλέψαι ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ = 𐤍𐤒), and Hab. ii. 20; Zeph. i. 7; Zech. ii. 17, εὐλαβεῖσθω ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ πᾶσα ἡ γῆ; = 𐤏𐤒, but, also = 𐤏𐤕, Nah. i. 7, γινώσκων κύριος τοὺς εὐλαβουμένους αὐτόν; Zeph. iii. 12, ὑπολείψομαι ἐν σοὶ λαὸν πραῖν καὶ ταπεινόν, καὶ εὐλαβηθήσονται ἀπὸ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ κυρίου; Prov. xxx. 5; = 𐤒𐤕, Prov. ii. 8; = 𐤕𐤕, Mal. iii. 16, οἱ φοβούμενοι τὸν κύριον καὶ εὐλαβούμενοι τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ. Cf. Ecclus. xviii. 27, xxiii. 18, vii. 29. Either timidity (comp. the false rendering in the LXX. of Jer. iv. 1, καὶ ἐὰν περιέλῃ τὰ βδελύγματα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ προσώπου μου εὐλαβηθῇ, where ἀπὸ πρ. μου should be taken with περιέλῃ, since the wrongly translated 𐤒𐤕 𐤍𐤒 forms the after clause) or carefulness of behaviour is chiefly meant, as also in profane Greek. Cf. Plato, de Legg. 318 E, under ἀμαρτάνω. The proper Hebrew expression for the fear of God is 𐤍𐤒, and is usually expressed by φοβεῖσθαι, sometimes also by σέβεσθαι. Accordingly the word stands in Acts xxiii. 10, εὐλαβηθεὶς ὁ χιλιάρχος μὴ διασπασθῇ ὁ Παῦλος

— to have apprehension, to be afraid; on the contrary, Heb. xi. 7, πίστει χρηματισθεὶς Νῶε περὶ τῶν μηδέπω βλεπομένων, εὐλαβηθεὶς κατεσκεύασε κ.τ.λ., of the fear of God.

Λατρεύω, from λάτρης, a servant, λάτρον, pay, in particular, wages for labour or service, is connected probably with ΛΑΩ, I will, or (according to Curtius, p. 326) with λάω, ἀπολαύω, to enjoy, λεία, λήϊς, prey (ΛΑΦ). Hesychius explains λατρεύει· ἐλεύθερος ὢν δουλεύει. According to Ammonius, λάτρης properly denotes prisoners of war. It is used both of free and of enforced surrender, of service either with or without pay. The thought it expresses is certainly wider than that of the other synonyms δούλος, θεράπων, διάκονος, οἰκέτης. It is not so often used as these, yet it seems to denote, at least most generally, willing service and free obedience. Isocr. 217 C, τοὺς δὲ τῷ κάλλει λατρεύοντας φιλοκάλους καὶ φιλοπόνους νομίζομεν εἶναι; Lucn. *Nigrin.* 15, λατρεύειν τῇ ἡδονῇ; Xen. *Ages.* vii. 2, λατρεύειν νόμοις; Phocylides, 112, καὶρῷ λατρεύειν; Soph. *Oed. C.* 105, αἰὲ μόχθοις λατρεύων; Eustath. *Il.* 1246. 10, λάτρης· ὁ ἐπιμίσθιος· ἀλλ' ὅμως ἐπὶ δούλων τέτακται· καὶ θήτες, ὄντες ἐπελείθεροι, μισθοῦ ὑπουργοῦσιν.

As to the use of this word in Holy Scripture, it is applied exclusively to the worship of God. It is in the LXX. = לָבַד in the historical books, while this word in the prophetic books (though still denoting God's service) is rendered by δουλεύειν, a term applied to human relationships in the historical books. Occasionally λατρ. denotes human relations, as in Deut. xxviii. 48, where the parallelism determined the selection of the word (λατρευτός, Lev. xxiii. 7, 8; Num. xxviii. 18; Ex. xii. 16).—So Ex. iii. 12, iv. 23, vii. 16, x. 3, 7, 8, 11, 26, xx. 5, xxiii. 24, 25; Deut. iv. 19, 28, v. 9, vi. 13, x. 12, 20; Josh. xxii. 5, xxiii. 7, xxiv. 2, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 31. In the Apocrypha always of God's service, but only in a few places, Ecclus. iv. 14; Judith iii. 9; 1 Esdr. i. 4, iv. 54; 3 Macc. vi. 6. Cf. λατρεία, 1 Macc. i. 43, ii. 19, 22. The word is also used in classical Greek of worship, the service of God, especially with reference to sacrifice, Plat. *Phaedr.* 244 E, καταφυγούσα πρὸς θεῶν εὐχάς τε καὶ λατρείας; *Apol.* 23 C, διὰ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ λατρείαν; Eurip. *Tro.* 450, of Cassandra, ἡ Ἀπόλλωνος λάτρης; *Phoen.* 220, Φοίβῃ λάτρης γενόμεν. Still θεράπων, θεραπεύειν, θεραπεία are the proper words in the classics for worship, cultus. But in biblical Greek (as is clear from N. T. usage) this word θεραπεύειν means to cherish, to wait upon, to care for, to render helping service, so that no other word remained to express distinctively divine service (so far as the Hebrew לָבַד denoted this) but λατρεύειν, λατρεία. As the above-named passages show, it is used to denote not only sacrifice, but submission to God generally, obedience and adoration rendered to God.

So also in the N. T., where the word occurs chiefly in Luke, Acts, and the Epistle to the Hebrews. With reference to sacrifice and temple service (cf. λατρεύματα, Eurip. *Iph. T.* 1275, of temple service), Luke ii. 37; Acts vii. 7; Heb. viii. 5, σκιᾷ λατρεύουσιν τῶν ἐπουρανίων; x. 2, τοὺς λατρεύοντας ἅπαξ κεκαθαρμένους; xiii. 10, οἱ τῇ σκηνῇ λατρεύοντες; ix. 9, θυσίαι . . . μὴ δυνάμεναι τελειῶσαι τὸν λατρεύοντα; Rev. vii. 15, λατρεύουσιν αὐτῷ ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτὸς ἐν τῷ ναῷ αὐτοῦ; xxii. 3, οἱ δούλοι αὐτοῦ λατρεύουσιν αὐτῷ. Then,

generally, *the recognition and acknowledgment of the state of dependence in which man stands to God*, Matt. iv. 10, αὐτῷ μόνῳ λατρεύσεις, cf. ver. 9, ἐὰν πεσὼν προσκυνήσῃς μοι; Luke iv. 8, i. 74, λατρεύειν αὐτῷ ἐν ὁσιότητι καὶ δικαιοσύνῃ; Heb. xii. 28, λατρεύωμεν εὐαρέστως τῷ θεῷ μετὰ εὐλαβείας καὶ δέους; Acts xxiv. 14, κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν ἣν λέγουσιν αἵρεσιν οὕτως λατρεύω τῷ πατρὶ τῷ θεῷ; xxvi. 7, xxvii. 23, τοῦ θεοῦ οὐ εἰμί, ᾧ καὶ λατρεύω; Rom. i. 9, ᾧ λατρεύω ἐν τῷ πνεύματί μου ἐν τῷ εὐαγγ.; Phil. iii. 3, ἡμεῖς γὰρ ἔσμεν ἡ περιτομή, οἱ πνεύματι θεῷ λατρεύοντες; 2 Tim. i. 3, τῷ θεῷ ᾧ λατρεύω . . . ἐν καθαρᾷ συνειδήσει.—Of idolatry, Acts vii. 42, λατρ. τῇ στρατιᾷ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ; Rom. i. 25, ἐλάτρευσαν τῇ κτίσει παρὰ τὸν κτίσαντα.

Λατρεῖα, ἡ, service, or divine service, see λατρεύω. John xvi. 2, λατρείαν προσφέρειν τῷ θεῷ. *Sacrifice* seems specially to be the service denoted, cf. Rom. ix. 4, ὧν . . . ἡ λατρεία καὶ αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι κ.τ.λ.; xii. 1, παραστήσαι τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν θυσίαν . . . τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν ὑμῶν; Heb. ix. 1, δικαιώματα λατρείας; ver. 6, οἱ ἱερεῖς τὰς λατρείας ἐπιτελοῦντες. Cf. Plat. *Phaedr.* 244 E, see λατρεύω. LXX. = לָבַח, Ex. xii. 25, 26; Josh. xxii. 27, elsewhere also = λειτουργία, e.g. Num. viii. 25.

Εἰδωλολατρεῖα, ἡ, idolatry, only in the N. T. and patristic Greek, 1 Cor. x. 14; Gal. v. 20; Col. iii. 5. For the plural, 1 Pet. iv. 3, ἀθέμιτοι εἰδωλολατρεῖαι, cf. Heb. ix. 6.—εἰδωλολάτρης, an idolater, also used only in N. T. and patristic Greek, 1 Cor. v. 10, 11, vi. 9, x. 7; Eph. x. 5; Rev. xxi. 8, xxii. 15.

Λέγω, to lay, to lay together, to collect, to read; post-Homeric, in the sense of to speak, to say. Hence—

Λόγος, ὁ, the word, “not, however, in a grammatical sense, for which ῥῆμα, ὄνομα, ἔπος is used, but always, like vox, of the living spoken word, the word not in its outward form, but with reference to the thought connected with the form,” Passow; in short, not the word of language, but of conversation, of discourse; not the word as a part of speech, but the word as part of what is uttered. We describe the different uses of λόγος in order as follows:—

(I.) In a formal sense, without laying stress upon what is said, but only denoting that something is said. (a.) A word, as forming part of what is spoken, utterance, generally in the plural; Hesiod, *Theogn.* 890, ἐξαπατήσας αἰμυλίοισι λόγοισι; Xen. *Anab.* ii. 5. 16, ἡδομαι ἀκοίῳ σου φρονίμοις λόγοις; ii. 6. 4, ὅποιοις μὲν λόγοις ἔπεισε Κῦρον; Aesch. *Prom.* 214, λόγοισιν ἐξηγεῖσθαι. Plato, Demosthenes, and others, λόγους ποιεῖσθαι, to speak. So Matt. xv. 23, οὐκ ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῇ λόγον; xxii. 46, and often; Acts ii. 40, ἐτέροις τε λόγοις πλείοσιν διεμαρτύρατο; Luke xxiii. 9; 1 Cor. xiv. 19, πέντε λόγους διὰ τοῦ νοῦς λαλῆσαι . . . μυρίους λόγους ἐν γλώσσῃ; ii. 4, ἐν πειθοῖς σοφίας λόγοις, ver. 13; Eph. v. 6, ἀπατᾶν κενοῖς λόγοις; 2 Pet. ii. 3; 3 John 10; Acts xvi. 36; Matt. xii. 37.—(b.) A word, as the expression which serves for the occasion, the language which one adopts, one's manner of speaking, etc. Cf. Dem. xviii. 256, εἰς τοιούτους λόγους ἐμπίπτειν ἀναγ-

κάζομαι; *I am obliged thus to speak.* Acts xviii. 15, ζήτημά ἐστιν περὶ λόγου καὶ ὀνομάτων καὶ νόμου τοῦ καθ' ὑμᾶς; Eph. iv. 29, πᾶς λόγος σαπρὸς ἐκ τοῦ στόματος ὑμῶν μὴ ἐκπορευέσθω; Col. iv. 6, ὁ λόγος ὑμῶν πάντοτε ἐν χάριτι, ἅλατι ἡρτυμένος, εἰδέναι πῶς δεῖ ὑμᾶς ἐνὶ ἐκάστῳ ἀποκρίνεσθαι; 1 Thess. ii. 5; 1 Cor. i. 17, εὐαγγελίζεσθαι οὐκ ἐν σοφίᾳ λόγου; ii. 1, xv. 2; 2 Cor. vi. 7, x. 10, 11, xi. 6; 1 Thess. i. 5, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἡμῶν οὐκ ἐγενήθη εἰς ὑμᾶς ἐν λόγῳ μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν δυνάμει.—(c.) *The word or speech, as an act, and not as a product, the speaking.* Acts xviii. 5, συνείχετο τῷ λόγῳ; Luke iv. 32, ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ ἦν ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ; 1 Cor. iv. 20, οὐ γὰρ ἐν λόγῳ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀλλ' ἐν δυνάμει. Thus when mention is made of Christ's wonder-working power by His word, e.g. Matt. viii. 8, μόνον εἶπε λόγῳ; viii. 16, ἐξέβαλε τὰ πνεύματα λόγῳ; Luke vii. 7; Acts xiv. 12, and elsewhere. Hence the frequent contrast even in profane Greek between λόγος and ἔργον, which separates or unites the contents (ἔργον) of the word from or with the word, or which refers generally to the relation subsisting between saying and doing (*vid.* ἔργον), 2 Cor. x. 11; Col. iii. 17, πᾶν ὃ τι ἐὰν ποιῇτε ἐν λόγῳ ἢ ἐν ἔργῳ; 1 John iii. 18, μὴ ἀγαπῶμεν λόγῳ . . . ἀλλ' ἐν ἔργῳ καὶ ἀληθείᾳ. Compare also Col. ii. 23, ἄτινά ἐστιν λόγον μὲν ἔχοντα σοφίας ἐν ἐθελοθρησκείᾳ κ.τ.λ. Cf. Herod. iii. 135 (see ἔργον); Luke xxiv. 19; Acts vii. 22; 2 Thess. ii. 17. Cf. 1 Tim. iv. 12, τύπος γίνου τῶν πιστῶν ἐν λόγῳ, ἐν ἀναστροφῇ κ.τ.λ.

(II.) In a material sense, the word as that which is spoken, the statement, both of single declarations and of longer speeches or conversations, expositions, explanations, etc. (a.) Of single communications, sayings, statements, affirmations, cf. Plat. *Parm.* 128 C, τῷ Παρμενίδου λόγῳ; *Theaet.* 172 B, τὸν Πρωταγόρου λόγον; *Apol.* 26 D, τὰ Ἀναξαγόρου βιβλία τοῦ Κλαζομενίου γέμει τούτων τῶν λόγων. So in Matt. xii. 32, ὃς ἂν εἴπῃ λόγον κατὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου; xv. 12, xix. 11, οὐ πάντες χωροῦσιν τὸν λόγον τοῦτον; xix. 22, xxi. 24; Mark xi. 29; Luke xx. 3; Matt. xxvi. 44, τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον εἰπών; Mark v. 36, ix. 10, x. 22, xiv. 39; Luke xii. 10; John ii. 22, ἐπίστευσαν τῇ γραφῇ καὶ τῷ λόγῳ ᾧ εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς; iv. 37, ἐν γὰρ τούτῳ ὁ λόγος ἐστὶν ὁ ἀληθινός. Cf. *Soph. Tr.* 1, λόγος μὲν ἐστ' ἀρχαῖος; John iv. 39, 41, 50, vii. 36, 40, xii. 38, xv. 20, 25, xviii. 9, 32, xix. 8, 13; Acts vi. 5, vii. 29, xx. 38, xxii. 22; Rom. ix. 9, xiii. 9; 1 Cor. xv. 54; Gal. v. 14; 1 Thess. iv. 15; 1 Tim. i. 15, iii. 1, iv. 9; 2 Tim. ii. 11; Tit. iii. 8; Heb. vii. 28. The plural οἱ λόγοι gathers up in one what had been spoken at different times or in a long discourse; Matt. vii. 24, of the Sermon on the Mount, ὅστις ἀκούει μου τοὺς λόγους τούτους; vii. 26, 28, x. 14, xix. 1, ἐτέλεσεν τοὺς λόγους τούτους; xxiv. 35, οἱ δὲ λόγοι μου οὐ παρέλθωσιν; xxvi. 1; Mark viii. 38, x. 24, xiii. 31; Luke iii. 4, iv. 22, vi. 47, ix. 26, 28, 44, xxi. 33, xxiv. 44; John x. 19, xiv. 24; Acts ii. 22, v. 5, 24, xv. 15, 24, xx. 35; Rom. iii. 4; 1 Thess. iv. 18; 1 Tim. vi. 3; 2 Tim. i. 13, iv. 15; Rev. i. 3, xvii. 17, xix. 9, xxi. 5, xxii. 6, 7, 9, 10, 18, 19; cf. *Xen. Cyrop.* i. 5. 3, τοῖς λόγοις τούτοις πειθόμενοι.—(b.) The singular ὁ λόγος often takes the place of the plural in this wider reference, and is used to denote *an exposition or account*, both comprehensively, *what one says*, has said, or has to say, and generally of longer expositions,

oral or written discussions, statements, etc.; cf. Xen. *Hist. Gr.* vi. 4, ἄχρι οὗ ὅδε ὁ λόγος ἐγράφετο; Acts i. 1, τὸν μὲν πρῶτον λόγον ἐποίησάμην περὶ πάντων κ.τ.λ.; Xen. *Anab.* ii. 1. 1, ἐν τῷ ἔμπροσθεν λόγῳ δεδήλωται. Thus the Epistle to the Hebrews is called λόγος τῆς παρακλήσεως, Heb. xiii. 22; cf. Acts xiii. 15, εἰ ἔστιν ἐν ὑμῖν λόγος παρακλήσεως; 1 Cor. xii. 8; Heb. iv. 13, v. 11. — Of what one has to allege against another, a *complaint*, Acts xix. 38, ἔχειν πρὸς τινα λόγον; Demosth. *Adv. Lacrit.* 599 (Kypke, *Observ. scr.*), ἐμοὶ μὲν οὖν ἐστὶν ὃ ἄνδρες δικασταί, πρὸς τούτους ὁ λόγος; cf. Matt. v. 32, παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας (xix. 9, Lachm.). — A *rumour* or *report*, Acts xi. 22; Mark i. 45; Matt. xxviii. 15; Luke v. 15; John xxi. 23; *conversation*, Luke xxiv. 17.

This brings us to the distinctively N. T. expression, ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, or ὁ λόγος κατ' ἐξοχὴν, the word of gracious announcement, the word of the gospel, denoting all that God says or has caused to be said to men. 'Ο λόγος occurs alone in Mark ii. 2, iv. 14–20, 33, viii. 32, xvi. 20; Luke i. 2, οἱ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται γενομένοι τοῦ λόγου; Acts viii. 4, εὐαγγελιζόμενοι τὸν λόγον; x. 44, xi. 19, xiv. 25, xvi. 6, κωλυθέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος λαλῆσαι τὸν λόγον ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ; xvii. 11 (xix. 20, Tisch., οὕτως κατὰ κράτος τοῦ κυρίου ὁ λόγος ἤρξανεν καὶ ἴσχυεν, is usually read κατὰ κράτος ὁ λ. τοῦ κυρ.), xx. 7; Gal. vi. 6, ὁ κατηχούμενος τὸν λόγον; Phil. i. 14; Col. iv. 3; 1 Thess. i. 6; 1 Tim. v. 17, οἱ κοπιῶντες ἐν λόγῳ καὶ διδασκαλίᾳ; Jas. i. 21, 22, 23; 1 Pet. ii. 8, iii. 1; cf. 1 John ii. 7, ἡ ἐντολὴ ἡ παλαιὰ ἐστὶν ὁ λόγος ὃν ἠκούσατε. This "word," so called κατ' ἐξ., is the declaration of the mystery of Christ, Col. iv. 3, ἵνα ὁ θεὸς ἀνοίξῃ ἡμῖν θύραν τοῦ λόγου λαλῆσαι τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ, the word of gospel preaching, λόγος ἀκοῆς, 1 Thess. ii. 13; Heb. iv. 2, see ἀκοή; Col. i. 5, ἣν (ἐλπίδα) προσηκούσατε ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῆς ἀληθείας τοῦ εὐαγγελίου; Acts xv. 7, ὁ λ. τοῦ εὐαγγελίου; Eph. i. 13, ὁ λόγος τῆς ἀληθείας, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς σωτηρίας ὑμῶν; cf. Acts xiii. 26, ὑμῖν ὁ λόγος τῆς σωτηρίας ταύτης ἐξαπεστάλη. Elsewhere it is designated according to its import, ὁ λόγος τῆς καταλλαγῆς, 2 Cor. v. 19; Acts xx. 32, ὁ λόγος τῆς χάριτος θεοῦ; 1 Cor. i. 18, ὁ λ. ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ; Phil. ii. 16, λ. ζωῆς; Col. iii. 16, ὁ λ. τοῦ Χριστοῦ; Heb. v. 13, λ. δικαιοσύνης (*vid.* δικαιοσύνη). See also the attributive designation, ὁ λ. τῆς ἀληθείας, 2 Tim. ii. 15, like Col. i. 5, Eph. i. 13.

The word thus described according to its import is called, with reference to its origin and the place whence it proceeds, ὁ λ. τοῦ θεοῦ; cf. 2 Cor. v. 19, ὁ θεὸς . . . θέμενος ἐν ἡμῖν τὸν λόγον τῆς καταλλαγῆς; Acts x. 36, τὸν λόγον ὃν ἀπέστειλεν τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραὴλ εὐαγγελιζόμενος εἰρήνην διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ; Acts xvii. 13, ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, used interchangeably with ὁ λ., ver. 11; Luke viii. 11, ὁ σπόρος ἐστὶν ὁ λ. τ. θ., but in vv. 12, 13, 15 simply ὁ λόγος. Cf. Matt. xiii. 19, ὁ λόγος τῆς βασιλείας, vv. 20–23, ὁ λόγ.; see xxiv. 14, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασ. 'Ο λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ denotes all that God has to say to men, and indeed as this is made known in the N. T. revelation of grace, and thus, as we have seen, the expression is always used to denote the N. T. announcement of salvation; comp. 1 Pet. i. 23–25. A comparison of the phrase with that used in the O. T. will show how important it is thus to define its meaning. 'Ο λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ seldom occurs in

the O. T.; we find it only in Judg. iii. 20, 1 Chron. xxv. 5 (Ps. lvi. 4, 10); the word of O. T. preaching is always called simply *דְּבַר יְהוָה*, λόγος τοῦ κυρίου, the word of the God of salvation (for the name Jehovah designates God as the God of promise, the God of the future revelation of grace, *אֱלֹהֵי אֱמֶת*). This latter phrase seldom occurs in the N. T., only in Acts viii. 25, xiii. 44, 48, 49, xv. 35, 36, xvi. 32, xix. 10; 1 Thess. i. 8; 2 Thess. iii. 1. All the more frequent, and indeed constantly occurring, is the other phrase *ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ*, which lays stress upon the authority attaching to the word of the gospel, 1 Thess. ii. 13, *παραλαβόντες λόγον ἀκοῆς παρ' ἡμῶν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐδέξασθε οὐ λόγον ἀνθρώπων ἀλλὰ καθὼς ἐστὶν ἀληθῶς λόγον θεοῦ*; Mark vii. 13, *ἀκυροῦντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ τῇ παραδόσει ὑμῶν*. The expression does not occur in Matthew, nor indeed in John's Gospel (for x. 35 does not refer to the Gospel). We find it in Mark vii. 13; Luke v. 1, viii. 11, xi. 28; Acts iv. 31, vi. 2, 7, viii. 14, xi. 1, xii. 24, xiii. 5, 7, 44, 46, xvii. 13, xviii. 11; Rom. ix. 6; 1 Cor. xiv. 36; 2 Cor. ii. 17, iv. 2; Col. i. 25; 1 Thess. ii. 13; 1 Tim. iv. 5; 2 Tim. ii. 9; Tit. ii. 5; Heb. iv. 12, xiii. 7; 1 Pet. i. 23; 2 Pet. iii. 5, 7; 1 John ii. 14; Rev. i. 2, 9, vi. 9, xx. 4; cf. xix. 9, *οἱ λόγοι ἀληθινοὶ εἰσὶν τοῦ θεοῦ*. This distinction between the O. T. expression and that of the N. T. may seem a merely formal one, but it is akin to another important difference. Concerning the communication of the word of grace to the prophets, we always read *דְּבַר יְהוָה הָיָה אֵלַי*; and of the hearing or perception of this word, it is said *יָחַז דְּבַר יְהוָה*, Isa. ii. 1; Mic. i. 1; Amos i. 1 (cf. Ps. lxxxix. 20; Isa. xiii. 1; 1 Chron. xxv. 5, *וַיִּחַז דְּבַר יְהוָה אֵלֶיךָ*). Now these expressions never occur in the N. T. except in John x. 35, *πρὸς οὗς ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ ἐγένετο*, where the reference is to an O. T. case. In these expressions the difference between the Old and New Testament revelation of grace, *i.e.* word, seems to centre. "The word of the Lord" stands in the O. T. as distinct from the revelation of the law in such a manner outside of the O. T. fellowship as to isolate itself, occupying an extraordinary place in relation thereto, and needing the opening up of a special organ in man appropriate to its reception (*הִיחַז*, *to behold or view*, denoting an ecstatic state). In the N. T., on the contrary, "the word of God" is a power which has been brought out of its mysterious concealment, and which in and through Christ has come among men, being present within the N. T. fellowship; Tit. i. 3, *ὁ ἀψευδὴς θεὸς . . . ἐφάνερωσεν καιροῖς ἰδίους τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ ἐν κηρύγματι ὃ ἐπιστεύθην ἐγὼ*; Acts x. 36, *τὸν λόγον ὃν ἀπέστειλεν τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραὴλ εὐαγγελιζόμενος εἰρήνην διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*; Acts xiii. 26; 1 Pet. i. 23 sqq., *ἀναγεγεννημένοι . . . διὰ λόγου ζῶντος θεοῦ καὶ μένοντος . . . τοῦτο δὲ ἐστὶν τὸ ῥῆμα τὸ εὐαγγελισθὲν εἰς ὑμᾶς*. No longer is it said, *ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου ἐγένετο* (cf. John i. 14, *ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο*); but, on the contrary, cf. Acts vi. 7, *ἡῤῥαυεν*; xii. 24, *ἡῤῥαυ. καὶ ἐπληθύνετο*; xix. 20, *ἡῤῥαυ. καὶ ἴσχυεν*; 2 Tim. ii. 9, *ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ οὐ δέδεσται*; 2 Thess. iii. 1, *ἵνα ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου τρέχῃ*; John xvii. 14, *δέδωκα αὐτοῖς τὸν λόγον σου*. Thus and henceforward *ὁ λόγος* appears as a *term. tech.*

The λόγος of St. John (i. 1, 14) is most simply explained as connected with and arising out of this use of the term. It denotes Christ as He who represents, or in whom

had been hidden from eternity, and specially from the beginning of the world, what God had to say to man, and what has come fully to light in the N. T. message of grace and mercy (comp. Jer. xxxiii. 14 sqq.); cf. the impersonal designation of Christ in 1 John i. 1 as $\delta \eta \nu \acute{\alpha} \pi' \acute{\alpha} \rho \chi \eta \varsigma$, $\delta \acute{\alpha} \kappa \eta \kappa \acute{\omicron} \alpha \mu \epsilon \nu \dots \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \tau \omicron \upsilon \lambda \acute{\omicron} \gamma \omicron \varsigma \tau \eta \varsigma \zeta \omega \eta \varsigma$, where what is spoken of is not an impersonal object, but an impersonal designation of a personal object; and especially Rev. xix. 13, $\kappa \alpha \iota \kappa \acute{\epsilon} \kappa \lambda \eta \tau \alpha \iota \tau \omicron \delta \nu \omicron \mu \alpha \alpha \upsilon \tau \omicron \upsilon \delta \acute{\omicron} \lambda \acute{\omicron} \gamma \omicron \varsigma \tau \omicron \upsilon \theta \epsilon \omicron \upsilon$; Christ represents the word of God as it has come into the world; but since the world does not receive it, its triumphant power must finally be revealed by a decisive conflict and victory.

This view of the Johannine *Logos* brings it into perfect accord with the progress of God's gracious revelation, and St. John's use of the term is the appropriate culmination of the view presented in other parts of the N. T. of "the word of God," denoting, as we have seen, the mystery of Christ. The significance of the O. T. representation, "the word of the Lord," has hitherto been too little considered; or if its connection with the N. T. view has been observed, it has been only in a logical manner, and not historically, as bearing upon the gradual revelation of God's plan of salvation; cf. Neumann on Jer. i. 1, "The word of God, the self-revelation of the eternal Godhead from eternity in the Word, is the source and principle of all prophetic words; therein they have their divine basis." Aquinas in like manner says (upon the same passage), "*verba prophetalia esse multa in se, attamen esse unum in sua origine, quia a verbo increato originem ducunt.*" Origen alone (as far as my knowledge extends) has at least put the question rightly, In what manner did the Logos who was with God and was God come to the prophet?—how could He manifest Himself? The hints we have given above are an attempt at the right solution of these questions,—a solution already suggested by Jewish theology itself in its doctrine of the word of God, מִמְרָא; cf. on Gen. iii. 8, קל מימרא דִי'; Ps. cxxviii. 5, יברכִינִךְ מִימְרָא דִי'; Judg. vi. 12, יהוה = מִימְרָא דִי' בִּסְעֶדֶךָ. The same is denoted by דְּבַרְיָא; Num. vii. 89, וּמַחֲמֵן הוּא דְּבֹרָא מִחֲמִלִּיל עֲמִיה, "the Word spoke with him from off the mercy-seat;" Gen. xxviii. 10, מִן בְּנִל דְּהִיה דְּבֹרָא מִחֲמֲדָא לְמַלְלָא עֲמִיה, "because the Word desired to speak with him." God Himself is the word in so far as the word is the medium of His revelation of Himself, and the word, though personality and hypostasis are not yet attributed to it, occupies a middle place between God and man, like δόξα, כְּבוֹד, שְׁבִיחָה, with which latter word מִמְרָא is used interchangeably; cf. Tholuck on John i. 1. That this representation was included in the Jewish idea of the Messiah, is clear from Gen. xlix. 18, where the Jerusalem Targum translates, "I have waited, not for liberation through Sampson or Gideon, but for salvation through Thy Word." If we are to seek for an explanation of the λόγος of St. John beyond Holy Scripture itself, it is to be found much more appropriately in Jewish theology than in Philo's doctrine of the Logos. The reason why preference has been given to the latter reference is because Philo predicates of his Logos attributes which in the N. T. are predicated of Jesus Christ, e.g. πρωτότοκος (πρωτόγονος), υἱός, εἰκόν, and others; cf. *de Confus. ling.* p. 427, ed. M., $\kappa \alpha \iota \acute{\alpha} \nu \mu \eta \delta \acute{\epsilon} \pi \omega \mu \acute{\epsilon} \nu \tau \omicron \iota \tau \upsilon \gamma \chi \acute{\alpha} \nu \eta \tau \iota \varsigma \acute{\alpha} \xi \iota \acute{\omicron} \chi \rho \epsilon \omega \varsigma \acute{\omega} \nu \upsilon \acute{\iota} \delta \varsigma \theta \epsilon \omicron \upsilon \pi \rho \omicron \sigma \alpha \gamma \omicron \rho \acute{\epsilon} \upsilon \epsilon \sigma \theta \alpha \iota \sigma \pi \omicron \upsilon \delta \alpha \acute{\zeta} \epsilon \tau \omega \kappa \omicron \sigma \mu \acute{\epsilon} \iota \sigma \theta \alpha \iota \kappa \alpha \tau \grave{\alpha} \tau \omicron \nu \pi \rho \omega \tau \acute{\omicron} \gamma \omicron \nu \omicron \nu$

αὐτοῦ λόγον, τὸν ἄγγελον πρεσβύτατον, ὡς ἀρχάγγελον πολυώνυμον ὑπάρχοντα· καὶ γὰρ ἀρχή, καὶ ὄνομα θεοῦ, καὶ λόγος [καὶ ὁ] οὐ (Mang.) κατ' εἰκόνα ἄνθρωπος, καὶ ὁρῶν Ἰσραήλ, προσαγορεύεται . . . Καὶ γὰρ εἰ μήπω ἱκανοὶ θεοῦ παῖδες νομίζεσθαι γεγόναμεν, ἀλλὰ τοῖς τῆς αἰδίου εἰκόνης αὐτοῦ, λόγου τοῦ ἱερωτάτου· θεοῦ γὰρ εἰκὼν λόγος ὁ πρεσβύτατος; cf. *Lib. Alleg.* iii. 106 M. Notwithstanding this similarity of attributes, however, the identity of the subject of whom they are predicated cannot justly be affirmed. The matter really stands thus: the *predicates* of the Son of God in Paul correspond with those of the Logos in Philo, but the *subject* is not the same. In John we find the designation of the *subject*, but not the *predicates*. Though Philo's idea of the Logos seems to coincide with what is said in the prologue to St. John's Gospel of John's Logos, a glance only at the statements of Philo (e.g. *de Somn.* 655; *de Mund. opif.* 5) suffices to show the incompatibility of St. John's view with Philonic representations, and any real coincidence between them must be denied. In *de Mund. opif.* 5 we read, δηλονότι καὶ τὸ ὅλον εἶδος, ὁ σύμπας αἰσθητὸς οὗτος κόσμος, ὃ μείζον ἐστὶ τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης μίμημα θείας εἰκόνης. δηλον δὲ ὅτι καὶ ἡ ἀρχέτυπος σφραγίς, ἃν φάμεν εἶναι κόσμον νοητόν, αὐτὸς ἂν εἴη τὸ ἀρχέτυπος παράδειγμα, ἰδέα τῶν ἰδεῶν, ὁ θεοῦ λόγος; *De Somn.* 655, Μὴ παρέλθης δὲ τὸ εἰρημένον (Gen. xxxi. 12, LXX., ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ θεὸς ὁ ὀφθεῖς σοι ἐν τόπῳ θεοῦ), ἀλλ' ἀκριβῶς ἐξέτασον, εἰ τῷ ὄντι δύο εἰσὶ θεοί· λέγεται γὰρ Ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ θεὸς ὁ ὀφθεῖς σοι, οὐκ ἐν τόπῳ τῷ ἐμῷ, ἀλλ' ἐν τόπῳ θεοῦ, ὡς ἂν ἐτέρου. Τί οὖν χρὴ λέγειν; ὁ μὲν ἀληθεῖα θεὸς εἰς ἐστίν· οἱ δ' ἐν καταχρήσει λεγόμενοι πλείους . . . Καλεῖ δὲ τὸν θεὸν τὸν πρεσβύτατον αὐτοῦ νυνὶ λόγον, οὐ δεισιδαίμωνων περὶ τὴν θέσιν τῶν ὀνομάτων κ.τ.λ. The Logos, therefore, of Philo cannot in any proper sense be called God, and is not pre-eminently an intermediate being between God and man, but stands as the divine world-ideal, occupying a middle place between God and the world, the latter being as akin to God as is man. It cannot even be proved that "the Logos is with Philo a special and distinct essence and mediator between God and the world, an hypostasis distinct from God" (Dorner, *Entwicklungsgesch. der Lehre von der Person Christi*, i. 30). God Himself, in His ideal relation to the world, i.e. the world-idea in God, is the Logos according to Philo; and this world-idea as such, distinct from God Himself,—the *first-begotten* Son of God in relation to the world as the *second* Son,—is the superior or chief of the world, the messenger of God to the world, the mediator for the world in God. Although, as Dorner says, the doctrine of distinction in God is indicated here, the examination of this distinction, as described by Philo, presents to us a perfect contrast to all biblical representations, and is especially so far removed from St. John's views, that to bring St. John's idea of the Logos into unison with Philo's would be preposterous. With Philo the actual world itself forms the third stage of the development of divine life, God and the Logos being the other two; and were it not for the dualistic view of matter, nothing would be left for the Philonic system but to call it Pantheism.

The mention of the *Logos* in Philo is certainly strange, because in classical usage *νοῦς* would have been a more appropriate term, and we must regard it as an unreasonable

attempt to unite Greek philosophy—*νοῦς*—with Jewish theology—*מִטְבָּ*—in a word accommodating itself to both expressions, viz. *λόγος*; an attempt so unreasonable, that in making it little is left of Jewish theology, save the terms “word” and “words.” The connection between St. John’s prologue and Philo’s language depends solely upon this affinity of Philo’s *Logos*-idea with the Jewish doctrine of “the word of God,” and the main difference still remains, viz. that the Jewish *מִטְבָּ*, like St. John’s *Logos*, belongs to the economy of grace, whereas the *Logos* of Philo is a purely metaphysical conception.

Now, when St. John calls Christ, according to His eternal being, “the Word,” this must not be regarded as the expression and designation of His inner divine relationship. This we have afterwards when he says, *καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν κ.τ.λ.*, a statement which would be at least strange if the name *λόγος* of itself denoted a subject possessing an inner divine relationship. Christ is called the *λόγος* in accordance with what He already was for the world in the beginning, what He always is for the world, and on account of what He is for the N. T. church as thus designated, viz. the representative and expression of what God has to say to the world, in whom and by whom God’s mind and purposes towards the world find their expression. But just as such, He possessed an inner and divine relationship, *καὶ ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν . . . scil. ἐν ἀρχῇ, πρὸ τοῦ τὸν κόσμον εἶναι*, John xvii. 5; and, indeed, this was a relationship of God to God—*καὶ θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος*. His relation to the world and to mankind (vv. 2–4) rests upon this. It is just thus that these declarations are of special weight and importance also in theology, because the relation of God and the divine nature to the world is at the same time the exponent of an inner relationship in the divine essence itself, which cannot be conceived of without a self-relationship of God to the world; and this justifies the scriptural view of the world as the central object of divine working and of divine revelation. This view is justified not only by the scriptural connection in which the expression stands, but by the light which it throws upon the historical development of the plan of salvation, and by its significance for the Christian church. The connection between the Old and the New Testament “word of God” is of great significance, moreover, in its bearing upon the doctrine of inspiration.

(c.) The subject-matter of discourse, Acts viii. 21, *οὐκ ἔστιν σοι μέρος οὐδὲ κλήρος ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ*; Luke iv. 36, *τίς ὁ λόγος οὗτος, ὅτι ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ κ.τ.λ.*

(III.) Account, regard, e.g. Acts xx. 24, *οὐδενὸς λόγον ποιοῦμαι*, *I make no account of*; Theocr. ii. 61, *ὁ δέ μεν λόγον οὐδένα ποιεῖ*; Tisch. reads Acts xx. 24, *οὐδενὸς λόγον ποιοῦμαι τὴν ψυχὴν τιμίαν ἐμαντῶ*, cf. Herod. i. 33, *λόγου ποιεῖσθαι τινα*; Phil. iv. 15, *εἰς λόγον δόσεως καὶ λήμψεως*; ver. 17, *εἰς λόγον ὑμῶν*.—Sometimes = reckoning, e.g. *λόγον αἰτεῖν, διδόναι*, etc., Matt. xii. 36, xviii. 23, and often. And hence = reason, insight, consideration. In biblical Greek only in Acts xviii. 14, *κατὰ λόγον ἂν ἠνεσχόμεν ὑμῶν* = reasonably, fairly, as *κατὰ λόγον* is often used in profane Greek.

Λογικός, ἡ, όν, (I.) pertaining to speech; (II.) pertaining to reason, reasonable. Not in the LXX. Only in 1 Pet. ii. 2, *τὸ λογικὸν ἄδολον γάλα ἐπιποθήσατε*, and Rom.

xii. 1, τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν ὑμῶν. In the latter passage it unquestionably means *reasonable*; but to take it, like νοερός, πνευματικός, in contrast with σωματικός, as contrasted with the material sacrifices of the O. T., is without warrant. The λογικὴ λατρεία is rather to be understood as that service of God which implies reasonable meditation or reflection in contrast with heathen practices, 1 Cor. xii. 2, and with the O. T. *cultus* which had become mere thoughtless habit, Isa. i. 12–15. Cf. λογικοὶ ἱατροί, *medici qui ratione et methodo propria morborum remedia investigabant*, Steph. Thes. Not λογικὴ λατρεία, but θυσία ζῶσα, is the synonym for the expression θυσίαι πνευματικαί, 1 Pet. ii. 5. —In 1 Pet. ii. 2, on the contrary, I cannot see how λογικὸν γάλα can by any possibility be “reasonable milk,” for there is no reason for taking λογικόν simply as implying that the expression is to be understood spiritually. It is also quite contrary to the meaning of the words to say that the milk is to be regarded as a nutriment for the λόγος in man, tending to his spiritual health; for had this been the idea, we should have expected λογικός as more appropriate to λόγος, in the sense of “reason.” Λογικός means simply *gifted with reason*. It remains therefore to understand λόγος of the word κατ’ ἐξ, the word of God, and λογικὸν γάλα, milk of the word, milk to be found in the word; and with this the second adjective ἄδολον corresponds; cf. 2 Cor. iv. 2, μηδὲ δολοῦντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ.

Λόγιον, τό, sentence, declaration, especially the utterances of the oracles of the gods. Hesychius, λόγια· θέσφατα, μαντεύματα, φῆμαι, χρησμοί. According to this use of the term, it occurs in the LXX. as = לִּשְׁמָע, Num. xxiv. 4; Ps. cvii. 11, cf. Ps. xii. 7, cxix. 148. So in the N. T., τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ, Rom. iii. 2; Heb. v. 12; 1 Pet. iv. 11, εἴ τις λαλεῖ, ὡς λόγια θεοῦ; Acts vii. 38, ὃς ἐδέξατο λόγια ζῶντα δοῦναι ὑμῖν. It is not, like ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, that which God has to say, but the term to denote the historical (O. T.) manifestation of this; and in 1 Pet. iv. 11 we do not read ὡς λόγον θεοῦ, the object being to give prominence to the contrast between the word and the mere subjectivity of the speaker.

Ἀναλογία, ἡ, from ἀνάλογος = ἀνὰ τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον, Plat. Tim. 32 B, οὕτω δὴ πυρός τε καὶ γῆς ὕδωρ ἀέρα τε ὁ θεὸς ἐν μέσφ' ἑαίς καὶ πρὸς ἄλληλα καθ' ὅσον ἦν δυνατόν ἀνὰ τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον ἀπεργασάμενος, ὃ τι πῦρ πρὸς ἀέρα, τοῦτο ἀέρα πρὸς ὕδωρ, καὶ ὃ τι ἀὴρ πρὸς ὕδωρ, τοῦτο ὕδωρ πρὸς γῆν, ξυνέδησε καὶ ξυνεστήσατο οὐρανὸν ὁρατὸν καὶ ἀπτόν. The substantive occurs sometimes in Plato, oftener in Aristotle and afterwards, and is = the right relation, the coincidence or agreement existing or demanded according to the standard of the several relations, not agreement as equality. Aristot. H. A. i. 1, ἕνια δὲ τῶν ζώων οὔτε εἶδει τὰ μόρια ταῦτα ἔχει οὔτε κατ' ὑπεροχὴν καὶ ἔλλειψιν, ἀλλὰ κατ' ἀναλογίαν; Sext. Adv. Gramm. 229, ἡ ἀναλογία ὁμοίου καὶ ἀνομοίου ἐστὶ θεωρία. Ἀναλόγως, similarly, coincident, corresponding, e.g. Sext. Pyrrh. i. 88, οἱ ἄλλοι ἀναλόγως; Jacobs, Anthol. vii. 12, κατιῶν καὶ πάλιν ἐπανιῶν ἀναλόγως. In Aristotle, arithmetical or geometric proportion. Arist. Eth. Nicom. v. 6, ἡ ἀναλογία ἰσότης ἐστὶ λόγων κ.τ.λ.—Plat. Tim.

32 C, τὸ τοῦ κόσμου σῶμα . . . δι' ἀναλογίας ὁμολογήσαν; *Polit.* 257 B, οἱ τῇ τιμῇ πλεόν ἁλλήλων ἀφεςτᾶσιν, ἢ κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς ὑμετέρας τέχνης; *Diod.* xi. 25, διεμέρισε τοῖς συμμάχοις κατὰ τὸν ἀριθμὸν τῶν συστρατευσάντων τὴν ἀναλογίαν ποιησάμενος. In the N. T. *Rom.* xii. 6, εἴτε προφητεῖαν κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως. If the explanation given under *πίστις* of the expression *μέτρον πίστεως*, ver. 3, be right, κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογ. τ. π. cannot be = κατὰ τὸ μέτρον πίστεως. What is treated of is not the subjective standard of faith, but an objective standard for prophesying. But this standard, again, is not *the faith* in an objective sense = *doctrina fidei*, a sense in which *πίστις* does not occur even in *Acts* vi. 7, comp. xvii. 31. Prophecy is to stand in a right relation to faith, is to correspond thereto, to build itself up upon the foundation of a rightly acting faith, which in turn it is to build up and promote, comp. 1 *Cor.* xiv. 1 sqq. The more imminent the danger lest a pretended prophecy should affect the faith of the individual and of the church, the more carefully ought this faith to be preserved and cherished by the exercise of this gift; see further under *προφήτης*.

Δογίζομαι, derived from *λογος*, *account*; *λεγω*, *to put together, to count* = *to occupy oneself with reckonings, with calculations* (comp. *ὀπλίζομαι*). Besides the aorist middle, it forms the passive aorist *ἐλογίσθην*, future *λογισθήσομαι*, with passive meaning; cf. *Krüger*, § xxxix. 14. 2. In classical Greek the perfect also occurs, *λελόγισμαι*, in an active or passive sense, comp. *Gen.* xxxi. 15, οὐχ ὥς αἱ ἁλλότριαι λελογίσμεθα αὐτῷ; in N. T. Greek the present also in a passive sense, *Rom.* iv. 4, 5, 24, ix. 8; cf. *Ecclus.* xl. 19. — (I.) **To reckon or count**, *Xen. Cyrop.* viii. 2. 18, *λογίσαι πόσα ἐστὶν ἔτοιμα χρήματα*; 1 *Cor.* xiii. 5, οὐ λογίζεται τὸ κακόν. — *Δογίζεσθαι τί τιμι*, *to reckon anything to a person, to put to his account*, either in his favour or as what he must be answerable for. Thus 2 *Cor.* v. 19, μὴ λογισάμενος αὐτοῖς τὰ παραπτώματα; *Rom.* iv. 8, ᾧ οὐ μὴ λογίσηται κύριος ἁμαρτίαν; 2 *Tim.* iv. 16, μὴ αὐτοῖς λογισθεῖη; *Rom.* iv. 4, τῷ δὲ ἐργαζομένῳ ὁ μισθὸς οὐ λογίζεται κατὰ χάριν ἀλλὰ κατὰ ὀφείλημα; ver. 6, ᾧ ὁ θεὸς λογίζεται δικαιοσύνην χωρὶς ἔργων; ver. 11, εἰς τὸ λογισθῆναι καὶ αὐτοῖς τὴν δικαιοσύνην. In this last passage the expression is used quite as a *term techn.* applied to God's act of justification, which is more fully explained in ver. 6. It is that imputation of righteousness, whose correlative is freedom from guilt, and the emphasis clearly rests upon *λογισθῆναι*, cf. iv. 10, 23, οὐκ ἐγράφη δὲ δι' αὐτὸν μόνον ὅτι ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ, ver. 24, the true meaning of which is clear from what follows. The LXX. often write *λογίζεσθαι τι εἰς τι, τινὰ εἰς τινά*, where the Greeks use the double accusative; e.g. 1 *Sam.* i. 13, ἐλογίσατο αὐτὴν Ἥλὶ εἰς μεθύουσιν, *to take any one for, to reckon as belonging to a certain class, to regard any one as*, = *בָּחַן*, *Gen.* xxxviii. 15; 1 *Sam.* i. 13; *Job* xiii. 24, xli. 24, ἐλογίσατο ἄβυσσον εἰς περίπατον; *Gen.* xv. 6, ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην; *Prov.* xvii. 28, ἀνοήτῃ ἐπερωτήσαντι σοφίαν σοφία λογισθήσεται; *Ps.* cvi. 31, καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην; *Xen. Cyrop.* i. 2. 11, μίαν ἄμφω ταύτας τὰς ἡμέρας λογίζονται; *Ael. H. N.* iii. 11, τὸ μηδὲν ἀδικῆσαι τὸν τροχίλον, λογίζεται οἱ μισθόν. Hence the expression occurs,

εἰς οὐδὲν λογίζεσθαι, *to esteem or reckon as of no account*, Acts xix. 27; Wisd. ii. 16, iii. 17, ix. 6. Thus it often occurs in Pauline phraseology, Rom. ii. 26, οὐχὶ ἡ ἀκροβυστία αὐτοῦ εἰς περιτομὴν λογισθήσεται; ix. 8, οὐ τὰ τέκνα τῆς σαρκὸς . . . ἀλλὰ τὰ τέκνα τῆς ἐπαγγελίας λογίζεται εἰς σπέρμα. Here (and the expression is perfectly appropriate, λογ. τι εἷς τι) the actual fact is not taken into account, the opposite rather is assumed, and according to this is the relationship or treatment regulated. *That is transferred to the subject in question, and imputed to him, which in and for itself does not belong to him*; when we read λογίζεσθαι τί τιμι εἰς τί, it denotes that something is imputed to the person *per substitutionem*. The object in question supplies the place of that for which it answers; it is substituted for it. So Rom. iv. 9, ἐλογίσθη τῷ Ἀβραάμ ἡ πίστις εἰς δικαιοσύνην; iv. 3, 5, 22; Gal. iii. 6; Jas. ii. 23. That this is the apostle's thought is clear from Rom. iv. 4, where λογίζεσθαι τι εἰς τι of ver. 3 is distinctly described as λογίζεσθαι κατὰ χάριν. We may read the whole passage, vv. 3–5, Ἐπίστευσεν δὲ Ἀβραάμ τῷ θεῷ καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην. τῷ δὲ ἐργαζομένῳ ὁ μισθὸς οὐ λογίζεται κατὰ χάριν ἀλλὰ κατὰ ὀφείλημα· τῷ δὲ μὴ ἐργαζομένῳ πιστεύοντι δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν δικαιούντα τὸν ἀσεβῆ, λογίζεται ἡ πίστις αὐτοῦ εἰς δικαιοσύνην. If λογίζεσθαι τι εἰς τι were not a λογίζεσθαι κατὰ χάριν, a reckoning *per substitutionem*, the statement at the end should have been λογίζεται ἡ δικαιοσύνη αὐτοῦ. But faith is now put in the place of righteousness, cf. ver. 6, ᾧ ὁ θεὸς λογίζεται δικαιοσύνην χωρὶς ἔργων—which, according to ver. 8, denotes the forgiveness of sins. Thus this λογίζεσθαι, *per substitutionem*, or κατὰ χάριν, is a *term techn.* for the justifying act of God, iv. 11, εἰς τὸ λογισθῆναι καὶ αὐτοῖς τὴν δικαιοσύνην; iv. 10, 23, 24. — Λογίζεσθαί τινα μετὰ τινος, *to number any one with*, Luke xxii. 37, μετὰ ἀνόμων ἐλογίσθη; Mark xv. 28. — (II.) *To reckon, to value or esteem, to take for*, 1 Pet. v. 12; 2 Cor. xii. 6. — Rom. viii. 36, λογίζεσθαί τινα ὥς, 1 Cor. iv. 1; 2 Cor. x. 2. Followed by the accusative with the infinitive, Phil. iii. 13; 2 Cor. xi. 5; Rom. xiv. 14. Followed by ὅτι, Heb. xi. 19. With two accusatives, Rom. vi. 11. — (III.) *To account, to conclude or infer, to believe*, Xen. *Hell.* vi. 1. 5, etc.; Rom. iii. 28, λογιζόμεθα δικαιῶσθαι πίστει ἄνθρωπον; ii. 3. — (IV.) *To consider*, John xi. 50; Mark xi. 31.

Λογισμός, ὁ, *reckoning, calculation, consideration, reflection*, e.g. λογισμῷ χρῆσθαι, ἐκ λογισμοῦ τι ποιεῖν, λογισμῷ τινὶ ποιεῖν τι, Thucyd., Plato, Xen., Aristotle. Therefore used of the consideration and reflection preceding and determining conduct, Aristot. *Rhet.* i. 10, πρᾶττεσθαι διὰ λογισμὸν τὰ δοκοῦντα συμφέρειν (cf. John xi. 50, Tisch.); Aristot. *Metaph.*, ἡ κατὰ προαίρεσιν κίνησις καὶ κατὰ τὸν λογισμὸν; Ps. xxxiii. 10, 11, synon. Βουλή; Prov. vi. 18, καρδία τεκταινομένη λογισμούς κακούς; Jer. xi. 19, ἐπ' ἐμέ ἐλογίσαντο λογισμὸν πονηρόν. In this sense in 2 Cor. x. 4 of considerations and intentions hostile to the gospel, λογισμούς καθαιροῦντες καὶ πᾶν ὕψωμα ἐπαιρόμενον κατὰ τῆς γνώσεως τοῦ θεοῦ. On the other hand, in Rom. ii. 15, of considerations and reflections following upon conduct, τῶν λογισμῶν κατηγορούντων ἢ καὶ ἀπολογουμένων. Not thus used in profane Greek, comp. *συνειδήσις*.—Cf. Prov. xii. 5, λογισμοὶ δικαίων κρίματα,

κυβερνώσι δὲ ἀσεβεῖς δόλους. Somewhat analogous is the rarer expression, connected with the meaning *computation*, λογισμὸν ἀποδοῦναι, λ. ἑαυτῷ διδόναι, *to give an account of oneself*, in Plutarch, Philostratus.

Διαλογίζομαι, *to reckon distributively, to settle with one, to ponder, to consider*, e.g. Plat. *Soph.* 231 C, πρὸς ἡμᾶς αὐτοὺς διαλογιζόμεθα, more rarely equivalent to διαλέγεσθαι = διαλέγειν κατὰ γένη τὰ πράγματα (Xen. *Mem.* v. 5. 12). So Xen. *Mem.* iii. 5. 1, διαλογιζόμενοι περὶ αὐτῶν ἐπισκοπῶμεν; cf. Mark ix. 33, 34. It differs from διαλέγεσθαι in this, that this latter word denotes *discussion*, but διαλογίζεσθαι, mainly *reflecting, calculating consideration*; hence also = *to be doubtful, to be uneasy about, to doubt*, Xen. *Hell.* vi. 4. 20, διαλογιζόμενοι πῇ . . . ἀποβήσοιτο. In the N. T. and in the LXX. for the most part of thoughts and considerations which in some sense or other are objectionable. Without this implied sense only in Ps. lxxvii. 6, διελογισάμην ἡμέρας ἀρχαίας, καὶ ἔτη αἰώνια ἐμνήσθην; 2 Macc. xii. 43, ὑπὲρ ἀναστάσεως διαλογιζόμενος; cf. Ael. *V. H.* xiv. 43 (in Schleusner), ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπου ψυχῆς διαλογίζεσθαι.—Luke iii. 15 i. 29. —Again, in Matt. xvi. 7, 8, Mark viii. 16, 17, as the outcome of little faith; Mark ii. 6, 8, Luke v. 21, 22, of opposition to Christ, cf. Luke xx. 14; Ps. xxi. 12, ἐκλιναν εἰς σέ κακά, διελογίσαντο βουλὴν κ.τ.λ.; Ps. xxxvi. 4, ἀνομίαν διελογίσατο (al. ἐλογ.); 1 Macc. xi. 8, διελογίζετο . . . λογισμοὺς πονηροῦς.—Matt. xxi. 25; Mark xi. 31; Luke xii. 17, of the unjust steward.—LXX. = נָחַן.

Διαλογισμός, ὁ, in the N. T. in a bad sense only, of thoughts and reflections in some way or other objectionable. In profane Greek = *calculation, consideration*, in Plato, Plutarch, and Strabo. So also in Ecclus. xxvii. 6, σκεύη κεράμεως δοκιμάζει κάμινος, καὶ πειρασμός ἀνθρώπου ἐν διαλογισμῷ αὐτοῦ, comp. vv. 6, 13, 26; Ps. xl. 6; Dan. ii. 29, 30, v. 6, 10, vii. 28. On the contrary, of objectionable thoughts, purposes, etc., Ps. lvi. 6, cxxxix. 20, cxlvi. 4; Isa. lix. 7; nevertheless διαλογισμοί does not in itself denote objectionable thoughts, as e.g. Phil. ii. 14; 1 Tim. ii. 8. Accordingly, in N. T. usage we find the addition, e.g., of πονηρός, κακός, Mark vii. 21; Matt. xv. 19; Jas. ii. 4. Without such an addition, in Luke ii. 35, v. 22, vi. 8, ix. 46, 47; Rom. i. 21; 1 Cor. iii. 20. The signification *suspicious, doubt*, proceeding from the state of indecision which lies at the basis of all consideration and calculation, is peculiar. So in Luke xxiv. 38; Rom. xiv. 1; Phil. ii. 14; 1 Tim. ii. 8. With the meaning *conference*, which the word has in Plutarch, *Apophth. Alex.* 101, it occurs in Ecclus. ix. 15; Wisd. vii. 20.

Ἐλλογέω, *to charge, to impute*, does not occur in Greek writers, except in inscriptions, cf. ἐλλόγιμος, *what is taken into account, or into consideration*. In Clem. Alex., ἐλλογίζειν; Rom. v. 13, ἀμαρτία δὲ οὐκ ἐλλογεῖται μὴ ὄντος νόμου; Philem. 18, εἰ δέ τι ἡδίκησέν σε ἢ ὀφείλει, τοῦτο ἐμοὶ ἐλλόγει, where Tisch. reads ἐλλόγα, therefore in the present ἐλλογάω; Hesychius, ἐλλόγει καταλογίσαι.

Ὁμολογέω,—(I.) *to say the same*, Xen. *Cyrop.* iv. 5. 26, ἀναγνῶναι δέ σοι καὶ τὰ

ἐπιστελλόμενα, ἔφη, βούλομαι, ἵνα εἰδὼς αὐτὰ ὁμολογῇς, ἂν τί σε πρὸς ταῦτα ἐρωτᾷ. Hence, to agree or coincide with, as distinct from συμφώνειν, with which it is joined, e.g. in Plat. *Rep.* ii. 403 D, as a definitely expressed, self-declared agreement; Herod. i. 23, λέγουσι Κορίνθιοι, ὁμολογέουσι δέ σφι Λέσβιοι; i. 171, οὕτω Κρήτες λέγουσι, οὐ μέντοι ὁμολογέουσι τούτοισιν οἱ Κᾶρες. With the dative of the person and the accusative of the thing, or the infinitive instead of the accusative, περί τι, ἐπί τινι. — (II.) To grant, to admit, to confess, *confiteri*; Xen. *Hist. Gr.* iii. 3. 11, ἡλέγχετο καὶ ὁμολόγει πάντα; John i. 20, ὁμολόγησεν καὶ οὐκ ἠρνήσατο, καὶ ὁμολόγησεν, ὅτι οὐκ εἰμὶ ὁ Χριστός; 1 John i. 9, ὁμολογεῖν τὰς ἁμαρτίας. Akin to this is, on the one hand, the meaning *profiteri*, to say openly, not to keep silence, etc.; and, on the other hand, to concede, to engage, to promise. The former we find in Matt. vii. 23, ὁμολογήσω αὐτοῖς ὅτι οὐδέποτε ἔγνω ὑμᾶς; Acts xxiv. 14, ὁμολογῶ δὲ τοῦτό σοι, ὅτι κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν ἦν λέγουσιν αἵρεσιν οὕτως λατρεύω τῷ πατρί θεῷ; Tit. i. 16, θεὸν ὁμολογοῦσιν εἰδέναι, τοῖς δὲ ἔργοις ἀρνοῦνται; Heb. xi. 13, ὁμολογήσαντες ὅτι ξένοι καὶ παρεπίδημοι εἰσιν κ.τ.λ. Cf. Plat. *Prot.* 317 B, ὁμολογῶ σοφιστὴς εἶναι. The latter in Matt. xiv. 7, μεθ' ὅρκου ὁμολόγησεν αὐτῇ δοῦναι; Acts vii. 17, cf. Xen. *Anab.* vii. 4. 22, πάντα ὁμολογοῦν ποιήσιν. — (III.) To recognise, expressly to acknowledge, to make known one's profession, to confess; cf. Thuc. iv. 62, τὴν ὑπὸ πάντων ὁμολογουμένην ἄριστον εἶναι εἰρήνην; Xen. *Anab.* v. 9. 27, πρὶν ἐποίησαν πᾶσαν τὴν πόλιν ὁμολογεῖν Λακεδαιμονίους καὶ αὐτῶν ἡγεμόνας εἶναι; Plat. *Conv.* 202 B, ὁμολογεῖται γε παρὰ πάντων μέγας θεὸς εἶναι. (With disputers = to grant that our opponent is right, τὰ ὁμολογούμενα, things upon which both parties are agreed, universally acknowledged, etc. "Ὁμολογεῖν saepe est disputantium, inter quos convenit de aliqua re, qui e concessis disputant," *Lex. Xen.*) Acts xxiii. 8, Σαδδουκαῖοι μὲν λέγουσιν μὴ εἶναι ἀνάστασιν μηδὲ ἄγγελον μήτε πνεῦμα, Φαρισαῖοι δὲ ὁμολογοῦσιν τὰ ἀμφότερα; Rev. iii. 5; Matt. x. 32; Luke xii. 8. Akin to this is the use of ὁμολογεῖν in the N. T. with the object of the person, Jesus Christ, denoting the public acknowledgment of Him, John ix. 22, εἰάν τις αὐτὸν ὁμολογήσῃ Χριστὸν, ἀποσυνάγωγος γένηται (Matt. x. 32, ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων), the basis and condition of which is faith in Him; John xii. 42, ἐκ τῶν ἀρχόντων πολλοὶ ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτόν, ἀλλὰ διὰ τοὺς Φαρισαίους οὐχ ὁμολόγουν, comp. Rom. x. 9, 10, καρδίᾳ γὰρ πιστεύεται . . . στόματι δὲ ὁμολογεῖται. Accordingly, the confessing of Christ is the outward expression of personal faith in Him. This is contrasted with ἀρνεῖσθαι, to withhold, refuse, or withdraw such a confession, 1 John ii. 23, πᾶς ὁ ἀρνούμενος τὸν υἱὸν οὐδὲ τὸν πατέρα ἔχει· ὁ ὁμολογῶν τὸν υἱὸν καὶ τὸν πατέρα ἔχει; Matt. x. 32, 33; Luke xii. 8. See also 1 John iv. 2, ὁμολ. Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθότα (see ἔρχεσθαι). Ver. 3, ὁμολ. τὸν Ἰησοῦν; ver. 15, ὃς ἂν ὁμολογήσῃ ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἐστὶν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ; 2 John 7, οἱ μὴ ὁμολογοῦντες Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐρχόμενον ἐν σαρκί. The ὅστις ὁμολογήσει ἐν ἐμοὶ ἔμπροσθεν κ.τ.λ. in Matt. x. 32, Luke xii. 8, is indeed without precedent in profane Greek, and is perhaps best explained by analogy with the Hebrew *לְיָהוּיָהּ*, Ps. xxxii. 5, cf. Neh. i. 6, ix. 2 (LXX. Neh. i. 6, ἐξαγορεύω ἐπὶ ἁμαρτίαις, cf. Ecclus. iv. 29); yet it is not wholly alien to Greek usage, as = he who makes confession concerning me; cf. Herod.

ix. 48, πλείστον δὴ ἐν ὑμῖν ἐψεύσθημεν, "we have been mistaken or deceived in you," cf. Bernhardt, p. 212. — 1 Tim. vi. 12, ὁμολ. τὴν καλὴν ὁμολογίαν, *vi. l.* Rom. x. 10 compared with ver. 9, where the recognition of Christ as κύριος is spoken of; cf. ver. 13, where it is said of Christ, μαρτυρήσας ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου τὴν καλὴν ὁμολογίαν, with reference to John xix. 37. — (IV.) To recognise, to praise, Heb. xiii. 15, καρπὸς χειλέων ὁμολογούντων τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ, the dative to be explained as = *to testify to Him our confession of Him*; so only in the LXX, usually ἐξομολογεῖσθαι, Ps. xlii. 6, xliii. 4, 5; Gen. xxix. 34, and other places.

Ὁμολογία, ἡ, agreement, compact, understanding. In N. T. Greek = recognition, confession, derived from ὁμολογεῖν (III.). So Heb. iii. 1, where Christ is called ἀρχιερεὺς τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν; x. 23, κατέχωμεν τὴν ὁμολογίαν τῆς ἐλπίδος ἀκλινῆ, cf. ver. 25; 2 Cor. ix. 13, ὁμολ. εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον. Absolutely = confession of Christ and to Christ (cf. Rom. x. 10), 1 Tim. vi. 12, 13; Heb. iv. 14.—In the LXX. with the meaning given under ὁμολογεῖν (IV.); 2 Esdr. ix. 8, δότε ὁμολογίαν καὶ δόξαν τῷ κυρίῳ. Elsewhere = vow, cf. ὁμολογεῖν (II.); = פָּקַדְתִּי, Deut. xii. 6, 17; Ezek. xlvi. 13; Amos iv. 5; = נָשָׁא, Lev. xxii. 18; Jer. xlv. 25.

Ὁμολογουμένως, confessedly, "*sine controversia, uno omnium consensu.*" Xen. Anab. ii. 6. 1, Κλέαρχος ὁμολογουμένως ἐκ πάντων τῶν ἐμπείρους αὐτοῦ ἐχόντων δόξας γενέσθαι ἀνὴρ καὶ πολεμικός; Plat. Menex. 243 C, ἄνδρες γενόμενοι ὁμολογουμένως ἄριστοι. In the N. T. 1 Tim. iii. 16, στῦλος καὶ ἐδραῖωμα τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ ὁμολογουμένως μέγα ἔστιν τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον.

Ἐκλέγω, in biblical Greek only in the middle, and once, Luke ix. 35, in the passive (but the reading is uncertain, ἐκλεγεμένος, ἐκλεκτός, ἀγαπητός); in profane Greek active and middle—(I.) to select, to choose out; Xen. Hell. i. 6. 19, ἐξ ἀπασῶν τῶν νεῶν τοὺς ἀρίστους ἐρέτας ἐκλέξας; Luke vi. 13, προσεφώνησεν τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐκλεξάμενος ἀπ' αὐτῶν δώδεκα, οὓς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασεν; Acts i. 24, ἀνάδειξον ὃν ἐξελέξω ἐκ τούτων τῶν δύο ἕνα; xv. 22, 25.—(II.) To elect, without special reference to the place from which or out of which, to choose a person to be something, to a position or state, so that the previous position would be regarded as the place of origin, comp. οἱ ἐκλεκτοὶ ἄγγελοι, 1 Tim. v. 21; Plat. Rep. vii. 535 A, μέμνησαι οὖν τὴν προτέραν ἐκλογὴν τῶν ἀρχόντων, οἷους ἐξελέξαμεν; Luke x. 42, ἀγαθὴν μερίδα ἐξελέξατο; xiv. 7, πρωτοκλισίας ἐξελέγοντο; Acts i. 2, οὓς [ἀποστόλους] ἐξελέξατο; vi. 5, ἐξελέξαντο Στέφανον; xv. 7, ἐξελέξατο ὁ θεὸς διὰ τοῦ στόματός μου ἀκοῦσαι τὰ ἔθνη κ.τ.λ.; John xv. 16, οὐχ ὑμεῖς μὲ ἐξελέξασθε, ἀλλ' ἐγὼ ἐξελεξάμην ὑμᾶς, καὶ ἔθηκα ὑμᾶς, ἵνα κ.τ.λ.; xv. 19, ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου οὐκ ἐστέ, ἀλλ' ἐγὼ ἐξελεξάμην ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου; vi. 70, οὐκ ἐγὼ ὑμᾶς τοὺς δώδεκα ἐξελεξάμην; xiii. 18, οἶδα οὓς ἐξελεξάμην.—(III.) The distinctively scriptural use of ἐκλέγεσθαι of God's dealings towards men in the scheme of redemption—Mark xiii. 20; Acts xiii. 17; 1 Cor. i. 27, 28; Eph. i. 4; Jas. ii. 5—corresponds with the use of the

Hebrew בחר, for which it stands in all but a few places, where בחר is = ἐπιλέγειν, Ex. xvii. 9, xviii. 25, Josh. viii. 3, 2 Sam. x. 9; αἰρεῖσθαι, Josh. xxiv. 15; προαιρεῖσθαι, Deut. vii. 6, Prov. i. 29; αἰρετίζειν, Zech. i. 17, ii. 16, Hag. ii. 13, Ps. cxix. 30, 173. In בחר, however, the idea of testing and deciding thereby is more prominent than that of choosing, and hence it means "to decide for anything," *to choose out*, and is akin to the meaning (II.). Comp. Gen. vi. 2, ἔλαβον ἑαυτοῖς γυναῖκας ἀπὸ πασῶν ὧν ἐξελέξαντο, לָבַח בְּחַר בְּשָׂאָה, xiii. 11, ἐξελέξατο ἑαυτῷ Λὼτ παῖσαν τὴν περικύριον τοῦ Ἰορδάνου; Deut. xxx. 19, ἐκλέξαι τὴν ζωὴν, ἵνα ζῇς σύ; 1 Sam. viii. 18, ὑμεῖς ἐξελέξασθε ἑαυτοῖς βασιλέα, cf. Deut. xvii. 15; Josh. xxiv. 22, ὑμεῖς ἐξελέξασθε κυρίῳ λατρεύειν αὐτῷ; Isa. lxvi. 3, ἐξελέξαντο ἃ ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτῶν ἠθέλησεν.—The idea of selection is specially prominent where it is said to be considered, as in 2 Sam. xxiv. 12, τρία ἐγὼ αἶρω ἐπὶ σέ· ἔκλεξαι σεαυτῷ ἐν ἐξ αὐτῶν. And this onesidedness of the Hebrew expression makes it an appropriate designation for that affection and preference which love feels towards the object of its choice, and which is somewhat remote from the sense of the Greek word, cf. 1 Sam. xx. 30, וְשָׂאָה נָתַן לָהּ בְּחַר, σὺ μέτοχος εἶ τῷ υἱῷ Ἰεσσαί. And hence the opposite of electing, viz. refusing or rejecting, does not apply to the object not chosen, but wherever it occurs expresses simply the annulling of the election in the case of the object chosen, *vid.* Jer. xxxiii. 24, αἱ δύο πατριαὶ ἃς ἐξελέξατο κύριος ἐν αὐταῖς, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἀπώσατο αὐτάς; Ps. lxxviii. 67, 68, cf. with ver. 59; Ex. xxxii. 32, 33; Isa. xiv. 1, ἐλεήσει κύριος τὸν Ἰακώβ καὶ ἐκλέξεται ἔτι τὸν Ἰσραὴλ; Zech. i. 17, ii. 16.—This is important as bearing upon the Christian use of the word, and primarily for its use with reference to Israel, showing that this choice of the one people before the rest does not imply the rejection of all the nations not chosen. The παρὰ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, Deut. iv. 37, x. 15, cf. xiv. 2, is to be understood simply according to the apostle's word, Acts xiv. 16, ὃς ἐν ταῖς παρῳχημέναις γενεαῖς εἴασεν πάντα τὰ ἔθνη πορεύεσθαι ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτῶν κ.τ.λ. Cf. also 1 Sam. xvi. 8, οὐδὲ τοῦτον ἐξελέξατο ὁ κύριος, vv. 9, 10 with xv. 23, ἐξουθενώσει σε κύριος μὴ εἶναι βασιλέα. The election of Israel in relation to other nations is parallel to the election of Levi in relation to the tribes of Israel, Deut. xviii. 5, αὐτὸν ἐξελέξατο κύριος ὁ θεός σου ἐκ πασῶν τῶν φυλῶν σου, παρεστάναι κ.τ.λ.; and to the selection of a special locality as the dwelling-place of God, Deut. xii. 5, ὁ τόπος ὃν ἂν ἐκλέξηται κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν ἐκ πασῶν τῶν φυλῶν ὑμῶν. The non-choosing, which amounts to rejection, arises only from opposition brought about by the perverted conduct of the chosen, cf. Num. xvi. 6, 7, concerning the opposition of the Korahites. The election of Israel, while it must not be viewed without reference to other nations, must still less be viewed apart from its determining to a goal. This is the basis of the special connection between God and Israel, by virtue of which God is Israel's God, and Israel is God's peculiar treasure, cf. Deut. xiv. 2, καὶ σε ἐξελέξατο κύριος ὁ θεός σου γενέσθαι σε αὐτῷ λαὸν περιούσιον ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν; Ps. cxxxv. 4; Ps. cxxxiii. 12, μακάριον τὸ ἔθνος οὗ ἐστὶ κύριος ὁ θεὸς αὐτοῦ, λαὸς ὃν ἐξελέξατο εἰς κληρονομίαν ἑαυτοῦ. The election is on God's part simply the outcome of free love, freely choosing its object, and hence the union of the word with ἐλεοῦν, ἀγαπᾶν (which see).

Cf. Deut. iv. 37, διὰ τὸ ἀγαπήσαι αὐτὸν τοὺς πατέρας σου καὶ ἐξελέξατο τὸ σπέρμα αὐτῶν; x. 15, τοὺς πατέρας ὑμῶν προείλατο κύριος ἀγαπᾶν αὐτοὺς καὶ ἐξελέξατο τὸ σπέρμα αὐτῶν; Isa. xiv. 1, ἐλεήσει κύριος τὸν Ἰακώβ καὶ ἐκλέξεται ἔτι τὸν Ἰσραήλ, cf. Zech. i. 17, ii. 16; Isa. xliv. 2, ὁ ἡγαπημ' ἰσραήλ, ὃν ἐξελεξάμην; xli. 8, σὺ δὲ Ἰσραήλ, παῖς μου, Ἰακώβ ὃν ἐξελεξάμην, σπέρμα Ἀβραὰμ ὃν ἡγάπησα; Ps. lxxviii. 68. Cf. Rom. xi. 28, κατὰ μὲν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἐχθροὶ δι' ὑμᾶς, κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἐκλογὴν ἀγαπητοὶ διὰ τοῦ πατέρος.

Now, as any claim to God's salvation must arise solely from His free election, the ἡττημα of Israel is thus understood by the Apostle Paul, Rom. xi. 12, cf. ver. 1. For this election, which excludes all legal claim on the part of its objects, and which characterizes God's saving plan and its realization,—Rom. ix. 11, ἵνα ἡ κατ' ἐκλογὴν πρόθεσις τοῦ θεοῦ μένη,—demands at the same time from the objects of it a faith, renouncing all legal claim, and the acknowledgment of the utter worthlessness of all claims upon man's part; but as Israel does not surrender itself thus to the election, but raises claims of its own, it puts itself out of connection with the divine election, cf. Rom. ix. 30–33. This is the gist of the argument in Rom. ix.–xi., which rightly states the idea. Thus historically the ἐκλογή (a term denoting not God's act, but the historical object of that act) denotes those who by faith have renounced all merit, and thus have entered upon the state intended for them by God's free love—as contrasted with “the rest,” who have asserted the claims of their own righteousness in opposition to God's electing grace; Rom. xi. 7, ὁ ἐπιζητεῖ Ἰσραήλ, τοῦτο οὐκ ἐπέτυχεν . . . ἡ δὲ ἐκλογὴ ἐπέτυχεν οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ ἐπωρώθησαν, cf. ver. 11. The ἐκλεκτοὶ are therefore the personal objects of the election, in so far as through faith they answer thereto, and not those whom God chose in foreknowledge of their faith. Hence the warning of St. Peter (2 Pet. i. 10), σπουδάσατε βεβαίαν ὑμῶν τὴν κλήσιν καὶ ἐκλογὴν ποιεῖσθαι, and the distinction between κλητοὶ and ἐκλεκτοί, cf. κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοί, Rom. viii. 28. Election, or ἡ κατ' ἐκλογὴν πρόθεσις, is to be regarded as embracing all, but, owing to man's guilt, as only partially realizing itself.

The N. T. ἐκλέγεσθαι, accordingly, will be understood to have as its historical objects those in whom the divine purpose is realized, Mark xiii. 20, διὰ τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς οὓς ἐξελέξατο; 1 Cor. i. 27, 28, μῶρα, ἀσθενῆ, ἀγενῆ ἐξελέξατο ὁ θεός,—that is, the divine election is so arranged that its realization embraces just the given objects. Jas. ii. 5, ὁ θεὸς ἐξελέξατο τοὺς πτωχοὺς τῷ κόσμῳ πλουσίους ἐν πίστει κ.τ.λ.; Eph. i. 4, ἐξελέξατο ἡμᾶς ἐν Χριστῷ πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, εἶναι ἡμᾶς κ.τ.λ., cannot be taken to imply a division of mankind into two classes according to a divine plan before history began; it simply traces back the state of grace and Christian piety to the eternal and independent electing-love of God. See under ἄγιος.

The construction ἐκλέγεσθαι ἐν τινι in some O. T. texts, e.g. 1 Sam. xvi. 9, 10, Jer. xxxiii. 34, and elsewhere, is worthy of notice. See εὐδοκεῖν. Concerning the conception of election, comp. in particular, Tholuck, *Römerbrief*, p. 467 sqq., and Beck, *Versuch über Röm. ix.*; Hofmann, *Schriftbeweis*, i. 218 sqq.

Ἐκλεκτός, verbal adj., in the sense of the perfect participle passive = (I.) Chosen out, separated, *e.g.* Plat. *Legg.* xii. 946 D, εἰς τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς δικαστὰς εἰσαγέτω, for which he elsewhere (*e.g.* xi. 926 D) has ἐκκριτός. Then (II.) chosen out, preferable, thus occasionally in classical Greek; oftener in the LXX., *e.g.* ἄνδρες ἐκλεκτοί, Judg. xx. 16, 34, 1 Sam. xxiv. 2, xxvi. 2, xiii. 2 = *chosen or picked men*; 2 Esdr. v. 8, λίθοι ἐκλεκτοί; Song v. 16; 1 Tim. v. 21, ἐκλ. ἄγγελοι? Lastly, (III.) chosen, 1 Pet. ii. 4, ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπων μὲν ἀποδοκιμασμένον [λίθον], παρὰ δὲ θεῷ ἐκλεκτόν, if we may not include this under II., see ver. 6. Elsewhere it corresponds with the scriptural use of ἐκλέγεσθαι under III. So also of an individual specially connected with God, *e.g.* Moses, Ps. cvi. 23; cf. Ps. lxxxix. 20, of David; generally of one chosen to a special service, *e.g.* of the servant of Jehovah in Isa. xli. 8, with which may be compared 1 Tim. v. 21, οἱ ἐκλεκτοὶ ἄγγελοι. Akin to this is Luke xxiii. 35, ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκλεκτός (ἐκλελεγμένος, ἀγαπητός). And hence of Israel collectively, the chosen people, ὁ ἐκλεκτός μου, Isa. xlii. 1, xlv. 4; cf. xliii. 20, τὸ γένος μου τὸ ἐκλεκτόν, λαόν μου ὃν περιποιήσάμην τὰς ἀρετάς μου διηγέσθαι, and οἱ ἐκλεκτοί, Isa. lxv. 9, 15, 22; Ps. cv. 6, 43, cvi. 5; 1 Chron. xvi. 13 = יְהוָה. Closely connected with the passages in Isaiah is the view decisively appearing in the N. T., viz. that the ἐκλεκτοί are persons who not only are *in thesi* the objects of the divine election, but who are so in fact, *i.e.* those who have entered upon the state of reconciliation conditioned by their election, and whose bearing towards God answers to God's bearing towards them, hence Matt. xxiv. 24, ὥστε πλανῆσαι εἰ δυνατόν καὶ τοὺς ἐκλεκτούς; Matt. xx. 16, xxii. 14, πολλοὶ κλητοί, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοί; Rev. xvii. 14, κλητοὶ καὶ ἐκλεκτοὶ καὶ πιστοί; Tit. i. 1, κατὰ πίστιν ἐκλεκτῶν θεοῦ. Thus οἱ ἐκλεκτοί, [οἱ] ἐκλεκτοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ come to denote those in whom God's saving purpose—ἡ κατ' ἐκλογὴν πρόθεσις—of free love is realized, and this gives to the texts cited their weight and emphasis. Matt. xxiv. 22, 31; Mark xiii. 20, 22, 27; Luke xviii. 7; Rom. viii. 33; Col. iii. 12; 2 Tim. ii. 10; 1 Pet. i. 1, ii. 9; 2 John 13. Once it would stand of an individual, Rom. xvi. 13, Ῥούφος ὁ ἐκλεκτὸς ἐν Κυρίῳ, if the apostle were not here more probably designating his own relation to the person named; cf. 1 Sam. xx. 30.

Ἐκλογή, ἡ, occurs in Plato and in later Greek, and means choice, election, more rarely in the sense, selection. Plat. *Rep.* iii. 414 A, ἡ ἐκλογὴ καὶ κατάστασις τῶν ἀρχόντων; Polyb. vi. 10. 9, κατ' ἐκλογὴν, according to selection. Not in the LXX.; *Psalt. Sal.* vii. 9, τὰ ἔργα ἡμῶν ἐν ἐκλογῇ καὶ ἐξουσίᾳ τῆς ψυχῆς ἡμῶν, τοῦ ποιῆσαι δικαιοσύνην καὶ ἀδικίαν; Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 14, ἐπ' ἀνθρώπων ἐκλογῇ τό τε καλὸν καὶ τὸ κακὸν πρόκειται. In the N. T. (I.) choice, election; Acts ix. 15, σκεῦος ἐκλογῆς ἐστίν μοι οὗτος τοῦ βαστάσαι κ.τ.λ. = *a chosen instrument*. Elsewhere it corresponds with the Christian sense of ἐκλέγεσθαι, and denotes the divine election which distinguishes the divine purpose of grace; hence ἡ κατ' ἐκλογὴν πρόθεσις, God's purpose according to election, Rom. ix. 11 and Rom. xi. 5, κατ' ἐκλογὴν χάριτος, because the election, which excludes all meritorious claims, proceeds for this very reason from grace, and refers itself to grace, Rom. xi. 28,

κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἐκλογὴν ἀγαπητοί, *vid.* ἐκλέγεσθαι; 1 Thess. i. 4, εἰδότες, ἀδελφοὶ ἠγαπημένοι ὑπὸ θεοῦ, τὴν ἐκλογὴν ὑμῶν; 2 Pet. i. 10, βεβαίαν ὑμῶν τὴν κλήσιν καὶ ἐκλογὴν ποιεῖσθαι, *vid.* ἐκλέγεσθαι.—(II.) As ἐκλογή signifies that which is chosen, selection, *e.g.* *Rhym.* 1, ἐκλογὴ ῥημάτων καὶ ὀνομάτων Ἀττικῶν, so in Rom. xi. 7 it means the chosen, the entire company of those in whom God's election has been historically realized, ἡ ἐκλογὴ ἐπέτυχεν, οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ ἐπωρώθησαν. For further on this, see above.

Λοῦω, to bathe, to wash, while νίζειν, νίπτειν, is = to wash or cleanse; πλύνειν, on the contrary, of washing clothes. Cf. John xiii. 10, ὁ λελουμένος οὐκ ἔχει χρεῖαν ἢ τοὺς πόδας νίψασθαι, ἀλλ' ἐστὶν καθαρὸς ὅλος.—Acts ix. 37, xvi. 33. Almost always of persons; occasionally, as in 2 Pet. ii. 22, ὅς λουσαμένη, of beasts.

While in classical Greek νίζειν or νίπτειν was used of religious washings,—cf. Eur. *Iph. T.* 1191, ἀγνοῖς καθαρμοῖς νιν νίψαι θέλω; Hom. *Il.* vi. 266, χερσὶ δ' ἀνίπτουσιν Διὶ λείβειν αἶθοπα οἶνον ἄζομαι, cf. Matt. xv. 2; Mark vii. 3; Matt. xv. 20; Mark vii. 2, 5,—λούειν is the term used in the LXX., as corresponding with the Hebrew רָחַץ, to denote the theocratic washings for cleansing from sin; *vid.* βαπτίζειν. And while βαπτίζειν was used for the N. T. washing in order to purification from sin, λούειν, λουτρόν, ἀπολούειν serve in some passages to give prominence to the full import of βαπτίζειν, which had become a *term. techn.*, or (as in Rev. i. 5) to denote cleansing from sin generally; Heb. x. 22, λελουμένοι τὸ σῶμα ὕδατι καθαρῷ; Rev. i. 5, τῷ λούσαντι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ. The word seems occasionally to have been used in profane Greek to denote religious cleansings, Plut. *Probl. Rom.* 264 D, λούσασθαι πρὸ τῆς θυσίας; Soph. *Ant.* 1186, τὸν μὲν λούσαντες ἀγνὸν λουτρόν.

Λουτρόν, τό, bath. Answering to the biblical use of λούειν, it denotes baptism, Eph. v. 26, ἵνα αὐτὴν ἀγιάσῃ καθαρίσας τῷ λουτρῷ τοῦ ὕδατος ἐν ῥήματι (*vid.* ῥήμα); Tit. iii. 5, ἔσωσεν ἡμᾶς διὰ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας,—where we must bear in mind the close connection between cleansing from sin and regeneration, cf. John iii. 8; 2 Cor. v. 17; Rom. vi. 4.—Ecclus. xxxi. 30, βαπτιζόμενος ἀπὸ νεκροῦ καὶ πάλιν ἀπτόμενος αὐτοῦ, τί ὠφέλησε τῷ λουτρῷ αὐτοῦ.—In classical Greek, λουτρά, in like manner, denote propitiatory offerings and offerings for purification, *vid.* Soph. *El.* lxxxiv. 434.—LXX.—πῦρ, Song iv. 2, vi. 5.

Ἀπολούω, to wash away, seldom in the LXX., *e.g.* Job ix. 30, ἐὰν γὰρ ἀπολούσωμαι χιόνι καὶ ἀποκαθάρωμαι χερσὶ καθαλαῖς. In the N. T. it gives prominence to the cleansing from sin connected with baptism, Acts xxii. 16, βάπτισαι καὶ ἀπόλουσαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας σου; and in 1 Cor. vi. 11, a confounding of the outward form with the inward cleansing is guarded against by the use of ἀπελούσασθε instead of ἐβαπτίσθητε. The middle, as with βαπτίζεσθαι, is = to have oneself washed, or, as also in Job viii. 30, to wash oneself. See βαπτίζειν.

Λύω, to loose, as opposed to δέειν, to bind.—(I.) To loosen, (α.) of things, to loosen or

untie, e.g. τὸν ἰμάντα, Mark i. 7; Luke iii. 16; σφραγίδα, Rev. v. 2, τὸν δέσμον τῆς γλώσσης, Mark vii. 35, cf. Luke xiii. 16. Also of the *loosing* or *untying* of beasts, comp. Matt. xxi. 2; (b.) of persons, to release, to set one free, e.g. ἐκ δουλείας, ἐκ δεσμών, etc.; Luke xiii. 16; Acts xxii. 30; Rev. xx. 3, 7. Also without addition, λύειν τινα, to liberate any one, to free him from punishment, see below.—(II.) to loosen—to loose, to undo, to remove, to set aside, to destroy, to break, etc., Matt. v. 19, μίαν τῶν ἐντολῶν τούτων; John vii. 23, τὸν νόμον; x. 35, τὴν γραφήν; ii. 19, τὸν ναόν; 1 John iii. 8, τὰ ἔργα τοῦ διαβόλου; Eph. ii. 14, τὸ μεσότοιχον τοῦ φραγμοῦ, etc. The meaning of the term in Matt. xvi. 19 is much contested, δώσω σοὶ τὰς κλεῖδας τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν, καὶ ὃ ἂν δήσῃς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἔσται δεδεμένον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, καὶ ὃ ἐὰν λύσῃς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἔσται λελυμένον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς; xviii. 18, ὅσα ἂν δήσητε ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἔσται δεδεμένα ἐν οὐρανῷ, καὶ ὅσα ἐὰν λύσητε ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἔσται λελυμένα ἐν οὐρανῷ. From the time of Lightfoot, Schöttgen, Wetstein, this has been taken as analogous to the Rabbinical words רָפָה and רָפָה, to bind and loosen = to forbid and allow (cf. Dan. ix. 6, 8, very often in speaking of the difference between the schools of Hillel and Shammai), and then the word is understood of “the moral, legislative power” given to the disciples. The objection certainly cannot justly be raised that this mode of expression has never been adopted in biblical Greek, because the N. T. Greek very often deviates from O. T. Greek, and adopts the language of Jewish theology. Our judgment as to the allowableness of this explanation must depend upon internal grounds. In the face of such expressions as Matt. v. 19, xxiii. 3, 4, such an interpretation seems more than hazardous; the quantitative ὅσα (xviii. 18) especially would militate against the spirit of N. T. life, thought, and phraseology; and it is evident from the context that in Matt. v. 19 a judicial and not a “legislative” authority is referred to, while in the first-named passage (Matt. xvi. 19) “the keys of the kingdom of heaven” simply imply the same thing, cf. Rev. iii. 7. The explanation also given by the Greek commentators (Theophylact, Euthymius) of the *remitting or retaining of sins*, presents no difficulty as far as λύειν is concerned, though, as to δέειν = κρατεῖν with the object “sins,” it cannot perhaps be established. Λύειν ἁμαρτήματα means not only to make atonement or compensation for sins, as in Soph. Phil. 1224, λύσων ὅς’ ἐξήμαρτον, but oftener still to forgive, to pardon. Eur. Or. 596, 597, ἢ οὐκ ἀξιοχρεῶς ὁ θεὸς ἀναφέροντι μοι μίσμα λύσαι; Plut. Mor. 195, τὰ μὲν οὖν ἡμαρτημένα λελύσθω τοῖς ἡνδραγαθημένοις; *ibid.* 214, ἐβούλοντο τὴν ἀτιμίαν λύσαι καὶ τοὺς νόμους τηρεῖν; 404, περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἡρώτα τὸν θεόν, εἴ τις εἴη παράκλησις καὶ λύσις (cf. Kypke, *Obs. Ser.*); Philo, *Vit. Mos.* 669, λύσις ἁμαρτημάτων; Isa. xl. 2, λέλυται αὐτῆς ἡ ἁμαρτία; Ecclus. xxviii. 2, αἱ ἁμαρτίαι σου λυθήσονται. We must explain δέειν as the appropriate antithesis of λύειν. See also Job xiv. 17, לְבַטְחַי יִשְׁכַּח וְיִשְׁכַּח וְיִשְׁכַּח וְיִשְׁכַּח.—The simpler plan would perhaps be to take ὁ and ὅσα as collective designations of persons, for which, indeed, according to the rule, the neuter singular is used, yet also the plural, e.g. 1 Cor. i. 27, 28. Λύειν τινά would then be—to release any one from punishment, as in Plat. *Legg.* i. 637 B, cf. Luke vi. 37, ἀπολύετε καὶ ἀπολυθήσεσθε, and

δέειν = to bind, to put under a ban, cf. Tobit iii. 17, viii. 3. But ὅσα would not sound acceptably to Greek ears if used in this sense.

Λύτρον, τό, the means of loosing; almost always for the price paid for the liberation of those in bondage (usually in the plural), just as λύειν sometimes means to release from bondage, to free, especially by a price paid (Xen., Thuc., Plato). So in the LXX. = ^{לְבִשָּׁה} Lev. xxv. 51, of the price paid for the release of one who had become a slave, see ver. 24; Num. iii. 46-51; Lev. xix. 20; Num. xviii. 15. As to the N. T. passages,—Matt. xx. 28, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου . . . ἦλθεν . . . δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν, Mark x. 45,—the fundamental idea in the word is the same as that more fully expressed in Num. xxxv. 31, οὐ λήψεσθε λύτρα περὶ ψυχῆς παρὰ τοῦ φονεύσαντος τοῦ ἐνόχου ὄντος ἀναιρεθῆναι· θανάτῳ γὰρ θανατωθήσεται. We must also remember that λύτρον in classical Greek denotes the means of expiation with reference to their intended result, e.g. in Aesch. Choeph. 48, λύτρον αἵματος (akin to λύειν), of acts of expiation, e.g. φόνον φόνῳ λύειν, Soph. O. R. 100; Eurip. Or. 510; Aesch. Choeph. 803 (791), ἄγετε, τῶν πάλαι πεπραγμένων λύσασθ' αἷμα προσφάτοις δίκαις, "atone for past acts of bloodguiltiness with new punishments." So of religious or ritualistic expiations, Plat. Rep. ii. 364 E, λύσεις τε καὶ καθαρμοὶ ἀδικημάτων; Soph. El. 447, λυτήρια τοῦ φόνου, the means of expiation. Even according to classical usage, therefore, it is by no means strange that the death of our Lord, elsewhere designated a sacrifice, should be called λύτρον, ransom, and the choice of the singular instead of the plural (which is also used in the LXX.) is explained by this reference, the ψυχὴν ἀντὶ πολλῶν = ψυχὴν ἀντὶ ψυχῆς, denoting the same expiatory death. Comparisons elsewhere used also lead us to take λύτρον here as = expiation. In Num. xxxv. 31, Ex. xxi. 30, λύτρον is = ^{קֶדֶשׁ} (see ἱλάσκομαι). In Ps. xlix. 8 this word in an analogous connection is = ἐξίλασμα, and λυτροῦν is the result of expiation, ἀδελφὸς οὐ λυτροῦται· λυτρώσεται ἄνθρωπος; οὐ δώσει τῷ θεῷ ἐξίλασμα ἑαυτοῦ καὶ τὴν τιμὴν τῆς λυτρώσεως τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ. Cf. Isa. xliii. 3 = ἄλλαγμα, with Matt. xvi. 26, Mark viii. 37, ἀντάλλαγμα τῆς ψυχῆς. The ransom price is an expiation or (Num. xxxv. 31) an equivalent for the punishment due, and therefore frees from the consequences of guilt. Accordingly, and in keeping with linguistic usage, the expression ἀντὶ πολλῶν is to be taken in combination with λύτρον, not with δοῦναι. Cf. the passages cited by Bretschneider, 3 Macc. vi. 29, ἀντίψυχον λάβε τὴν ἐμὴν ψυχὴν; xvii. 22, ἀντίψυχον τῆς τοῦ ἔθνους ἀμαρτίας; Act. Thom. 47, λύτρον αἰώνων παραπτωμάτων.

Δυτρόω, literally, to bring forward a ransom, the active being used not of him who gives, but of him who receives it; hence = to release on receipt of a ransom, cf. Plat. Theæt. 165 E, οὐ σε χειρωσάμενος . . . ἐλύτρον χρημάτων ὅσων σοὶ τε κάκεινφ ἐδόκει; Diod. xix. 73, τῶν στρατιωτῶν οὓς μὲν ἐλύτρωσεν. In the middle, to release by payment of a ransom, to redeem. Passive, to be redeemed, ransomed. So in biblical Greek, where ἀπολυτρόω only occurs once in the active = to redeem, to ransom, Ex. xxi. 8, while elsewhere this verb is also = λυτρόω, to receive a ransom. We find the latter only in the middle = to

ransom, to redeem, and in the passive, to be ransomed or redeemed. In the LXX. generally = פדוּ, e.g. Ps. xlix. 8, xxxi. 6, lxxi. 23; Ex. xiii. 15; Lev. xix. 20, xxvii. 29, etc. So also in the N. T. the middle, Luke xxiv. 21, Tit. ii. 14; the passive, 1 Pet. i. 18.—As to the meaning of the word, it denotes that aspect of the Saviour's work wherein He appears as *the Redeemer of mankind from bondage*. This bondage, which is still regarded quite generally as oppression in Luke xxiv. 21,—*ἡμεῖς δὲ ἠλπίζομεν ὅτι αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ μέλλων λυτροῦσθαι τὸν Ἰσραὴλ*, for the deficient understanding of Christ's death on the part of the Emmaus disciples is explained by the O. T. expressions, מִן־כָּל־חַטֹּאתֵינוּ, מִן־כָּל־עֲוֹנוֹתֵינוּ, —is in the two other texts (Tit. ii. 15; 1 Pet. i. 18) clearly the guilt and thralldom of the sinner in God's sight (*vid.* λύτρον); and hence λύτρωσις, ἀπολύτρωσις. *Redemption as the result of expiation*, this is the prominent thought in the N. T. view of salvation, and this was foreshadowed in the connection between the *sins* of Israel and their *oppression*, so often mentioned in the O. T., cf. Isa. xl. 1, 2. That this thought was akin to the O. T. view is evident from the passage above cited under λύτρον, Ps. xlix. 8, and also from Ps. cxxx. 8, καὶ αὐτὸς λυτρώσεται τὸν Ἰσραὴλ ἐκ πασῶν τῶν ἀνομιῶν αὐτοῦ. Cf. Eph. i. 7, ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ, τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν παραπτωμάτων.—1 Pet. i. 18, ἐλυτρώθητε ἐκ τῆς ματαίας ὑμῶν ἀναστροφῆς . . . τιμῇ αἵματι. Cf. Isa. lii. 3, δωρεὰν ἐπράθητε, καὶ οὐ μετὰ ἀργυρίου λυτρωθήσεσθε; Tit. ii. 14, ἵνα λυτρώσῃται ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης ἀνομίας καὶ καθαρίσῃ ἐαυτῷ λαὸν περιούσιον.

Λύτρωσις, ἡ, if we are to take the active of λυτρόω as furnishing the true meaning, must literally denote not redemption or ransom, but the act of freeing or releasing, deliverance. It occurs only occasionally in profane Greek, Plut. *Arat.* 11, λύτρωσις αἰχμαλώτων = ransom. In biblical Greek = redemption, deliverance, not with reference to the person delivering, but to the person delivered, and therefore in a passive sense, like most substantives in -σις, Latin -io.—LXX. = פִּדְיוֹן, Ps. cxxx. 7, cxl. 9.—Lev. xxv. 48. In the N. T. Luke i. 68, ἐποίησεν λύτρωσιν τῷ λαῷ αὐτοῦ, cf. ver. 71; ii. 38, προσδεχόμενοι λύτρωσιν Ἱερουσαλήμ. In Heb. ix. 12, of redemption from guilt and punishment of sin brought about by expiation, διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος εἰσῆλθεν ἐφάπαξ εἰς τὰ ἅγια, αἰῶνίαν λύτρωσιν εὐράμενος.

Λυτρωτής, ὁ, only in biblical and ecclesiastical Greek, redeemer, liberator. LXX. = מוֹשִׁי, Ps. xix. 15, lxxviii. 35, which in Isaiah (where it more frequently occurs in a soteriological sense) is = ὁ ῥυόμενος, ῥυσάμενος, *vid.* Isa. xlix. 7, lix. 20, xlvii. 4, and often. In the N. T. only in Acts vii. 35, of Moses, τοῦτον ὁ θεὸς καὶ ἄρχοντα καὶ λυτρωτὴν ἀπέσταλκεν.

Ἀντίλυτρον, τό, only in the N. T., and, indeed, only in 1 Tim. ii. 6, ὁ δοὺς ἑαυτὸν ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων = ransom; the λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν of Matt. xx. 28, Mark x. 45, is here called ἀντίλυτρον, in order to lay stress upon the fact of Christ's coming and suffering in the stead of all, and for their advantage (ὑπέρ). As in Matt. xx. 28,

Mark x. 45, a reference at least to *expiation*, whereby the expression is there determined, is undeniable; so here also (cf. 1 Pet. i. 18, 19), because the *διδόναι ἑαυτὸν* can denote nothing less than self-surrender to death; cf. Tit. ii. 14, *ὃς ἔδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, ἵνα λυτρώσῃται ἡμᾶς*; Gal. i. 4.

Ἀπολύτρωσις, ἡ, literally, releasing for a ransom, but in Plut. *Pomp.* 24 = ransoming, cf. ἀπολυτρόω = *to ransom*, Ex. xxi. 8.—Rarely in profane Greek; elsewhere only in N. T. and patristic Greek, and, indeed, only = liberation, redemption, cf. λύτρωσις.—(I.) Deliverance from suffering, from persecution, etc., Heb. xi. 35, *οὐ προσδεξάμενοι τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν, ἵνα κρείττονος ἀναστάσεως τύχωσιν*.—(II.) Redemption as the result of expiation, deliverance from the guilt and punishment of sin; Eph. i. 7, *ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ, τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν παραπτωμάτων*; Col. i. 14; Rom. iii. 24, *διὰ τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ὃν προέθετο ὁ θεὸς ἱλαστήριον*; Heb. ix. 15, *θανάτου γινομένου εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν τῶν . . . παραβάσεων*; 1 Cor. i. 30, *δικαιοσύνη τε καὶ ἁγιασμός καὶ ἀπολύτρωσις*.—(III.) Redemption, as a deliverance still future, ἐλευθερία τῆς δόξης τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ θεοῦ, Rom. viii. 21, denoting the final and decisive revelation of salvation; Luke xxi. 28, *ἐγγίξει ἡ ἡμέρα ὑμῶν*; Eph. i. 14, *ἀρράβων . . . εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν τῆς περιποιήσεως κ.τ.λ.*; iv. 30, *ἐν ᾧ ἐσφραγίσθητε εἰς ἡμέραν ἀπολυτρώσεως*.—Rom. viii. 23, *υἱοθεσίαν ἀπεκδεχόμενοι, τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν*.

M

Μανθάνω, μαθήσομαι, ἔμαθον; probably akin to μάομαι, *to endeavour, to desire, to seek*, = *to learn, to experience, to bring into experience*; Acts xxiii. 27, *μαθὼν ὅτι Ῥωμαῖός ἐστιν*; Gal. iii. 2, *τοῦτο μόνον θέλω μαθεῖν ἀφ' ὑμῶν, ἐξ ἔργων νόμου τὸ πνεῦμα ἐλάβετε ἢ ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως*; cf. Joseph. *Antt.* v. 8. 11, *μαθεῖν τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς ἰσχύος*. The aorist is = *to have learnt anything, to understand it*, Phil. iv. 11, *ἐγὼ γὰρ ἔμαθον ἐν οἷς εἰμι αὐτάρκης εἶναι*. Answering to διδάσκειν (1 Tim. ii. 11, 12), which denotes instruction concerning the facts and plan of salvation, *μανθάνειν* denotes a bearing corresponding thereto, and is therefore = *to cause oneself to know*, therefore a moral bearing, and the presupposition of this in the sphere of the religious life. Cf. John vi. 45, *ἔσονται πάντες διδακτοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ. πᾶς ὁ ἀκούσας παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ μαθὼν ἔρχεται πρὸς μέ;* Phil. iv. 9, *ἃ καὶ ἐμάθετε . . . ταῦτα πράσσετε*. In Col. i. 7, *μανθάνειν* answers to ἐπιγινώσκειν *τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ*, ver. 6; 2 Tim. iii. 7, *πάντοτε μανθάνοντα καὶ μηδέποτε εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας ἐλθεῖν δυνάμενα*; cf. ver. 6, see ἐπιγινώσκειν, Matt. ix. 13, xi. 29; Rom. xvi. 17; 1 Cor. xiv. 31. It once occurs with a personal object, Eph. iv. 20, *οὕτως ἐμάθετε τὸν Χριστὸν, εἰ γε αὐτὸν ἠκούσατε καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ ἐδιδάχθητε καθὼς ἐστιν ἀλήθεια ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ*. This cannot be compared with *μανθάνειν τινα, to perceive or notice any one*, in classical Greek, at the most Eurip. *Bacch.* 1345, *ὅψ' ἔμαθεθ' ὑμᾶς, too late ye have known yourselves, i.e. perceived what manner of persons ye are, what ye have*

done. In Eph. iv. 20, as the following εἰ γε αὐτὸν ἠκούσατε shows, Christ is the object of *μανθάνειν*, rather as He is the object-matter, the sum and substance of the gospel, than as He is a Person; hence τὸν Χριστόν is used, whereas we have ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ immediately afterwards; Χριστός is the descriptive name for the Person *Jesus*. — The word also occurs in Matt. xxiv. 32; Mark xiii. 28; 1 Cor. iv. 6, xiv. 35; 1 Tim. ii. 11, v. 4, 13; 2 Tim. iii. 14; Tit. iii. 14; Heb. v. 8; Rev. xiv. 3; John vii. 15. LXX. = תלם.

Μαθητής, ὁ, a learner, pupil, over against διδάσκαλος, εὐρέτης; often in Xen., Plato, and others, = *μανθάνων*, Xen. *Mem.* i. 2. 17; Matt. x. 24, οὐκ ἔστιν μαθητής ὑπὲρ τὸν διδάσκαλον; ver. 25, ἄρκετὸν τῷ μαθητῇ ἵνα γένηται ὡς ὁ διδάσκαλος αὐτοῖ; Luke vi. 40. In the N. T. only in the Gospels and Acts—(I.) οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου, Mark ii. 18; Luke v. 33, vii. 18; Matt. xi. 2; John iii. 25. καὶ οἱ τῶν Φαρισαίων, Mark ii. 18; John ix. 28, σὺ μαθητής εἶ ἐκείνου, ἡμεῖς δὲ τοῦ Μωϋσέως ἐσμὲν μαθηταί. It is clear that *μαθητής* means more than a mere pupil or learner; it signifies an adherent who keeps the instruction given to him, and makes it his rule of conduct. Cf. Plat. *Apol.* 33 A, οὗς οἱ διαβάλλοντες ἐμέ φασιν ἐμοὺς μαθητὰς εἶναι. ἐγὼ δὲ διδάσκαλος μὲν οὐδενὸς πώποτ' ἐγενόμην. εἰ δέ τις ἐμοῦ λέγοντος καὶ τὰ ἐμαντοῦ πράττοντος ἐπιθυμεῖ ἀκούειν . . . οὐδενὶ πώποτε ἐφθόνησα; Xen. *Mem.* i. 6. 3, οἱ διδάσκαλοι τοὺς μαθητὰς μιμητὰς ἑαυτῶν ἀποδεικνύουσιν. In this sense it is used especially (II.) of the disciples of Jesus, ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ οἱ μαθ. αὐτοῦ, Matt. ix. 19; cf. John viii. 31, ἔλεγεν οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς πρὸς τοὺς πεπιστευκότας αὐτῷ Ἰουδαίους· ἐὰν ὑμεῖς μένητε ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῷ ἐμῷ, ἀληθῶς μαθηταὶ μου ἐστέ; Luke xiv. 26, 27, 33; ver. 27, ὅστις οὐ βαστάζει τὸν σταυρὸν ἑαυτοῦ καὶ ἔρχεται ὀπίσω μου, οὐ δύναται εἶναι μου μαθητής; John xv. 8, ἵνα καρπὸν πολλὸν φέρητε καὶ γενήσεσθε ἐμοὶ μαθηταί; cf. John ix. 27, Matt. v. 1 with iv. 22. Thus (a.) of the twelve apostles, οἱ δώδεκα μ., Matt. xi. 1, or οἱ ἑνδεκα μ., Matt. xxviii. 16, who are usually called οἱ μαθ' αὐτοῦ, as in Matt. v. 1, viii. 23, 25, ix. 10, etc., also simply οἱ μαθηταί, Matt. xiv. 19; Mark ix. 14, etc. Also with the dative, *vid.* Krüger, xlvi. 12. 1; οἱ σοὶ μαθηταί, Mark ii. 18; John xv. 8. Then (b.) of all followers of Jesus, Matt. viii. 21; Luke vi. 13, προσεφώνησεν τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκλεξάμενος ἀπ' αὐτῶν δώδεκα, οὗς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασεν; vi. 17, ὄχλος μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ; vii. 11, συνεπορεύοντο αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἱκανοὶ καὶ ὄχλος πολὺς; John vi. 60, 66; Luke x. (i. 17) 23. Hence it came to be (c.) the name given to those who believe on Christ (John viii. 31, see above), simply as *μαθηταί*. Comp. the Aristotelian saying, δεῖ πιστεῦειν τὸν μανθάνοντα; Matt. x. 42, ὃς ἐὰν ποτίσῃ ἓνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων . . . εἰς ὄνομα μαθητοῦ; cf. xviii. 6, ἓνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων τῶν πιστευόντων εἰς ἐμέ. So, besides this place, always in the Acts; cf. Acts xix. 9, ὡς δέ τινες ἐσκληρύνοντο καὶ ἠπειθουν κακολογούντες τὴν ὁδὸν ἐνώπιον τοῦ πλήθους, ἀποστὰς ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἀφώρισεν τοὺς μαθητὰς; Acts vi. 2, τὸ πλήθος τῶν μαθητῶν, with iv. 32, τὸ πλήθος τῶν πιστευσάντων; Acts i. 15, vi. 1, 2, 7, ix. 10, 19, 25, 26, 38, xi. 29, xiii. 52, xiv. 20, 22, 28, xv. 10, xvi. 1, xviii. 23, 27, xix. 1, 9, 30, xx. 1, 7, 30, xxi. 4, 16; ix. 1, οἱ μ. τοῦ κυρίου; xi. 26,

χρηματίζειν τε πρῶτον ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ τοὺς μαθητὰς Χριστιανούς. Most remarkable is the application of the name *μαθηταί* (Acts xix. 1) to John's disciples at Ephesus, evidently on account of the relation of John the Baptist to the Messiah; these disciples were utterly ignorant that the Messiah was *Jesus*, cf. ver. 4, and hence it is evident that *μαθηταί* denoted just the followers of the Christ, the Messiah—a significant fact bearing upon the connection between O. T. and N. T. believers.

Μαθήτρια, ἡ, with *μαθητρίς* occurring only in later Greek (Diod. Sic., Diog. Laert., Philo), a female pupil or disciple; in the N. T. sense of *μαθητής*, Acts ix. 36.

Μαθητεύω, in Plutarch and others after him, answering to the formation of the word = to be a pupil, e.g. Plut. *Mor.* 837 C, ἐμαθήτευσε δ' αὐτῷ καὶ Θεοπόμπος. So Matt. xxvii. 57, ἐμαθήτευσεν τῷ Ἰησοῦ, of Joseph of Arimathea. In patristic Greek the medial passive still occurs, *μαθητεύεσθαι τινι*, to be instructed by, to be any one's pupil, e.g. ὁ ἅγιος Ἱερόθεος τῷ ἁγίῳ Παύλῳ ἐμαθητεύθη, Basil M.; Ignat. *ad Eph.* 10, ὑμῖν μαθητευθῆναι, to be instructed by you, or to learn of you. And thus I would explain Matt. xiii. 52, πᾶς γραμματεὺς μαθητευθεὶς τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν, who is a disciple of the kingdom of heaven, for the various readings ἐν τῇ βασ. or εἰς τὴν βασ. show that the usual explanation is a misunderstanding of the expression. In the other N. T. texts where it occurs the verb is transitive = to instruct any one, to teach, to make any one a disciple, in the N. T. sense of *μαθητής*; cf. Matt. x. 42, the only place except in the Acts where *μ.* occurs in this sense, and by the same evangelist who in Matt. xxviii. 19 writes *μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη... μαθητεύειν* being divided, according to vv. 19, 20, into the two elements *βαπτίζειν* and *διδάσκειν*. So also Acts xiv. 21, εὐαγγελιζόμενοι τε τὴν πόλιν ἐκείνην καὶ μαθητεύσαντες ἱκανούς. — This transitive meaning is sometimes found in other verbs in -εύω, e.g. 1 Kings i. 43, ὁ βασιλεὺς Δαυὶδ ἐβασίλευσε τὸν Σαλωμών, 1 Sam. viii. 22; Isa. vii. 6; 1 Macc. viii. 13; cf. Winer, § 38. 1.

Μάρτυς, *υποσ*, ὁ, dative plural *μάρτυσι*, is derived by Curtius (as before, 296) and Schenkl (*Griech.-deutsch. Schulwörterb.*) from the Sanskrit root *smṛi*, *smarami*, to remember; *smṛtis*, remembrance; Latin, *memor*; Old High German, *mari*, a report or tale; literally, one who remembers. In the Zend language *mar* signifies to recollect, to know, to mention; *mareti*, doctrine. Gothic, *merjan*, κηρύσσειν. It is = witness, i.e. one who has information or knowledge or joint knowledge of anything, and hence one who can give information, or bring to light or confirm anything, Matt. xxvi. 65, τί ἔτι χρεῖαν ἔχομεν μαρτύρων; ἴδε νῦν ἠκούσατε τὴν βλασφημίαν; Mark xiv. 63; Plat. *Polit.* 340 A, τί δέεται μάρτυρος; αὐτὸς γὰρ ὁ Θρασύμαχος ὁμολογεῖ; Matt. xviii. 16, ἵνα ἐπὶ στόματος δύο μαρτύρων ἢ τριῶν σταθῇ πᾶν ῥήμα. So 2 Cor. xiii. 1; 1 Tim. v. 19; Heb. x. 28; Acts vii. 58. It usually denotes simply that the witness confirms something, though in many cases it also implies that he avers something, and supports his statement on the strength of his own authority. Thus in Acts vi. 13, ἔστησαν μάρτυρες λέγοντας Ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος οὐ

παύεται ρήματα λαλῶν κ.τ.λ. In the sense simply of *confirmation* it occurs 2 Cor. i. 23, μάρτυρα τὸν θεὸν ἐπικαλοῦμαι; cf. Mal. iii. 5. Again, simply of the knowledge or cognizance which the witness possesses, Rom. i. 9, μάρτυς γάρ μου ἐστὶν ὁ θεός; Phil. i. 8; 1 Thess. ii. 5, θεὸς μάρτυς; ver. 10, ὑμεῖς μάρτυρες καὶ ὁ θεός, ὡς ὁσῶς . . . ἐγενήθημεν. — 1 Tim. vi. 12; 2 Tim. ii. 2. — In Heb. xii. 1, τοσοῦτον ἔχοντες περικείμενον ἡμῖν νέφος μαρτύρων, they are described as witnesses who have an experimental knowledge of that which is required of us, viz. faith, x. 35–37, xi. 6 sqq., xii. 2. We cannot (as some have tried to do) bring the active or at least intransitive μάρτυς into connection with the passive μαρτυρεῖσθαι, xi. 2, 4, 5, 39, as if it referred to the witness meted out to them or given by them. This passive μαρτυρεῖσθαι cannot determine the meaning of the word; at best, it can only be regarded as expressing a confirmation of the μάρτυρες in their capacity as witnesses. Their significance for us as witnesses is to be deduced not from ver. 39, but from ver. 40. Peculiar to the N. T. is (I.) the designation of those who announce the facts of the gospel and tell its tidings, as μάρτυρες, e.g. Acts i. 8, ἔσεσθέ μοι μάρτυρες ἐν τε Ἱερουσαλὴμ καὶ ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς; Rev. xi. 3, τοῖς δυσὶν μάρτυσίν μου; derivatives from μ. are used according to the analogy of this meaning. Cf. especially διαμαρτύρομαι, ἐπιμαρτυρεῖν; 1 Cor. xv. 15, ψευδομάρτυρες τοῦ θεοῦ. This rests upon the significance which the apostles, as preachers of the gospel, claim for their prerogative as witnesses to Jesus; Acts xiii. 31, οἵτινες (sc. συναναβάντες αὐτῷ) νῦν εἰσὶν μάρτυρες αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὸν λαόν; Acts ii. 32, τοῦτον τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀνέστησεν ὁ θεός, οὗ πάντες ἡμεῖς ἐσμέν μάρτυρες; iii. 15, x. 39, ἡμεῖς μάρτυρες πάντων ὧν ἐποίησεν κ.τ.λ.; vv. 40, 41, τοῦτον ὁ θεός ἡγειρεν . . . καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτὸν ἐμφανῇ γενέσθαι οὐ παντὶ τῷ λαῷ, ἀλλὰ μάρτυσιν τοῖς προκεχειροτονημένοις ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ; 1 Pet. v. 1, παρακαλῶ ὁ συμπρεσβύτερος καὶ μάρτυς τῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ παθημάτων. Hence Acts i. 22, μάρτυρα τῆς ἀναστάσεως σὺν ἡμῖν γενέσθαι ἓνα τούτων; xxii. 15, ἔση μάρτυς αὐτῷ πρὸς πάντας ἀνθρώπους ὧν ἐώρακας καὶ ἤκουσας; xxvi. 16. They declare the truth concerning Christ, and ratify it by their own experience, Acts v. 32 (cf. ver. 31 and John xv. 26, 27). — (II.) μάρτυς is used as a designation of those who have suffered death in consequence of confessing Christ, Acts xxii. 20, τὸ αἷμα Στεφάνου τοῦ μάρτυρός σου; Rev. ii. 13, Ἀντίπας ὁ μάρτυς μου ὁ πιστὸς ἀπεκτάνθη; xvii. 6, ἐκ τοῦ αἵματος τῶν ἁγίων καὶ ἐκ τοῦ αἵματος τῶν μαρτύρων Ἰησοῦ. This, however, must not be understood (as in ecclesiastical Greek) to denote that their witness consisted in their suffering death,—cf. *Constit. Apost.* v. 9. 923, ὁ ἐν μαρτυρίᾳ ἐξελθὼν ἀψευδῶς ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀληθείας, οὗτος ἀληθινὸς μάρτυς ἀξιόπιστος ἐν οἷς συνηγωνίσατο τῷ λόγῳ τῆς εὐσεβείας διὰ τοῦ οἰκελοῦ αἵματος,—it refers rather to the witnessing of Jesus, which was the cause of their death; cf. in xvii. 6 the distinction between ἅγιοι and μάρτυρες; xx. 4, αἱ ψυχαὶ τῶν πεπελεκισμένων διὰ τὴν μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦ. — (III.) Rev. i. 5, Jesus Christ is called ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστός; iii. 14, ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστὸς καὶ ἀληθινός, which, according to xxii. 20, λέγει ὁ μαρτυρῶν ταῦτα, must mean, *He who gives the information contained in the Apocalypse concerning ἃ δεῖ γενέσθαι ἐν τάχει*, i. 1; cf. the words at the outset, ἀποκάλυψις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἣν ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ ὁ θεός.

Μαρτύριον, τό, witness; ordinarily, *the declaration which confirms or makes known anything*, as in 2 Cor. i. 12, τὸ μαρτύριον τῆς συνειδήσεως ἡμῶν. Hence of things which testify to anything, *e.g.* Plat. Legg. xii. 943 C, τὸν στέφανον ἀναθεῖναι μαρτύριον εἰς κρίσιν. Thus Jas. v. 3, ὁ ἰδὼς αὐτῶν (τοῦ χρυσοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἀργύρου) εἰς μαρτύριον ὑμῖν κείται—that is, *in proof of the following accusation*, ἐθισαυρίζεσθε ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις. Cf. Ruth iv. 7. Also in classical Greek with the sig. *proof*.—When N. T. preaching is called τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ, *the testimony of Christ*, 1 Cor. i. 6, cf. 2 Tim. i. 8, μὴ οὖν ἐπαισχυνθῆς τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν, the meaning is, that the preacher bases what he says upon his own direct knowledge, and clothes it with the authority of a testimony at one with the reality; that the gospel preached is a narrative of actual and practical truth, a declaration of facts (and thus the form of expression distinguishes itself from the work of Christian doctrinal teaching); cf. Acts iv. 34, δυνάμει μεγάλη ἀπεδίδουν τὸ μαρτύριον οἱ ἀπόστολοι τῆς ἀναστάσεως τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ; 2 Thess. i. 10, ἐπιστεύθη τὸ μαρτύριον ἡμῶν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς. For Acts v. 32, see μάρτυς. 1 Tim. ii. 6, ὁ δοὺς ἑαυτὸν ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων, τὸ μαρτύριον καιροῖς ἰδίαις, is somewhat similar to τὸ λεγόμενον = *according to the saying*,—for καιρ. ἰδ., comp. Tit. i. 2, 3,—and therefore is = *as now is testified, as is announced in his time; conformably with what is announced*.—The preaching of the gospel is accordingly called (1 Cor. ii. 1) τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ θεοῦ, akin to the O. T. expression *יְהוָה יִשָּׁע, what Jehovah testifies or announces*, Ps. xix. 8, cxix. 14, etc.; cf. *ה' סִקְנֵהּ* τοῦ μαρτυρίου, *יִשָּׁע ה' לְהַשִּׁיב, Num. ix. 15; Acts vii. 44; Rev. xv. 5* (a mistranslation by the LXX. of *יָשַׁע ה' לְהַשִּׁיב*).—This reference to N. T. facts is everywhere implied in the expression εἰς μαρτύριον of the synoptical Gospels, and first in Matt. viii. 4, Mark i. 44, Luke v. 14, where our Lord directs the leper to show himself to the priest, and to offer the gift that Moses commanded, εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς. Whatever doubt there might be as to the force of the expression here, a comparison of the places where it occurs leads us naturally to the conclusion that μαρτύριον has always the same signification, and that here it is = *that they may thus hear of Christ the Messiah*, or as Bengel says, “*de Messia praesente*.” Matt. x. 18, ἐπὶ ἡγεμόνας δὲ καὶ βασιλεῖς ἀχθήσεσθε ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν; cf. Mark xiii. 9, Luke xxi. 13, ἀποβήσεται ὑμῖν εἰς μαρτύριον, *i.e.* for those mentioned in ver. 12. Matt. xxiv. 14, κηρυχθήσεται τοῦτο τὸ εὐ. τῆς βασ. . . εἰς μαρτύριον πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν. On Matt. viii. 4, Bengel aptly refers to John v. 36, αὐτὰ τὰ ἔργα ἃ ἐγὼ ποιῶ, μαρτυρεῖ περὶ ἐμοῦ ὅτι ὁ πατήρ με ἀπέσταλκεν. But Mark vi. 11, Luke ix. 5, τὸν κονιορτὸν . . . ἀποτινάξατε, εἰς μαρτύριον ἐπ' αὐτούς (Mark vi. 11, αὐτοῖς), must be understood like Jas. v. 3, though not without reference to the fact of the gospel having been preached. Heb. iii. 5, Μωϋσῆς μὲν πιστὸς ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ εἰς μαρτύριον τῶν λαληθησομένων, *for the averment of that which*, etc. Cf. 1 Pet. i. 11, προμαρτύρομαι.

Μαρτυρία, ἡ, (I.) bearing witness, certifying, *e.g.* εἰς μαρτυρίαν καλεῖσθαι, *to be summoned to bear witness*; John i. 7, ἦλθεν εἰς μαρτυρίαν, ἵνα μαρτυρήσῃ.—(II.) Certifying, witnessing to, Mark xiv. 55, 56, 59; Luke xxii. 71; *that which any one witnesses or states concerning*

any person or thing, Tit. i. 13, ἡ μαρτυρία αὕτη ἐστὶν ἀληθής, concerning the saying of Epimenides as to the Cretans; 1 Tim. iii. 7, δεῖ καὶ μαρτυρίαν καλὴν ἔχειν ἀπὸ τῶν ἑξωθεν. Besides these texts and Acts xxii. 18, οὐ παραδέξονται σου τὴν μαρτυρίαν περὶ ἐμοῦ, it is used only by St. John. In John xix. 35, xxi. 24, of the evangelist's testimony. In i. 19, of the testimony of the Baptist concerning Jesus, cf. iii. 26 under μαρτυρεῖν, and with this v. 36, ἐγὼ δὲ ἔχω μαρτυρίαν μελίζω τοῦ Ἰωάννου, viii. 17; 3 John 12. Of the declarations of Jesus concerning Himself, viii. 13, 14, v. 31, cf. ver. 32. It is a declaration which not only informs but corroborates, a testimony borne by a witness who speaks with the authority of one who knows; v. 34, ἐγὼ δὲ οὐ παρὰ ἀνθρώπων τὴν μαρτυρίαν λαμβάνω, the corroboration of that which I really am. So in 1 John v. 9, 10, μαρτυρία τοῦ θεοῦ, ἣν μεμαρτύρηκεν περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, — and the apostle designates the eternal life possessed by the believer as God's gift, as the witness testifying to him what is of Christ, ver. 11, αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ μαρτυρία ὅτι ζῶν αἰώνιον ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν ὁ θεός; cf. ver. 10, ὁ πιστεύων εἰς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ ἔχει τὴν μαρτυρίαν ἐν αὐτῷ. In John iii. 11, 32, 33, the testimony of Jesus is that which Jesus declares with the authority of a witness, of one who knows; ver. 11, ὁ οἶδαμεν λαλοῦμεν καὶ ὁ ἑωράκαμεν μαρτυροῦμεν, καὶ τὴν μαρτυρίαν ἡμῶν οὐ λαμβάνετε. But in Rev. i. 2, 9, ἡ μαρτ. Ἰησοῦ is the announcement of the gospel, the apostolic preaching of Christ, as it is determined by the apostle's testimony, cf. ver. 2, ὅσα εἶδεν. This testimony, which specially concerns Christ, and which is based upon knowledge of Him specially vouchsafed, is also spoken of as ἡ μαρτ. τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, Rev. xii. 17, xix. 10, xx. 4, of which, xix. 10, we read, ἡ μ. Ἰησοῦ ἐστὶν τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς προφητείας. This explains the expression, ἔχειν τὴν μ. Ἰησοῦ, xii. 17, xix. 10, vi. 9, which may be taken as synonymous with ἔχειν τὸ πν. τῆς προφ. (Instead of μ. Ἰ. we find in vi. 9, cf. with i. 2, 9, simply μαρτ., cf. xii. 11, ἐνίκησαν αὐτὸν διὰ τὸ αἷμα τοῦ ἀρνίου καὶ διὰ τὸν λόγον τῆς μ. αὐτῶν.) Cf. xi. 3, δώσω τοῖς δυσὶν μάρτυσίν μου καὶ προφητεύσουσιν, with ver. 7, ὅταν τελέσωσιν τὴν μαρτ. αὐτῶν. That μ. is used in the N. T. to denote martyrdom, is an untenable inference from Rev. xi. 7, xii. 11. See μάρτυς.

Μαρτύρομαι, to cause to witness for oneself, to call to witness. So also in Judith vii. 28. But in the N. T. Acts xx. 26, Gal. v. 3, Eph. iv. 17 = to attest, to announce and ratify as truth. Also in Acts xvi. 22, 1 Thess. ii. 12, apparently the more correct reading, instead of μαρτυρεῖσθαι. So in classical Greek only occasionally, Plato, *Phileb.* 47 D, ταῦτα δὲ τότε μὲν οὐκ ἐμαρτυράμεθα, νῦν δὲ λέγομεν = to affirm.

Διαμαρτύρομαι, (I.) to call to witness, Deut. iv. 26, διαμαρτύρομαι ὑμῖν σήμερον τὸν τε οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν. Oftener (II.) (a.) to assert or attest anything, to make known or affirm a truth with emphasis. Xen. *Hell.* iii. 2. 13, διαμαρτυράμενος ὅτι ἔτοιμος εἴη κοινῇ πολεμεῖν καὶ ξυμμάχεσθαι, seemingly borrowed from the expression, to call [the gods] to witness that, etc., Acts xx. 23, τὸ πν. τὸ ἅγ. διαμαρτύρεται μοι λέγων ὅτι δέσμα καὶ θλίψεις με μένουσιν; Heb. ii. 6. Used especially in N. T. Greek of attesting the facts and truths of redemption,—an impressive declaration of Christian doctrine, as distinct from progressive

instruction, and excluding the possibility of reasonable objection, Acts viii. 25, διαμαρτυράμενοι καὶ λαλήσαντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ κυρίου; xviii. 5, διαμαρτυρόμενος τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις τὸν Χριστόν; xx. 24, τὸ εὐαγγ.; xxviii. 23, τὴν βασ. τ. θ.; xxiii. 11, τὰ περὶ ἐμοῦ (Ἰῷ. Χῷ.); xx. 21, τὴν εἰς θεὸν μετάνοιαν καὶ πίστιν εἰς τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰν.; x. 42, κηρύξαι τῷ λαῷ καὶ διαμαρτύρασθαι ὅτι αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ ὠρισμένος ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ κριτὴς κ.τ.λ. 1 Thess. iv. 6, ἔκδικος κύριος . . . καθὼς . . . διαμαρτυράμεθα. LXX. = 𐤇𐤓𐤕 Hiphil, Ezek. xvi. 2, διαμαρτύρου τῇ Ἱερουσαλὴμ τὰς ἀνομίας. So also xx. 4. = 𐤇𐤓𐤕, Deut. xxxii. 46, λόγους οὓς ἐγὼ διαμαρτύρομαι ὑμῖν; 2 Chron. xxiv. 19, καὶ ἀπέστειλεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς προφήτας ἐπιστρέψαι πρὸς κύριον, καὶ οὐκ ἤκουσαν καὶ διαμαρτύρατο αὐτοῖς καὶ οὐχ ὑπήκουσαν. — (b.) To conjure any one, to exhort earnestly, Diod. xviii. 62, διαμαρτυρόμενος μὴ δίδόναι μηδὲν τῶν χρημάτων Εὐμένει. Thus often in Plutarch. — 2 Tim. ii. 14, iv. 1. Followed by ἵνα, 1 Tim. v. 21; Luke xvi. 28, ὅπως διαμαρτύρηται αὐτοῖς, ἵνα μὴ καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔλθωσιν εἰς τὸν τόπον τοῦτον τῆς βασάνου. LXX. = 𐤇𐤓𐤕, Neh. ix. 26, διεμαρτύροντο ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐπιστρέψαι.

Μαρτυρέω, to be witness, to bear witness, *i.e.*, primarily, to attest anything that one knows, and therefore to make declarations with a certain authority, usually for or in favour of, and hence to confirm or prove. In the N. T. chiefly in St. John's and St. Luke's writings, and in the Hebrews; in but few other places.—(I.) μαρτυρεῖν τι, ὅτι, etc., John i. 34, iii. 32, iv. 39, 44, xii. 17; 1 John i. 2, iv. 14, v. 6. Without object = to bear witness, 3 John 12; John xix. 35, i. 32; Acts xxvi. 5.—(II.) Of the evangelic announcement of salvation in the sense named under μάρτυς, cf. the successive steps, ὁρᾶν — μαρτυρεῖν — ἀπαγγέλλειν in 1 John i. 2 (John i. 34), on which E. Haupt observes: "In ἀπαγγέλλειν the emphasis lies on the communication of the truth; in μαρτυρεῖν, upon the truth which is communicated." Compare Rev. i. 2, ἐμαρτύρησε τὴν μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦ.—Rev. xxii. 20, ὁ μαρτυρῶν ταῦτα, of the apocalyptic announcement of Christ, cf. i. 1, 5, iii. 14; see μάρτυς.—μ. τινὶ ὅτι, ὡς, to bear witness to any one that, etc., Matt. xxiii. 31; Luke iv. 22; Gal. iv. 15; Col. iv. 13; Rom. x. 2; Acts xxii. 5; John iii. 28. Cf. 2 Cor. viii. 3. Usually μ. τινί, to bear witness for, or in favour of any one. Herod. ii. 18, iv. 29, μαρτυρεῖ μοι τῇ γνώμῃ, it favours my opinion. So John iii. 26, ὃ σὺ μεμαρτύρηκας, for whom thou hast witnessed; v. 33, τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, as in xviii. 37, cf. 1 Tim. vi. 13; 3 John 3, 6, ἐμαρτύρησάν σου τῇ ἀγάπῃ; Acts x. 43, τούτῳ πάντες οἱ προφῆται μαρτυροῦσιν κ.τ.λ., xiii. 22, xiv. 3, κύριος ὁ μαρτυρῶν τῷ λόγῳ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ, cf. συνεπιμαρτυρεῖν, Heb. ii. 4.—Acts xv. 8, ὁ καρδιογνώστης θεὸς ἐμαρτύρησεν αὐτοῖς, δοὺς τὸ πν. κ.τ.λ. Perhaps also Heb. x. 15, μαρτυρεῖ δὲ ἡμῖν καὶ τὸ πν. τὸ ἅγ., is = the Holy Ghost also witnesseth for us. Thus taken, the question as to the object to be supplied is obviated (cf. Rev. xxii. 16), and the expression ἔχοντες οὖν παρρησίαν, ver. 19, follows all the more appropriately. In a derived sense only μ. τινί means to testify or give assurance to any one, Rev. xxii. 16, 18. Cf. the passive μαρτυρεῖται τινι, a good report is given of one, 3 John 12, Δημητρίῳ μεμαρτύρηται ὑπὸ

πάντων καὶ ὑπ' αὐτῆς τῆς ἀληθείας. Also *μ. περί τινος* always means (where the connection shows), *to witness in favour of*; and thus *μ. τί, τινί, περί, ὑπέρ τινος*, in the merely formal sense = *to declare, to witness*, occurs comparatively rarely. This import of the word, viz. *witnessing in favour of the object referred to*, is all the more obvious where what is meant is not a declaration, but a report stating the object. Accordingly *μ. περί τοῦ φωτός* is equivalent to, *to witness for the light*, John i. 7, ἦλθεν εἰς μαρτυρίαν, ἵνα μαρτυρήσῃ περί τοῦ φωτός, ἵνα πάντες πιστεύσωσιν δι' αὐτοῦ; vv. 8, 15, v. 31, 32, 36, 37, 39, viii. 13, 14, 18, x. 25, xv. 26; 1 John v. 9, 10; cf. John xviii. 23, εἰ κακῶς ἐλάλησα μαρτύρησον περί τοῦ κακοῦ. In John ii. 25, οὐ χρεῖαν εἶχεν ἵνα τις μαρτυρήσῃ περί τοῦ ἀνθρ., on the contrary, the witnessing is indifferent—either for or against; in vii. 7, μαρτυρῶ περί τοῦ κόσμου ὅτι τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ πονηρά ἐστίν, it must be understood unfavourably; cf. 1 Cor. xv. 15, ἐμαρτυρήσαμεν κατὰ τοῦ θεοῦ.—(III.) The passive μαρτυροῦμαι, I am witnessed to, recognised, is derived from an active μαρτ. τινά, which does not occur except, perhaps, in inscriptions, e.g. *Murat.* MXXVI. 5, ἦν καὶ θεοὶ καὶ βροτοὶ ἐμαρτύρησαν σωφροσύνης ἔνεκα, but may be explained from *μ. τί, to be a witness for something, to recognise it* (cf. *μ. τινί τι*). So Rom. iii. 21, δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ . . . μαρτυρουμένη ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφ. Usually with a personal subject, Acts x. 22, μαρτυρούμενος ὑπὸ ὅλου τοῦ ἔθνους; xvi. 2, ὃς . . . ἐμαρτυρεῖτο ὑπὸ τῶν ἀδελφῶν; xxii. 12, vi. 3; 1 Tim. v. 10, ἐν ἔργοις καλοῖς μαρτυρουμένη, cf. ἐπαινεῖσθαι ἐν τινι, 1 Cor. xi. 22; Heb. xi. 2, ἐν τῇ πίστει ἐμαρτυρήθησαν οἱ πρεσβ.; xi. 39, μαρτυρηθέντες διὰ τῆς πίστ., of divine recognition given to a person, cf. ver. 4, δι' ἧς ἐμαρτυρήθη εἶναι δίκαιος, μαρτυροῦντος ἐπὶ τοῖς δώροις αὐτοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ; ver. 5, μεμαρτύρηται εὐαρεστηκέναι τῷ θεῷ. Indefinitely = *it is witnessed concerning one*, Heb. vii. 8, μαρτυρούμενος ὅτι ζῇ. So, too, ver. 17, μαρτυρεῖται γὰρ ὅτι σὺν ἱερεὺς κ.τ.λ., if we do not read μαρτυρεῖ, sc. ἡ γραφή. It is observable that this mode of expression occurs only in Acts and Hebrews, excepting Rom. iii. 21; 1 Tim. v. 10.—The middle, which occurs occasionally in later Greek, μαρτυρεῖσθαι, is = *to testify, to aver*, and, according to some MSS., occurs in Acts xxvi. 22, 1 Thess. ii. 12, instead of μαρτύρεσθαι. In Heb. vii. 17, also, the reading μαρτυρεῖται for μαρτυρεῖ may be explained in like manner.

Ἐπιμαρτυρέω, to testify emphatically, to appear as a witness decidedly for anything, in contrast with ἀντιμαρτ., to bear counter evidence, to contradict; 1 Pet. v. 12, ἐπιμαρτυρῶν ταύτην εἶναι ἀληθὴ χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ.—Συνεπιμαρτυρεῖν, Heb. ii. 4.

Μάτην, an adverb, strictly the accusative of μάτη; compare εἰς μάτην in the same sense, *vain, in vain*; it stands in a causal sense = *groundless, invalid*, and in a final sense = *objectless, useless, futile*, and, according to circumstances, it combines both = *idle, vain*. Originally, perhaps, (I.) in a final sense = *what is of no avail, of no use*; Aesch. *Prom.* 44, τὰ μηδὲν ὠφελούντα μὴ πόνει μάτην; Ps. cxvii. 1, 2, εἰς μάτην; Ezek. xiv. 23, οὐ μάτην πεποίηκα πάντα = *in vain*; Jer. ii. 30, μάτην ἐπάταξα τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν, παιδείαν οὐκ ἐδέξασθε; Tit. iii. 9, ζητήσεις ἀνωφελεῖς καὶ μάταιοι, see μάταιος;

Aristot. *Eth. Nicom.* i. 1, *ματαίως ἀκούσεται καὶ ἀνωφελῶς*.—(II.) In a causal sense = *groundless, untrue, untenable, false*, as opposed to *ἀληθές*; Soph. *Philoct.* 345, *λέγοντες εἴτ' ἀληθές εἴτ' οὖν μάτην*; Ps. xxxix. 12, *πλὴν μάτην πᾶς ἄνθρωπος* = *לֵבָר*; Jer. viii. 8, *εἰς μάτην ἐγενήθη σχοῖνος ψευδὴς γραμματεῦσιν*, syn. with *δωρεάν*, both = *דָּבָר*, Ps. xxxv. 7; Prov. iii. 20; = *כִּזְבִּי*, *untrue, false*, Ps. xli. 7; so also Matt. xv. 9; Mark vii. 7, *μάτην δὲ σέβονται με διδάσκοντες διδασκαλίας ἐντάλματα ἀνθρώπων*, from Jer. xxix. 3.

Μάταιος, α, ον, sometimes also ὁ, ἡ, vain, idle, in a final and in a causal sense.—(I.) In a final sense, *useless, frivolous*; Chrysostom, *τὰ πρὸς μηδὲν χρήσιμα*; Eurip. *Phoen.* 1666, *μάταια μοχθεῖν*, *to trouble oneself in vain*. In Aristotle, as opposed to *ικανόν*. Still it is more than *ἀνωφελής*, for it not only negatively blames, but by giving prominence to objectlessness it denotes what is positively to be rejected, *bad*, what is objectless, and therefore wrong or unjustifiable. Eurip. *Cycl.* 662, *μάταιόν τι δρᾶν τινα*.—1 Cor. xv. 17, *ματαία ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν, ἔτι ἐστὲ ἐν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ὑμῶν*. Compare ver. 14, *κένη*; Tit. iii. 9, *εἰσὶν γὰρ ἀνωφελεῖς καὶ μάταιοι* (the *ζητήσεις καὶ γενεαλογίαι* κ.τ.λ.). With the Greeks, *μάταιον* applies to sin, “as that which is in itself vanity and nothingness, without consistency or result, and in its foundation folly,” Nägelsbach, *Nachhom. Theol.* vi. 2. Thus the final signification prevails even if, with Nägelsbach, we adopt as the actual explanation the Homeric *οὐκ ἀρετᾷ κακὰ ἔργα*, *Od.* viii. 329, cf. Hesiod, *opp.* 265, *οἱ αὐτῷ κακὰ τεύχει ἀνὴρ ἄλλω κακὰ τεύχων ἢ δὲ κακὴ βουλή τῷ βουλευσάντι κακίστη*; Xen. *Hell.* vi. 3. 11, *τὸ πλεονεκτεῖν ἀκερδές*.—Aesch. *Choeph.* 918, *πατὴρ μάται*, *the father's guilt*; *Eumen.* 337, *αὐτουργίαι μάταιοι*. This use of the word gives special weight to 1 Pet. i. 18, *ἐλευθερώθητε ἐκ τῆς ματαίας ὑμῶν ἀναστροφῆς*. This usage does not elsewhere appear in Holy Scripture, but the word receives a new significance in another direction. It is, that is, (II.) in a causal sense = *groundless, idle, devoid of worth*, Plat. *Ax.* 369 C, *μάταιος οὖν ἡ λύπη*; Soph. 231 B, *περὶ τὴν μάταιον δοξοσοφίαν*; Xen. *Ven.* xii. 13, *ἐκ τῶν ματαίων λόγων ἔχθρας ἀναιροῦνται*. Accordingly, not merely have we *μάταια ἔπεα*, *groundless, offensive, bad words*, Herod. vii. 15, 1, for which in vii. 13, *ἀεικέστερα ἀπορρίψαι ἔπεα ἐς ἄνδρα πρεσβύτερον* (cf. *ματαιιότηας*, Ps. xxxvii. 13), but *λόγος μάτ.* = *feigned, false*, Herod. ii. 118, 1, *εἰ μάταιον λόγον λέγουσιν οἱ Ἕλληνες τὰ περὶ Ἰλίου γενέσθαι ἢ οὐ*. Ezek. xiii. 6–9 = *כִּזְבִּי*, parallel with *λόγος ψευδής, μαντεία μάταια*; Zeph. iii. 13, *οὐ ποιήσουσιν ἀδικίαν οὐδὲ μὴ λαλήσουσιν μάταια*; Ps. iv. 3, synonymous with *ματαιότης* and *ψεῦδος*; cf. Aristot. *de gener.* i. 8, *ψεῦδος καὶ μάταιον*. Thus of inner hollowness and worthlessness, both as to import and result, 1 Cor. iii. 20, *κύριος γινώσκει τοὺς διαλογισμοὺς τῶν σοφῶν ὅτι εἰσὶν μάταιοι*; Tit. iii. 9, cf. *ματαιολογία*, 1 Tim. i. 6; *ματαιολόγος*, Tit. i. 10. With this is connected the designation of idols and false gods as *μάταια*, in opposition to *θεὸς ζῶν*, Acts xiv. 15, *ἀπὸ τούτων τῶν ματαίων ἐπιστρέφειν ἐπὶ θεὸν ζῶντα*; cf. Jer. ii. 5, *ἐπορεύθησαν ὀπίσω τῶν ματαίων καὶ ἐματαιώθησαν*. So LXX. = *יָצַב*, Lev. xvii. 7, 2 Chron. xi. 15; *לֵבָר*, Zech. xi. 17; *לֵבָר*, Jer. ii. 5; Amos ii. 4 = *כִּזְבִּי*.—Elsewhere usually = *כִּזְבִּי*.

Ματαιότης, ἡ, only in biblical and patristic Greek = vanity, nothingness, worthlessness. Often in the LXX. = לִּפְנוּי , Eccles. i. 2, ii. 1, and often, Ps. xxxi. 7, lxxviii. 33; lii. 9 = תִּהְיֶה ; xxvi. 4 = כִּשְׁוִי ; as also cxix. 37, cxxxix. 20, $\text{λήψονται εἰς ματαιότητα τὰς πόλεις σου}$.—In N. T. Rom. viii. 20, $\text{τῇ ματαιότητι ἣ κτίσις ὑπετάγη . . . ἐπ' ἐλπίδι}$, as in Eccles. i. 2, ii. 1, etc. The emptiness of the present appears in contrast with the living fulness of the future; 2 Pet. ii. 18, $\text{ὑπέρογκα ματαιότητος φθεγγόμενοι}$; Eph. iv. 17, $\text{τὰ ἔθνη περιπατεῖ ἐν ματαιότητι τοῦ νοὸς αὐτῶν}$, since they are destitute of all truth within.

Ματαιόω, only in biblical and patristic or post-Christian Greek. Melet. *de Nat. Hom.* v. 21, $\text{ἐματαιώθησαν ἐν τοῖς ἑαυτῶν διαλογισμοῖς}$, cf. Rom. i. 21 = to make vain or worthless; the active only in Jer. xxiii. 16, $\text{ματαιοῦσιν ἑαυτοῖς ὄρασιν}$. Elsewhere only the passive and, indeed, impersonal; 1 Sam. xiii. 13, $\text{μεματαιώται σοι ὅτι οὐκ ἐφύλαξας τὴν ἐντολὴν μου . . . καὶ νῦν ἡ βασιλεία σου οὐ στήσεται σοι}$. Comp. above, the Greek view of sin as μάταιον . The passive = to become vain or worthless, to frustrate, in an intransitive sense, not = to become worthless, but rather = to get off the right path, to follow foolish or bad courses, which, however, is not strong enough; 1 Sam. xxvi. 21, $\text{ἐν τῇ σήμερον μεματαιώμαι καὶ ἡγνόηκα πολλὰ σφόδρα}$; 2 Sam. xxiv. 10, ἐματαιώθην σφόδρα ; Tisch. ἐμωράνθην , cf. Rom. i. 22; Jer. ii. 5, $\text{ἐπορεύθησαν ὀπίσω τῶν ματαίων καὶ ἐματαιώθησαν}$; so 2 Kings xvii. 15.—Rom. i. 21, $\text{ἐματαιώθησαν ἐν τοῖς διαλογισμοῖς αὐτῶν}$, cf. 1 Cor. iii. 20 and Ps. xciv. 11.

Ματαιολόγος, ὁ, only in Tit. i. 10, and thence transferred to patristic Greek, one who speaks emptiness or vanity; Tit. i. 10, $\text{ματαιολόγοι καὶ φρεναπάται}$, cf. Jer. xxiii. 16; Ezek. xiii. 6–9. The substantive ματαιολογία , 1 Tim. i. 6 (cf. ver. 7), occurs occasionally elsewhere, e.g. Plutarch, *Mor.* 6 F. It denotes speaking which lacks reason, worth, and the fruit of divine and eternal life; see μάταιος .

Μένω, ἔμεινα, (I.) intransitively, to stay, to wait.—(II.) Transitively, to expect.

Ἵπομένω, (I.) intransitively, to stay behind, Luke ii. 43; Acts xvii. 14; to continue, a synonym with καρτερεῖν . So 1 Pet. ii. 20, $\text{κολαφιζόμενοι, πάσχοντες ὑπομενεῖτε}$. It denotes especially the psychological definiteness or stayedness of Messianic or Christian hope in the midst of the contradictions of this life; *vid.* ὑπομονή, ἐλπίς , Matt. x. 22, xxiv. 13; Mark xiii. 13, $\text{ὁ δὲ ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος, οὗτος σωθήσεται}$; cf. Luke xxi. 19, $\text{ἐν τῇ ὑπομονῇ ὑμῶν κτήσεσθε τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν}$. Hence, as contrasted with ἀρνεῖσθαι , 2 Tim. ii. 12, $\text{εἰ ὑπομένομεν, καὶ συμβασιλεύσομεν· εἰ ἀρνησόμεθα, κακείνος ἀρνήσεται ἡμᾶς· εἰ ἀπιστοῦμεν κ.τ.λ.}$; Rom. xii. 12, $\text{τῇ ἐλπίδι χαίροντες, τῇ θλίψει ὑπομένοντες}$.—(II.) Transitively, to bear, to acquiesce in, 1 Cor. xiii. 7, $\text{ἡ ἀγάπη πάντα ἐλπίζει, πάντα ὑπομένει}$; 2 Tim. ii. 10, $\text{πάντα ὑπομένω διὰ τοὺς ἐκλέκτους}$; Heb. xii. 2, σταυρόν ; xii. 3, ἀντιλογίαν ; xii. 7, παιδείαν . Of persons in conflict = to keep one's ground, e.g. Hom. *Il.* xvi. 814, $\text{οὐδ' ὑπέμειναν Πάτροκλον}$; cf. $\text{ἀνδρικῶς ὑπομεῖναι . . . ἀνάνδρως φεύγειν}$, Plat. *Theaet.* 177b; Heb. x. 32, πολλὴν ἄθλησιν ; Jas. i. 12, πειρασμόν .

Ἵπομονή, ἡ, a remaining behind, or staying, *e.g.* Πελοποννησίων υἱ. ἐν Ἰταλίᾳ, Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* i. 44. According to the Greek expression, we may thus understand 1 Chron. xxix. 15, ὡς σκιὰ αἱ ἡμέραι ἡμῶν ἐπὶ γῆς, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἵπομονή. But this does not correspond with the Hebrew נִחְמָה, *hope*, cf. Job xiv. 2, 5, 7. The word occurs only in later Greek, and answers to the usual καρτερία, καρτέρησις, holding out, enduring. Mostly in biblical and patristic Greek, because the LXX. used it as a rendering of Hebrew words denoting hope, *vid.* ἐλπίς, hope being the basis of ἵπομονή. It denotes the peculiar psychological clearness and definiteness which hope attains in the economy of grace, by virtue, on the one hand, of its distinctive character excluding all wavering, doubt, and uncertainty; and, on the other, in conformity with its self-assertion amid the contradictions of this present world. Hence, *e.g.*, Jehovah is called the ἵπομονή Ἰσραήλ, Jer. xiv. 8, xvii. 13; cf. Ps. xxxix. 8, xxvii. 14, etc. Thus are explained the expressions, 2 Thess. iii. 5, ἵπομονή Χριστοῦ, the patience which waits for Christ; Rev. iii. 10, ὁ λόγος τῆς ἵπομονῆς μου, the word which treats of patient waiting for me—the word of prophecy; cf. 1 Thess. i. 3, ἡ ἵπομ. τῆς ἐλπίδος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Further, cf. Rom. xv. 5, ὁ θεὸς τῆς ἵπομονῆς, ver. 13, τῆς ἐλπίδος, with ver. 4, ἵνα διὰ τῆς ἵπομονῆς καὶ τῆς παρακλήσεως τῶν γραφῶν τὴν ἐλπίδα ἔχομεν. Again, the threefold graces, πίστις, ἀγάπη, ἵπομονή, Tit. ii. 2, with 1 Cor. xiii. 13, πίστις, ἐλπίς, ἀγάπη. Similarly 1 Tim. vi. 11; 2 Tim. iii. 10.—Luke xxi. 19, ἐν τῇ ἵπομονῇ ὑμῶν κτήσασθε τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν, with reference to the final manifestation of Messianic redemption. Like 2 Thess. iii. 5, Rev. iii. 10, is Rev. i. 9 to be understood, συγκαινωνὸς ἐν τῇ θλίψει καὶ βασιλείᾳ καὶ ἵπομονῇ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, if this the Received reading be (as I think it is) preferable to that which explains the text by ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. These representations, embodied in ἵπομονή, give special significance to the words in Rev. xiii. 10, ὧδε ἔστιν ἡ ἵπομονή καὶ ἡ πίστις τῶν ἁγίων; xiv. 12, ὧδε ἡ ἵπομονή τῶν ἁγίων ἔστιν, οἱ τηροῦντες τὰς ἐντολὰς τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὴν πίστιν Ἰησοῦ. Patience is expressly named in Rom. viii. 25 as the appropriate result of hope, εἰ δὲ ὃ οὐ βλέπομεν ἐλπίζομεν, δι' ἵπομονῆς ἀπεκδεχόμεθα; cf. 2 Pet. iii. 12, προσδοκῶντας καὶ σπεύδοντας τὴν παρουσίαν τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμέρας; Col. i. 11, cf. with ver. 12. It manifests itself amid the disappointments and contradictions of this life, Rom. v. 3, 4, ἡ θλίψις ἵπομονὴν κατεργάζεται, ἡ δὲ ἵπομονή δοκιμὴν, ἡ δὲ δοκιμὴ ἐλπίδα, Jas. i. 3, 4.—2 Thess. i. 4; Heb. x. 36, ἵπομονῆς γὰρ ἔχετε χρεῖαν, ἵνα τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ ποιήσαντες κομίσησθε τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν; cf. Rev. xiv. 12; Heb. xii. 1; Rev. ii. 2, 3, 19; 2 Pet. i. 6.—Luke viii. 15, καρποφορεῖν ἐν ἵπομονῇ; Rom. ii. 7, καθ' ἵπομονὴν ἔργου ἀγαθοῦ; 2 Cor. xii. 12, τὰ σημεῖα τοῦ ἀποστόλου κατειργάσθη . . . ἐν πάσῃ ἵπομονῇ, is simply = endurance, perseverance; cf. Plut. *Pelop.* 1, αἰσχροῶν λόγων καὶ πράξεων ἵπομονή; 2 Cor. i. 6, ἐν ἵπομονῇ τῶν αὐτῶν παθημάτων ὧν καὶ ἡμεῖς πάσχομεν; vi. 4, ὡς θεοῦ διάκονοι, ἐν ἵπομονῇ πολλῇ, ἐν θλίψεσιν κ.τ.λ. = endurance, patience in sufferings.

Μέσος, η, ον, middle, in the midst.

Μεσίτης, ου, ό, mediator. This word is unknown in Attic Greek; it occurs in Philo, Josephus, Polyb., Diod., Lucian, and indeed, *e.g.*, of treaties of peace, Polyb. xxviii. 15. 8, τοὺς Ῥοδίους μεσίτας ἀποδείξαι; cf. *Ant.* xvi. 2. 2, τῶν παρ' Ἀγρίππα τινῶν ἐπιζητευμένων μεσίτης ἦν; Philo, *de Vit. Mos.* 160, 14, οἱ μεσίτης καὶ διαλλακτὴς οὐκ εὐθὺς ἀπεπῆδησεν, ἀλλὰ πρότερον τὰς ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἔθνους ἱκεσίας καὶ λιτὰς ἐποιεῖτο, συγγνώμην τῶν ἡμαρτημένων δεόμενος; Luc. *Apor.* 27, τράπεζα, φιλίας μεσίτης; cf. μεσιτεύω, Polyb. xi. 34. 3, μεσιτεύσαι τὴν διάλυσιν εὐνοϊκῶς, *to bring about a reconciliation*. Suid., μεσίτης, ό εἰρηνοποιός. μεσέγγυος μεσίτης, ἐγγυητής, μέσος δύο μερῶν; further = *he who appears or stands security for anything*; Diod. iv. 54, μεσίτην γεγονότα τῶν ὁμολογιῶν, *he who pledges himself for promises*; Joseph. *Antt.* iv. 6. 7, ταῦτα δὲ ὁμνύντες ἔλεγον, καὶ θεὸν μεσίτην, ὃν ἰπισχυοῦντο, ποιούμενοι. — According to Moeris, μεσέγγυος (Hesych., μεσέγγυος, μεσίτης) in Attic Greek denotes the surety, who lays down a guarantee in order to mediate between two parties, for which the appropriate term was μεσιδῖος, μεσιδιωθῆναι (Lob. *Phryg.* pp. 121, 122). Μεσιδῖος occurs in a passage in Aristotle (*Eth.* v. 4), where some read μεσόδικος = μέσος δικαστής, Thuc. iv. 83; Aristot. *Eth.* v. 4, καὶ καλοῦσιν ἔνιοι μεσιδῖους [τοὺς δικαστὰς] ἐὰν τοῦ μέσου τύχωσιν, τοῦ δικαίου τευζόμενοι, *i.e.* when they are just to both parties. Μεσίτης hardly corresponds with these expressions; it rather resembles διαιτήτης, διαλλακτὴρ, διαλλακτής, *the arbitrator*, forestalling the judge, whose province it is amicably to arrange matters, cf. Philo *in loc.* In the LXX. it occurs only in Job ix. 33, εἴθε ἦν ό μεσίτης ἡμῶν καὶ ἐλέγχων καὶ διακούων ἀνὰ μέσον ἀμφοτέρων, therefore = διαιτήτης; a paraphrase of the Hebrew expression, וְיִשְׁמַח־לָנוּ יְיָ וְיִשְׁמַח־לָנוּ יְיָ כִּי אֵין בֵּינֵנוּ מְשִׁיטָה, *there is no arbitrator between us, who can lay his hand upon us both*.

In the N. T. μεσίτης is used in both senses, **a mediator**, and **one who guarantees**. — (I.) **Mediator**, first in a general sense, Gal. iii. 19, 20, ό νόμος . . . διαταγείς δι' ἀγγέλων ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου. ό δὲ μεσίτης ἐνός οὐκ ἔστιν, ό δὲ θεός εἰς ἐστίν. In explanation of this much disputed passage we offer the following remarks. In ver. 21, by the οὖν (which both concludes and resumes the argument) the question is introduced, ό οὖν νόμος κατὰ τῶν ἐπαγγελιῶν τοῦ θεοῦ; and the answer is given, μὴ γένοιτο. That the law is not opposed to the promises of God—not opposed to the δι' ἐπαγγελίας κεχάρισται or the χαρίζεται ό θεός of ver. 18—is manifest from the fact that it was ordained by the hand of a mediator. Now a mediator presupposes parties. But as God is one, and the εἰς denotes not only numerical but qualitative unity, as the μεσίτης shows, this disagreement cannot be in Him, which would be the case if the law contradicted the promises and their characteristic features as free acts of grace. In such a case God would contradict Himself. Now it is evident—from the fact that there was introduced a mediator between the people and God, and from the circumstance, answering thereto, that God employed angels in the dispensation of the law—that the relation of God to Israel had been disturbed. Israel was no longer τὸ σπέρμα ᾧ ἐπὶγγελται, and thus the interposition of the law had its cause, not in God, but in Israel and their sin, the people having rejected the promises of God, and there being consequently as yet “no seed” who might inherit

those promises. This very fact also was to be brought out fully and clearly by the law itself, cf. Rom. v. 20; Gal. iii. 22–24; Heb. x. 1; cf. p. 120 for τῶν παραβάσεων χάριν. The apostle does not now further dwell upon the διαταγὴς δι' ἀγγέλων because it simply serves to strengthen the ἐν χειρὶ μεσίτου, which throws the necessary light upon it. Instead of God and Israel, we have angels and a mediator (Moses) ministering in the dispensation of the law. Moses as a mediator is not God's mediator, for He needs no mediator; as He is one, He cannot be in contradiction with Himself. From this self-evident fact it is clear that the law cannot be against the promises of God, for it is on the other hand characterized (by the fact of the mediations connected with it) as an intermediate institution τῶν παραβάσεων χάριν, and thus the difficulty of the relation between law and promise disappears, as both are still of God. In this the very manner of its appearance the law includes all under sin, and delays the fulfilment of the prophecies, ἄχρις οὗ ἔλθῃ τὸ σπέρμα ᾧ ἐπὶγγέλλεται, or εἰς τὴν μέλλουσαν πίστιν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι, ver. 22 sqq. — Thus μεσίτης, in Pauline phraseology, is — one who unites parties, one who mediates for peace, 1 Tim. ii. 5, εἰς θεός, εἰς καὶ μεσίτης θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων, ἄνθρωπος Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς, ὁ δὸς ἑαυτὸν ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων. Christ is thus called Mediator, because in man's behalf He satisfies the claims of God upon man. But in the Epistle to the Hebrews He is called μεσίτης clearly in the sense (II.) viz. as a surety, one who becomes security for something; Heb. viii. 6, κρείττονός ἐστιν διαθήκης μεσίτης, ἥτις ἐπὶ κρείττοσιν ἐπαγγελίαις νενομοθέτηται; cf. vii. 22, κρείττονος διαθήκης γέγονεν ἕγγυος Ἰησοῦς; ix. 15, διαθήκης καινῆς μεσίτης; xii. 24, προσεληλύθατε . . . διαθήκης νέας μεσίτη Ἰησοῦ. He it is who, with reference to mankind, mediates or guarantees for them a new and better διαθήκη, and with reference to God appears as High Priest; cf. vii. 20–22. What the Epistle to the Hebrews divides into these two elements, the High-priesthood and the Mediatorship of Christ, St. Paul represents as blended in the Mediatorship (1 Tim. ii. 5). See ἕγγυος.

Μεσιτεύω, (I.) to be a mediator between two contending parties, *vid.* μεσίτης. — (II.) to guarantee, Heb. vi. 17, ὁ θεὸς . . . τὸ ἀμετάθετον τῆς βουλῆς αὐτοῦ ἐμεσίτευσεν ὄρκῳ, corresponding with the use of μεσίτης in the Hebrews. There are no other instances of its use in this sense. Delitzsch compares with it אֲבִיבִי, *become a surety for me with thyself*, Job xvii. 3, Isa. xxxviii. 14, cf. with Ps. cxix. 22; but this does not correspond with the point of the text in the Hebrews, and in a forced manner takes the word back to the first meaning.

Μορφή, ἡ, the form, distinctively belonging to any essence, a synonym with εἶδος, the form or appearance of a thing as presented in the mind; ἰδέα, the form as the distinctive nature and character of the object; σχῆμα, the *habitus* or *condition*, Aristot. *Metaph.* 6, λέγω δὲ τὴν μὲν ὕλην οἷον τὸν χάλκον, τὴν δὲ μορφήν τὸ σχῆμα τῆς ἰδέας; Plut. *Mor.* 1013 C, αὐτὸς τε γὰρ ὁ κόσμος οὗτος καὶ τῶν μερῶν ἕκαστον αὐτοῦ συνέστηκεν ἐκ τε σωματικῆς οὐσίας καὶ νοητῆς ὧν ἡ μὲν ὕλην καὶ ὑποκείμενον, ἡ δὲ μορφήν καὶ εἶδος τῷ

γενομένην παρέσχε; Aeschyl. *Suppl.* 496, μορφῆς οὐχ ὁμόστολος φύσις, *is not of the same nature, does not correspond with the appearance*; Aeschyl. *Prom.* 210, Θέμις καὶ Γαῖα, πολλῶν ὀνομάτων μορφὴ μία; Plut. *Mor.* 1064 A, μεταβαλεῖν εἰς θηρίου μορφήν τὸ εἶδος. In this sense = *form, as it is peculiar to any one*, Dan. iv. 33, ἡ μορφή μου ἐπέστρεψεν ἐπ' ἐμέ (Theodotion; LXX. = δόξα). Hence generally, *the form in which anything appears*; Plat. *Rep.* ii. 380 D, ἀρα γόητα τὸν θεὸν οἶει εἶναι καὶ οἶον ἐξ ἐπιβουλῆς φαντάζεσθαι ἄλλοτε ἐν ἄλλαις ιδέαις, τότε μὲν ἄλλον γινόμενον καὶ ἀλλάττοντα τὸ αὐτοῦ εἶδος εἰς πολλὰς μορφάς, τότε δὲ κ.τ.λ. Especially of *the human form*, cf. Dan. v. 6, 9, 10, vii. 28 = יָהּ, and iv. 33. Elsewhere in the LXX., Isa. xlv. 13 = יִצְרָאֵל, ἐποίησεν αὐτὸ ὡς μορφήν ἀνδρός; Job iv. 16 = יִצְרָאֵל, οὐκ ἦν μορφή πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν μου, cf. Wisd. xviii. 1, φωνὴν μὲν ἀκούοντες, μορφήν δὲ οὐχ ὁρῶντες.—In the N. T. only in Mark xvi. 12, ἐφανερώθη ἐν ἐτέρᾳ μορφῇ, and Phil. ii. 6, 7, ὃς ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων . . . μορφήν δούλου λαβών. As μορφήν δούλου denotes *the form* which evidences the position of a servant, which belongs to a slave as expressive of his state, so μορφή θεοῦ means *the form of God*, as the expression of the divine essence, the formal designation of that which, as to its substance, is called positively δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ, cf. John xvii. 5, and see δόξα. Cf. John v. 37, τὸ εἶδος τοῦ θεοῦ; 1 John iii. 2. This formal designation is chosen both on account of the parallel with μορφή δούλου, and because even in the first clause what is treated of is not the nature or essence, but *the condition, the standing*. From a divine position or state, Christ came down into the position or state of a servant by the renunciation of what belonged to Him in His position as divine. Thus ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων is not indeed identical with, but is parallel to, ὡν εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ, and Meyer rightly refers to Heb. i. 3, ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ. For further criticism of the passage, *vid.* κενώω.

Μορφόω, to form. The word rarely occurs, and when it is = *to fashion or delineate*; it is easily referred back to its primary meaning (e.g. ἄμορφα μορφοῦν in Philo), as in *Anth.* i. 33. 1, μορφῶσαι τὸν ἀσώματον = *to mould into a form*; Clem. Alex. *Strom.* vi. 635, μορφώσαντες ξύλα καὶ λίθους κ.τ.λ. In the N. T. Gal. iv. 19, οὓς πάλιν ὠδίνω ἄχρις οὗ μορφωθῇ Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν. We are also reminded of ii. 20, ζῶ δὲ οὐκέτι ἐγώ, ζῇ δὲ ἐν ἐμοὶ Χριστός, and Rom. viii. 29, προόρισεν συμμόρφους τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ; 2 Cor. iii. 18, τὴν αὐτὴν εἰκόνα μεταμορφούμεθα.

Μόρφωσις, ἡ, a shaping, passive, the image or impress. In its active signification, e.g. Theophr. *Char.* pl. iii. 7. 4, μόρφωσις τῶν δένδρων ὕψει τε καὶ ταπεινότητι καὶ πλάτει, of the training of trees. In the N. T. passively, Rom. ii. 20, ἔχοντα τὴν μόρφωσιν τῆς γνώσεως καὶ τῆς ἀληθείας ἐν τῷ νόμῳ,—an expression like τύπος διδαχῆς, vi. 17. Also in 2 Tim. iii. 5, ἔχοντες μόρφωσιν εὐσεβείας, τὴν δὲ δύναμιν αὐτῆς ἡρνημένοι,—cf. Aesch. *Suppl.* 496, μορφῆς οὐχ ὁμόστολος φύσις.

Μεταμορφόω, to transform, to alter, to metamorphose; usually ἀλλοιοῦν, ἑτεροιοῦν, μεταβάλλειν. Primarily of the bodily form, Ammon. 92, μεταμορφοῦσθαι μεταχαρακτη-

ρισμός καὶ μετατίπωσις σώματος εἰς ἕτερον χαρακτήρα. Rarely of moral transformation (μεταβάλλειν τοὺς τρόπους); Symmach. Ps. xxxiv. 1, ὅτε μετεμόρφωσε τὸν τρόπον αὐτοῦ; LXX., ἡλλοίωσε τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ, of change in the outward *habitus*. In the N. T. of Christ's transfiguration, Matt. xvii. 2, μετεμορφώθη ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν, καὶ ἔλαμψεν τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ κ.τ.λ.; Mark ix. 2; cf. Luke ix. 28, τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ ἕτερον. The words of the apostle in 2 Cor. iii. 18, τὴν δόξαν κυρίου κατοπτριζόμενοι, τὴν αὐτὴν εἰκόνα μεταμορφούμεθα κ.τ.λ., must be understood of redeemed mankind collectively, cf. vv. 7, 17; Rom. xii. 2, on the contrary, must be understood of the moral habits and conduct of life, μὴ συσχηματιζέσθε τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ, ἀλλὰ μεταμορφούσθε τῇ ἀνακαινώσει τοῦ νοῦς. Cf. μορφή and σχῆμα, Phil. ii. 7; iii. 21, μετασχηματίζει τὸ σῶμα τῆς ταπεινώσεως ἡμῶν τῷ σώματι τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ.

We find also the compounds σύμμορφος, Rom. viii. 29, Phil. iii. 21, of like or similar form (Lucian, *Amor.* 29); συμμορφοῦν, to form similarly with, to make conformably to, Phil. iii. 10; for which Lachm. reads συμμορφίζειν.

Μυστήριον, τό, from μύω, to close, to shut, e.g. the lips, the eyes; intransitively, to close or end, also of wounds, muscles; connected with the Latin *mutus*, *vid.* Passow, Curtius, Schenkl; hence, too, a locking up, or that which serves for locking up, and (as μύειν is properly used of the organs of sense, of perception or communication) what obstructs, hinders, excludes perception or communication—**mystery**. In classical Greek usually in the plural, τὰ μυστήρια, as denoting *secret* politico-religious doctrines, the *mysteries*, especially of the Eleusinian mysteries, wherein some *secret* information, which was in turn to be kept secret, was communicated to the initiated; cf. Herod. ii. 51. 2, οἱ δὲ Πελασγοὶ ἱρόν τινα λόγον περὶ αὐτοῦ (*sc.* Ἑρμῆω) ἔλεξαν, τὰ ἐν τοῖσι ἐν Σαμοθρίκῃ μυστηρίοισι δεδήλωται. Thus μυστήριον does not properly denote that which is wholly withdrawn from knowledge, or cannot be known, but a knowledge of hidden things which is itself to be kept secret, or which at least is unknowable without special communication of it. This is clear from the two remarks of a scholiast on Aristoph. *Ran.* 459, *Av.* 1073. In the first passage we read, μυστήριον δὲ ἐκλήθη παρὰ τὸ τοὺς ἀκούοντας μύειν τὸ στόμα καὶ μηδενὶ ταῦτα ἐξηγεῖσθαι· μύειν δὲ ἐστὶ κλεῖν τὸ στόμα. In the second passage it is said of Diagoras, who disparaged the Eleusinian mysteries, τὰ μυστήρια πᾶσι διηγείτο κοινοποιῶν αὐτὰ καὶ μικρὰ ποιῶν καὶ τοὺς βουλομένους μυεῖσθαι ἀποτρέπων. Hence Theodoret on Rom. xi. 25, μυστήριόν ἐστι τὸ μὴ πᾶσιν γινώριμον, ἀλλὰ μόνον τοῖς θεωρουμένοις. In a secondary and material sense the word denotes generally what withdraws itself, or is, or is said to be, withdrawn from knowledge or manifestation. Thus in Menander, μυστήριόν σου μὴ κατέλπης τῷ φίλῳ,—that which thou wilt or oughtest to keep secret; Marc. Ant. iv. 5, ὁ θάνατος τοιοῦτον οἶον γένεσις φύσεως μυστήριον; Plat. *Theaet.* 156 A, ὦν μέλλω σοὶ τὰ αὐστήρια λέγειν.

We find the word used in both significations, closely bordering on each other, in biblical Greek. (Of heathen worship, in Wisd. xiv. 15, 23.) — (I.) Formal, a knowledge of

hidden things, requiring a special communication or revelation; Wisd. vi. 24, οὐκ ἀποκρύψω ὑμῖν μυστήρια; Rom. xvi. 25, μυστήριον σεσηγημένον; xi. 25, οὐ θέλω ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο; 1 Cor. ii. 7, λαλοῦμεν θεοῦ σοφίαν ἐν μυστηρίῳ; Eph. vi. 19, γνωρίσαι τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ εὐαγγελίου; 1 Tim. iii. 9, ἔχοντας τὸ μυστήριον τῆς πίστεως ἐν καθαρᾷ συνειδήσει—the knowledge which faith possesses, iii. 16, τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον. Thus also we may understand what our Lord says of the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, Luke viii. 10, ὑμῖν δέδοται γνῶναι τὰ μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ, τοῖς δὲ λοιποῖς ἐν παραβολαῖς, ἵνα βλέποντες μὴ βλέπωσιν κ.τ.λ.; Matt. xiii. 11 (Mark iv. 11, τὸ μ. τῆς β.); the knowledge of the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven was given in parables. It is evident from the passages now quoted that μυστήριον here designates information dependent on divine revelation, a knowledge of the truths of the gospel so far as these have been or are made known by divine revelation, and this must be regarded as the biblical or N. T. meaning of the expression. (Nowhere in the O. T. save in the texts cited under (II).) In this sense the word occurs in 1 Cor. iv. 1, οἰκονόμοι μυστηρίων θεοῦ; xiii. 2, ἐὰν ἔχω προφητείαν καὶ εἰδῶ τὰ μυστήρια πάντα καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γνῶσιν; Col. iv. 3, λαλῆσαι τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ; ii. 2, εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ θεοῦ, ἐν ᾧ εἰσὶν πάντες οἱ θησαυροὶ τῆς σοφίας καὶ τῆς γνώσεως ἀπόκρυφοι. So also, if the reading be genuine, in 1 Cor. ii. 1, καταγγέλλων ὑμῖν τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ θεοῦ (instead of μαρτύριον). (II.) That which is withdrawn from knowledge, which is hidden as the object of divine revelation, —the word in the sense (I.) being a more formal term. — So especially in Ephesians and Colossians. Eph. i. 9, γνωρίσας ἡμῖν τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ; iii. 3, κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν ἐγνωρίσθη μοι τὸ μυστήριον; ver. 4, ἡ σύνεσις μου ἐν τῷ μυστηρίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, cf. ver. 6; ver. 9, τίς ἡ οἰκονομία τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ ἀποκεκρυμμένου . . . ἐν τῷ θεῷ; Col. i. 26, τὸ μυστήριον τὸ ἀποκεκρυμμένον . . . νυνὶ δὲ ἐφανερώθη, cf. ver. 27, τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης τοῦ μυστηρίου τούτου ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, ὅς ἐστιν Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν; Rev. x. 7, ἐτελέσθη τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ θεοῦ, ὡς εὐγγέλισεν τοὺς . . . προφῆτας. Cf. Dan. ii. 18, 19, 27–30, iv. 6; Wisd. ii. 22, τὰ μυστήρια τοῦ θεοῦ, the hidden laws of the divine government, God's secret purposes. Ecclus. xxii. 22, xxvii. 16, 17, τὰ μυστήρια τοῦ φίλου; ver. 21; Tob. xii. 7, 11, μυστήριον βασιλέως; Judith ii. 2, ἔθετο μετ' αὐτῶν τὸ μυστήριον τῆς βουλῆς αὐτοῦ; 2 Macc. xiii. 21, προσήγγειλε τὰ μυστήρια τοῖς πολεμίοις. So also in 1 Cor. xiv. 2, πνεύματι λαλεῖ μυστήρια; xv. 51, μυστήριον ὑμῖν λέγω; 2 Thess. ii. 7, τὸ μυστήριον τῆς ἀνομίας ἐνεργεῖται; Eph. v. 32, τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο μέγα ἐστίν. So in Rev. i. 20, τὸ μυστήριον τῶν ἐπτὰ ἀστέρων—that which is hidden beneath the seven stars; xvii. 7, σοὶ ἔρω τὸ μυστήριον τῆς γυναικὸς, and the inscription μυστήριον upon the forehead of this woman, xvii. 5. So also if the parables themselves, apart from their import, be called μυστήρια (though this indeed is nowhere the case), *vid.* Matt. xiii. 11, τὰ μυστήρια τῆς βασιλ. τ. οὐρ.

M ō m o s, ὁ, blame, fault. Num. xix. 2; Lev. xxi. 16, 17, 21; Deut. xv. 21 = *cas*. Hence

Ἄ μ ω μ ο ς, ὁ, ἡ, without blame, without fault, as against *ἔμωμος*, which Aquila

and Symmachus employ in Mal i. 14 instead of the διεφθαρμένον of the LXX., but which is not known elsewhere in profane Greek. Ἄμωμος likewise is very rare in profane Greek, Hesiod, *Th.* 259, φυήν τ' ἐρατὴ καὶ εἶδος ἄμωμος; Anacr. in Stob. *Ecl.* lxvi. 6, κόμης ἄμωμον ἄνθος; Aesch. *Pers.* 185, δύο γυναῖκες . . . κάλλει ἀμώμω; Herod. ii. 177, ἄμωμος νόμος. More frequently in the LXX., for the most part = מִצְוָה, Ex. xxix. 1; Lev. i. 3, 10, xxii. 21, compare the contrast in ver. 22. Num. vi. 14, xix. 2, of the spotlessness of the beasts for sacrifice. (Compare 1 Macc. iv. 42, of the priests. So also in Philo.) Answering to this we have in the N. T. 1 Pet. i. 19, ἐλυτρώθητε τιμῇ αἵματι ὡς ἀμωῦ ἀμώμου καὶ ἀσπίλου Χριστοῦ; Heb. ix. 14, ἐαυτὸν προσήνεγκεν ἄμωμον τῷ θεῷ. The application of the word elsewhere in the N. T. may be akin to this, especially its combination with ἅγιος, Eph. i. 4, v. 27; Col. i. 22, ἁγίους καὶ ἀμώμους καὶ ἀνεγκλήτους. In the remaining places it alternates in the MSS. with ἀμώμητος, unblame-worthy, blameless, which occurs in later Greek, and more frequently than ἄμωμος, Phil. ii. 15; Jude 24; 2 Pet. iii. 14. — Once more in Rev. xiv. 5. Chrysostom combines ἀμωμότης and τελειότης

N

Νεκρός, ὁ, poetic (especially in Homer) νεκός, akin to the Latin *nox, nocere, nocere*, also an adj. νεκρός, ἄ, ὄν; a dead body, a human corpse, especially of those fallen in battle (cf. Rev. xvi. 3); hence, generally, the dead as distinct from the living, the deceased—the dead in Hades, νεκροὶ τεθνηῶτες. Cf. Hom. *Od.* xii. 383, δύσομαι εἰς Ἀΐδαο καὶ ἐν νεκύεσσι φαείνω; 1 Pet. iv. 6, νεκροῖς εὐηγγελίσθη; Luke xvi. 30, εἰάν τις ἀπὸ νεκρῶν πορευθῇ πρὸς αὐτούς. Τεθνηκώς denotes *one who has experienced death*; νεκρός, *one who is in a state of death* (cf. θάνατος (II.) (a.) and (b.)). John xii. 1, ὅπου ἦν Λάζαρος ὁ τεθνηκώς, ὃν ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν; Rev. i. 17; Acts xx. 9, etc. Cf. 1 Thess. iv. 14, οἱ κοιμηθέντες διὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, with ver. 16, οἱ νεκροὶ ἐν Χριστῷ. In the N. T. the article is usually omitted in the combinations ἐγείρειν, ἐγείρεσθαι, ἀναστῆναι ἐκ νεκρῶν, while νεκροὶ and οἱ νεκροὶ are carefully to be distinguished, cf. Mark xii. 26, 27; 1 Cor. xv. 15, 16, 29, 32, 52. In classical Greek, on the contrary, νεκροὶ is often used without the article to denote the dead.

Νεκρός corresponds with θάνατος as the state of man when he has suffered the penal sentence of death, and therefore like θάνατος it is often used in N. T. Greek to denote the state of men still living; and we may understand it of the state of those whose life is appointed to death as the punishment of sin; but *not*, as is so often supposed, of so-called “spiritual death.” Cf. Col. ii. 13, Eph. ii. 1, 5, νεκροὶ ἐν παραπτώμασιν (an expression like νεκροὶ ἐν Χριστῷ, except that this latter presupposes the death of the body), with Rom. vii. 9, ἡ ἁμαρτία ἀνέζησεν, ἐγὼ δὲ ἀπέθανον; Eph. iv. 18, ἀπηλλοτριωμένοι τῆς ζωῆς τοῦ θεοῦ, and Harless *in loc.* See also the context in Eph. ii. 1, 5–7, νεκροὺς ἐν παραπτώμασιν συνεζωοποίησεν τῷ Χριστῷ, χάριτί ἐστε σεσωσμένοι, καὶ συνήγειρεν, καὶ συνεκάθισεν ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. Were we to take νεκρός to denote reli-

gious inaction and incapability, we should violate the connection of the passage which treats of the reception of salvation. Compare also the O. T. passages, Prov. xxi. 16, ix. 18, ii. 18 (Hebrew). So also cf. Eph. v. 14, ἔγειρε ὁ καθεύδων καὶ ἀνάστα ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν καὶ ἐπιφαύσει σοι ὁ Χριστός, with Isa. ix. 1, lx. 1 sqq.; Ezek. xxxvii. Death in the language of Scripture denotes the condition of man apart from salvation, which certainly implies a moral condition, moral conduct—νεκροὶ ἐν παραπτ. . . ; but this moral condition is not itself called *death*. The main element in the conception of death is a judicial sentence on account of sin, just as *life* in its highest sense means salvation, and yet ζῆν never (save with an express qualification) denotes moral action in life; cf. Rom. vi. 11, νεκρὸς τῇ ἀμαρτίᾳ. Νεκρός is = *given over to death* (even during life), *vid.* Rom. viii. 10, σῶμα νεκρὸν δι' ἀμαρτίαν. The passage which seems most to favour the meaning "spiritual death" is Rom. vi. 13, παραστήσατε ἑαυτοὺς τῷ θεῷ ὡς ἐκ νεκρῶν ζῶντας; but these words are so closely connected with vv. 6–11 (see especially vv. 8, 10, 11) that they cannot have this meaning, ὡς not being = *tanquam*, but = *quippe qui*. In Rom. xi. 15, εἰ γὰρ ἡ ἀποβολὴ αὐτῶν καταλλαγὴ κόσμου, τίς ἡ πρόσλημψις εἰ μὴ ζωὴ ἐκ νεκρῶν, νεκρός evidently denotes the state of unbelieving Israel apart from the gospel. — In Matt. viii. 22 (Luke ix. 60), ἄφες τοὺς νεκροὺς θάψαι τοὺς ἑαυτῶν νεκρούς, it is clear that the *mortui sepelientes* as well as the *mortui sepeliendi* are in a state of death, with this difference, however, the former are under sentence of death, and the latter have already suffered the penal sentence; whereas they who follow the Lord have found salvation, and have entered upon fellowship with Him, cf. Isa. ix. 1. There remains for consideration Rev. iii. 1, ὄνομα ἔχεις ὅτι ζῆς καὶ νεκρὸς εἶ, where mention is not certainly made of moral inability, but only of *inaction*, and we may understand ζῆν and νεκρός as, *e.g.*, in Xen. *Cyr.* viii. 7. 23, τὰ ἔργα τινὸς ζῶσιν ἐμφανῇ (perhaps = *flourish*). Still see also ver. 2, στήρισον τὰ λοιπὰ ἃ ἐμελλον ἀποθανεῖν. — For Luke xv. 24, of the prodigal son, νεκρὸς ἦν καὶ ἀνέζησεν, ἦν ἀπολωλὼς καὶ εὗρέθη, cf. Soph. *Philoct.* 1030, ὃς οὐδέν εἰμι καὶ τέθνηχ' ὑμῖν πάλαι. For other examples, *vid.* Kypke, *observ. scr.* — In profane Greek, νεκρός is certainly used in the same manner as when we speak of spiritual death, cf. Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 5, διὸ καὶ ἐν τῇ βαρβάρῳ φιλοσοφίᾳ νεκροὺς καλοῦσι τοὺς ἐκπεσόντας τῶν δογμάτων καὶ καθυποτάξαντας τὸν νοῦν τοῖς πάθεσι τοῖς ψυχικοῖς. Cf. schol. on Aristoph. *Ran.* 423, διὰ τὴν κακοπραγίαν νεκροὺς τοὺς Ἀθηναίους καλεῖ. So also in patristic Greek.

The adjective is in N. T. Greek, like ζῆν in profane Greek, applied to other conceptions whose position, force, or efficacy is to be specially characterized (*vid.* ζάω), *e.g.* πλῆστις νεκρά, Jas. ii. 17, 26, ἀμαρτία νεκρά; Rom. vii. 8, ἔργα νεκρά; Heb. vi. 1, ix. 14, *works in which no life appears*, which carry death in them, as works of sin; hence vi. 1, μετάνοια ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἔργων; ix. 14, καθαρίζειν τὴν συνείδησιν ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἔργων. Compare defilement through death, under καθαρίζειν.

Νέκρωσις, ἡ, a killing; rarely in classical Greek, and very rarely, it would seem, with an active meaning; usually decay (Galen) or deadness, Rom. iv. 19, τὴν νέκρωσιν

τῆς μήτρας Σάρρας. Cf. Chrys., νέκρωσιν χρὴ νοεῖν ψυχῆς τὴν κακοπραγίαν. Then in 2 Cor. iv. 10, τὴν νέκρωσιν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῷ σώματι περιφέροντες, ἵνα καὶ ἡ ζωὴ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῷ σώματι ἡμῶν φανερωθῇ = the killing as an event past, as Jesus was put to death, what befell Him every way befalls us. Cf. 1 Cor. xv. 31; Rom. viii. 36.—νεκρόω, Rom. iv. 19; Col. iii. 5; Heb. xi. 12.

Νέος, α, ον, new, not yet old, i.e. young, lively. See καινός; cf. οἶνος νέος, Matt. ix. 17; Mark ii. 22; Luke v. 37, 38, in contrast with οἶνος πάλαιος, ver. 39. What has not long existed, e.g. νέοι θεοί, often of Zeus, etc., in contrast with the Titans; νέος μαθητής, a novice, Aristotle, *Eth.* i. 3. In the LXX. generally = נַעַר; only in Lev. xxiii. 16, xxvi. 10, Song vii. 13 = שָׁהָה. Its relation to καινός is that it does not in itself displace or supplant the old, but simply excludes oldness, and what pertains to age. Hence διαθήκη νέα, Heb. xii. 24, not as supplanting the πάλαια, but because it is not as the πάλαια, viii. 13, vii. 18, 19. Thus also we must take Col. iii. 10, ἐνδυσάμενοι τὸν νέον τὸν ἀνακαινούμενον κ.τ.λ., where ἀνακαιν. denotes the exclusion and supplanting of the old man, while νέος answers to παλιγγενεσία, Tit. iii. 5, and to ἀνωθεν γεννηθῆναι, John iii. 3; cf. Ps. ciii. 5, ἀνακαινισθήσεται ἡ νεότης σου. We may observe the same relation of νέος to παλαιός in 1 Cor. v. 7, ἐκκαθάρατε τὴν παλαιὰν ζύμην, ἵνα ἦτε νέοι φύραμα, καθὼς ἐστε ἄζυμοι.—Elsewhere, excepting in Tit. ii. 4 (feminine), the comparative νεώτερος, Luke xv. 12, 13, xxii. 26; John xxi. 18; Acts v. 6; 1 Tim. v. 1, 2, 11, 14; Tit. ii. 6; 1 Pet. v. 5.

Νεόω, to renew; very rarely in profane Greek; Jer. iv. 3, νεώσατε ἑαυτοῖς νεώματα (fallow ground) καὶ μὴ σπεύρητε ἐπ' ἀκάνθαις. Somewhat oftener we meet with νεάω in profane Greek, to plough fallow ground, to prepare new ground for seed.

Ἀνανεόω, to renew, to make young. Suidas, ἀναζωπυρῆσαι, ἀνανεῶσαι, ἀνεγείραι, ζωῶσαι. The active rarely occurs, e.g. Marc. Anton. iv. 3, ἀνανέου σεαυτόν. In the LXX. Job xxxiii. 24, ἀνανεώσει αὐτοῦ τὸ σῶμα ὥσπερ ἀλοιφήν ἐπὶ τοίχῳ; Aquila in Ps. xxix. 2, ἀνανεώσας με. The middle in a transitive sense occurs somewhat oftener, in Thucyd., Herodian, Polyb., Diodor.; παλαιὰν φιλίαν, Thuc. vii. 33; 1 Macc. xii. 1, 10, 16; τὴν μάχην, Herodian, iv. 15, 16. But the middle never occurs with a reflexive meaning = to renew oneself. It is evident that the meaning "to recollect," e.g. Luc. amor. 8, ἡρωϊκοὺς μύθους ἀνανεούμενος; Sext. Pyrrh. *Hyp.* iii. 268, ἀναμνησκόμενοι καὶ ἀνανεοίμενοι ταῦτα ἅπερ ᾔδεσαν, is only a particularizing of the meaning to renew, to refresh, even if we had not the full expression, ἀνανεοῦσθαι τι τῇ μνήμῃ, Thom. Mag. p. 28. It is accordingly, in Eph. iv. 23, ἀνανεοῦσθαι τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ νοός ὑμῶν, to be taken passively, cf. ii. 10, iv. 24. As to the thing meant, see νέος, and what is there said upon Col. iii. 10.

Νόμος, ὁ, usage, custom, right, ordinance; Hesiod, Pindar, Herodotus, e.g. Hes. *Th.* 66, Μοῦσαι . . . μέλπονται πάντων τε νόμους καὶ ἥθεα κέδνα; Herod. i. 132, ἀνευ

μάγου οὐ σφι νόμος ἐστὶ θυσίας ποιέεσθαι; i. 61, ἐμίσητό οἱ οὐ κατὰ νόμον; iii. 38, νόμον πάντων βασιλέα φήσας εἶναι—*usus est tyrannus*. The word is derived from νέμω, to assign, manage, or administer, cf. νέμεσις, νεμέσεια, and, according to Curtius, is akin to Numa, Numitor, numerus; Cic. de leg. i. 19, *Legem doctissimi viri Graeco putant nomine a summi cuique tribuendo appellatam*; Plat. Symp. ii. 644 C, οἱ νόμοι τῆς ἴσα νεμούσης εἰς τὸ κοινὸν ἀρχῆς καὶ δυνάμεως ἐπάνυμοι γεγόνασιν. (That the idea of order is the prominent one, appears from the fact that νόμος is applied to the order of tone and of key in music, cf. Deut. xxxii. 46 = תְּנִיחָ.) It had come to be used in a special sense of laws of state and equity committed to writing; cf. Aristot. Rhet. ad Alex. 2, νόμος δὲ ἐστὶν ὁμολόγημα πόλεως κοινὸν διὰ γραμμάτων προστάττον πῶς χρῆ πράττειν ἕκαστα; Plat. Legg. i. 644 D, ὃς (λογισμὸς) γενόμενος δόγμα πόλεως κοινὸν νόμος ἐπανόμασται. The νόμοι differed from the ἔθη as the written from the unwritten laws, Schol. Thuc. ii. 37; Plat. Legg. viii. 841 B, παρ' αὐτοῖς ἔστω νόμιμον, ἔθει καὶ ἀγράφῳ νομισθὲν νόμῳ; Plut. Lyk. 13, μία οὖν τῶν ῥητρῶν ἦν, ὥσπερ εἴρηται, μὴ χρῆσθαι νόμοις ἐγγράφοις; Aristot. Rhet. i. 10. 2, νόμος δ' ἐστὶν ὁ μὲν ἴδιος, ὁ δὲ κοινός. λέγω δὲ ἴδιον μὲν καθ' ὃν γεγραμμένον πολιτεύονται κοινὸν δὲ ὅσα ἄγραφα παρὰ πᾶσιν ὁμολογεῖσθαι δοκεῖ; cf. γράφειν, γράμμα, and the N. T. characteristic designation of O. T. law as γράμμα. "In Athens, Solon's laws were specially called νόμοι, those of Draco θεσμοί, and hence νόμος became the established name for law when set up in a state, and recognised as a standard for the administration of justice, whether transmitted from generation to generation, or set up by legislative power; in Herod., the Tragedians, Aristotle, Xen., Plato; but Homer (who seems not to know the word at all in the *Odyssey* or *Iliad*) uses θέμιστες in this sense," Passow. As νόμος denotes law as a rule and ordinance, it is evident that the word attained this signification only upon the formation of a settled national life; and as it denotes all that pertains to the order of state and law, it serves as a fit rendering for the Hebrew תְּנִיחָ (literally, instruction or pointing out of God's order towards Israel), whereas רַח = πρόσταγμα, and especially δικαίωμα; תְּנִיחָ = ἐντολή. Synonyms, θεσμός—law with reference to the authority upon which it rests, and which it asserts; ἐντολή, of a particular command (cf. Heb. vii. 5, ix. 19; Matt. xxii. 36; Eph. ii. 15); δόγμα, an authoritative conclusion, a proposition universally binding.

As to the use of the word in the N. T., and in biblical Greek generally, it differs, first of all, formally from that of classical Greek, in the fact that in the latter legal enactments collectively are designated by the plural, and particular laws by the singular (which also denotes "usage," "right," and as a generic term, e.g. in Plato, de legibus, 314 B, τὰ δόγματα ταῦτα καὶ ψηφίσματα νόμον εἶναι); cf. Krüger on Thuc. i. 77. 2, "ὁ νόμος was used as a collective noun in prose by no means so generally as our word law, though it occurs thus, e.g., with reference to a passage of Pindar [Plat. Gorg. 484 B], in [Herod. iii. 38. 2] Plat. Prot. 337 D, de leg. 690 B. On the contrary, rendering the same passage, we have οἱ πόλεως βασιλῆς νόμοι, Symp. 196 C; cf. Aristotle, Pol. iii. 3. At any rate, ὁ νόμος does not thus appear in Thuc." But in biblical Greek ὁ νόμος signifies the law of the

Israelites, according to which all the relations of personal and social life were regulated, —the *divine law* with its various enactments; cf. ὁ νόμος τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασιν, Eph. ii. 15. The plural only, as in Heb. viii. 10, x. 16 (from Jer. xxxi. 31, where in the Hebrew it is singular), διδούς νόμους μου εἰς τὴν διάνοιαν αὐτῶν. Νόμος is used (I.) in quite a general way as = law; but thus it rarely occurs, as in John xix. 7, ἡμεῖς νόμον ἔχομεν καὶ κατὰ τὸν νόμον ἡμῶν ὀφείλει ἀποθανεῖν. So in the expressions, ὁ νόμος τοῦ νοός μου, Rom. vii. 23; ἕτερος νόμος (sc. ὁ ὢν ἐν τοῖς μέλεσίν μου) . . . ὁ νόμος τῆς ἁμαρτίας, and ver. 25; viii. 2, ὁ νόμος τῆς ἁμαρτίας καὶ τοῦ θανάτου, opposed to ὁ νόμος τοῦ πνεύματος τῆς ζωῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. All these expressions have reference to the law of God as it lays claim to man's obedience as the only universally valid law. Cf. Rom. vii. 1, ὁ νόμος κυριεύει τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, and therefore law as a power determining man, cf. ver. 23; δουλεῖν νόμῳ, ver. 25; δεδέσθαι νόμῳ, vii. 2 (1 Cor. vii. 39); vii. 2, ὁ νόμος τοῦ ἀνδρός, cf. Lev. xiv. 2, ὁ νόμος τοῦ λεπροῦ.—Rom. iii. 27, διὰ ποίου νόμου; τῶν ἔργων; οὐχί, ἀλλὰ διὰ νόμου πίστεως. Accordingly (II.) νόμος is used constantly (as in the O. T. Apocrypha) to designate that rule of life and action which God gave the Israelites, the law of the people of Israel, more particularly described as ὁ νόμος τοῦ κυρίου, Luke ii. 39, xxiii. 24; ὁ νόμος τῶν Ἰουδαίων, Acts xxv. 8, cf. John xviii. 31; Acts xviii. 15, xxiii. 29; ὁ νόμος ἡμῶν, John vii. 51, xix. 7; Acts xxiv. 6; ὁ πατρῶς νόμος, Acts xxii. 3; ὁ νόμος Μωϋσέως, John vii. 23; Luke ii. 22; Acts xiii. 39, xv. 5, xxviii. 23; 1 Cor. ix. 9; Heb. x. 28. This latter expression can hardly be regarded as the historical designation for the law of Israel, but as the name given to it in the light of the history of redemption; and it is connected with Moses in the position assigned him in that history, cf. John i. 17, ὁ νόμος διὰ Μωϋσέως ἐδόθη, ἡ χάρις καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐγένετο; v. 45, Μωϋσῆς εἰς ὃν ἠλπίκατε, cf. ver. 46; Acts vi. 11, λαλεῖν ῥήματα βλάσφημα εἰς Μωϋσῆν καὶ τὸν θεόν; vii. 35, 37, 44; xxi. 21, ἀποστασίαν διδάσκεις ἀπὸ Μωϋσέως; Rom. v. 14, ἐβασίλευσεν ὁ θάνατος ἀπὸ Ἀδὰμ μέχρι Μωϋσέως κ.τ.λ.; 1 Cor. x. 2, πάντες εἰς τὸν Μωϋσῆν ἐβαπτίσαντο; 2 Cor. iii. 7 sqq.; Heb. iii.; Gal. iii. 19 sqq.—We also find it alone = the law, not so much, with special limitation, *our law*, i.e. the law of Israel, but rather *God's law*, ὁ νόμος τοῦ θεοῦ, Rom. vii. 22, 25, viii. 7; clothed with divine authority, and laying claim to independent and exclusive obligation, ordering man's relations to God, and governing human life universally with reference to God. Compare the biblical conception of δίκαιος, Acts xviii. 13, παρὰ τὸν νόμον ἀναπείθει οὗτος τοὺς ἀνθρώπους σέβεσθαι τὸν θεόν; Matt. v. 18, ἕως ἂν παρέλθῃ ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ, ἰῶτα ἢ ἓν ἢ μία κεραία οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου; xxii. 36, xxiii. 23; Luke ii. 27, x. 26, xvi. 17; Acts vii. 53, xv. 24, xxi. 20, 24, 28, xxii. 12, xxiii. 3. In St. Paul's Epistles, in Hebrews, and in James, it occurs without the article in the same sense, but not in the nominative save in Rom. iv. 15, v. 20; the article is usually wanting in places where stress is laid not upon its historical impress and outward form, but upon the conception itself; not upon the law which God gave, but upon law as given by God, and as therefore the only one that is or can be. So especially in passages where νόμος is used alternately

with and without the article, Rom. ii. 14, 15, ὅταν γὰρ ἔθνη τὰ μὴ νόμον ἔχοντα φύσει τὰ τοῦ νόμου ποιῶσιν, οὗτοι νόμον μὴ ἔχοντες ἑαυτοῖς εἰσὶν νόμος, οἵτινες ἐνδείκνυνται τὸ ἔργον τοῦ νόμου γραπτὸν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν; ii. 23, ὃς ἐν νόμῳ καυχᾶσαι, διὰ τῆς παραβάσεως τοῦ νόμου τὸν θεὸν ἀτιμάζεις; ver. 27, κρινεῖ σε ἡ ἐκ φύσεως ἀκροβυστία τὸν νόμον τελούσα σὲ τὸν διὰ γράμματος καὶ περιτομῆς παραβάτην νόμου; Rom. iv. 15, ὁ γὰρ νόμος ὀργὴν κατεργάζεται· οὐ γὰρ οὐκ ἔστιν νόμος, οὐδὲ παράβασις. But that νόμος without the article also means the law which was given to Israel, is clear most manifestly from Rom. v. 13, ἄχρι γὰρ νόμου ἁμαρτία ἦν ἐν κόσμῳ, ἁμαρτία δὲ οὐκ ἐλλογεῖται μὴ ὄντος νόμου; ver. 20, νόμος δὲ παρεισήλθεν, ἵνα πλεονάσῃ τὸ παράπτωμα; cf. v. 14, ἀπὸ Ἀδὰμ μέχρι Μωϋσέως. Νόμος, that which law is, namely, God's ordainment, the expression of the will of God, has but one historical embodiment, viz. ὁ νόμος;—genus and species coincide. (Νόμος does not occur without the article in the historical books of the N. T. excepting in Luke ii. 23, 24, where, as a particularizing designation, νόμος κυρίου is used. We find it oftener in the O. T. Apocrypha.)

While in the Epistle to the Hebrews the law is viewed as an historical preparation for the revelation of grace in Christ, as an institution and rule for the obtainment of grace in the O. T. dispensation, in the Pauline Epistles (Romans, 1 Cor., Gal., Eph., Phil., 1 Tim.) and in the Epistle of James it is regarded as the divine order and rule of human life and conduct,—the announcement of God's commandments which are ever obligatory upon man; and its connection with the plan of salvation in Christ is explained accordingly. Hence has arisen the ordinary distinction, already perhaps finding its basis in the O. T. (cf. Ex. xxxiv. 28; Deut. x. 4, and especially Deut. v. 22), between the ceremonial and the moral law. We cannot, indeed, say that St. Paul speaks only of the moral law, and the Epistle to the Hebrews of the ceremonial law. When St. Paul says, Gal. v. 3, μαρτύρομαι δὲ πάλιν παντὶ ἀνθρώπῳ περιτεμνομένῳ ὅτι ὀφειλέτης ἐστὶν ὅλον τὸν νόμον ποιῆσαι, he evidently has in his mind the entire law of Israel; and so in Phil. iii. 5, 6, κατὰ νόμον Φαρισαῖος . . . κατὰ δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐν νόμῳ γενόμενος ἄμεμπτος, cf. Rom. vii. 7–11. The law which forbade sin presented a perfect righteousness to the sinner by instituting propitiatory sacrifice; and thus we may understand such passages as Luke i. 6. Still, as the apostle usually gives prominence to man's relation to the law and its claims upon him, he generally views the law as the requirement and rule of man's moral and religious life, νόμος δικαιοσύνης, Rom. ix. 31; viii. 7, τὸ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς ἔχθρα εἰς θεόν· τῷ γὰρ νόμῳ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐχ ὑποτάσσεται· οὐδὲ γὰρ δύναται; iii. 19, ὅσα ὁ νόμος λέγει τοῖς ἐν τῷ νόμῳ λαλεῖ, ἵνα πᾶν στόμα φραγῇ καὶ ὑπόδικος γένηται πᾶς ὁ κόσμος τῷ θεῷ; ii. 26, ἐὰν οὖν ἡ ἀκροβυστία τὰ δικαιώματα τοῦ νόμου φυλάσῃ. Cf. ver. 23 with vv. 21, 22; vii. 7, τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν οὐκ ᾔδειν εἰ μὴ ὁ νόμος ἔλεγεν οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις; viii. 3, 4, xiii. 8, 10; Gal. iii. 10, 12, 13; 1 Tim. i. 8, 9. He contemplates man mainly in his relation to God's plan of salvation, therefore he says, Gal. iii. 12, ὁ νόμος οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ πίστεως; and the claims of the law with reference to moral conduct (the Decalogue) he considers to be the main point and the starting-point of the entire law. Its ordinances

as to worship and sacrifice are in his view partly the extension and application of those fundamental principles, and partly a kind of amends or atonement for a deficient moral obedience. Comp. Deut. v. 22, *and Jehovah added no more*, with reference to the Decalogue. But viewing the law as a divine institution connected with man's salvation as realized in Christ, so that there comes mainly into consideration what and how much grace the law gave the sinner, the Epistle to the Hebrews gives prominence to its ordinances concerning priesthood and sacrifice. Heb. vii. 5, 28, *ὁ νόμος γὰρ ἀνθρώπους καθίστησιν ἀρχιερεῖς*; ix. 22, *ἐν αἵματι πάντα καθαρίζεται κατὰ τὸν νόμον*; x. 8, viii. 4, ix. 19 (for vii. 16, *κατὰ νόμον ἐντολῆς σαρκίνης*, see *σάρκινος*). Paul makes use of the law to prove the fact of sin; in the Epistle to the Hebrews the law is represented in its bearing upon presupposed sin. Gal. iii. 19, *τί οὖν ὁ νόμος*; *τῶν παραβάσεων χάριν προσετέθη*; Rom. iv. 15, v. 13, 20, vii. 8; Heb. x. 3, *ἐν αὐταῖς ἀνάμνησις ἁμαρτιῶν κατ' ἐνιαυτόν*; Rom. iii. 20, *διὰ νόμον ἐπίγνωσις ἁμαρτίας*. The Decalogue proves the fact of sin, and convicts man; recognising man's guilt, the law ordains sacrifice and priesthood. Thus far the usual distinction between the moral and ceremonial law is allowable, but we must regard them as two constituent and connected parts of one and the same whole. The idea of the law as a moral standard is to be found even in the Epistle to the Hebrews; see chap. viii. 10, x. 16, ii. 2, viii. 9, ix. 15, x. 28, *ἀθετήσας τὸν νόμον Μωϋσέως . . . ἀποθνήσκει*. Even the O. T. indicates this distinction by attaching special importance to the Decalogue, Ex. xxxiv. 28, xxv. 16. But the close connection between the two parts of the law appears in the similarity of statement concerning its abrogation by the revelation of grace in Christ both in Hebrews and in St. Paul's Epistles; see Heb. vii. 5, 12, *μετατιθεμένης γὰρ τῆς ἱερωσύνης ἐξ ἀνάγκης καὶ νόμου μεταθεσις γίνεται*; x. 1, *σκιὰν γὰρ ἔχων ὁ νόμος τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν*; vii. 19, *οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐτελείωσεν ὁ νόμος*. With these compare Rom. x. 4, *τέλος γὰρ νόμου Χριστός*; Eph. ii. 15, *ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ τὸν νόμον τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασι καταργήσας*. (It is in keeping with this that the operation of divine grace is called in Hebrews *καθαρίζειν*, and by St. Paul *δικαιοῦν*.) As to the relation of the law to the plan of salvation, cf. Heb. x. 3, *ἐν αὐταῖς ἀνάμνησις ἁμαρτιῶν*, x. 1, *σκιὰν γὰρ ἔχων κ.τ.λ.*, with St. Paul's declarations, Gal. iii. 21, 24, *ὁ νόμος παιδαγωγὸς ἡμῶν γέγονεν εἰς Χριστὸν, ἵνα ἐκ πίστεως δικαιωθῶμεν*; ver. 23, *ὑπὸ νόμον ἐφρουρούμεθα συγκεκλεισμένοι εἰς τὴν μέλλουσαν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι πίστιν*. St. Paul, too, contemplates the law as a preparation for grace; but he has in his mind what the law *demand*s as preparative to the gift and reception of salvation, whereas the Epistle to the Hebrews contemplates what the law *gives* or provides. Though in St. Paul's view the law is not contradictory or opposed to the promises of grace (Gal. iii. 21, *ὁ οὖν νόμος κατὰ τῶν ἐπαγγελιῶν τοῦ θεοῦ*; *μὴ γένοιτο*!), still he always denies to it any causative relation direct or indirect to the accomplishment of salvation or the blessings of grace; Rom. iii. 21, *χωρὶς νόμου δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ πεφανέρωται*; cf. vv. 27, 28; iv. 13, *οὐ γὰρ διὰ νόμου ἡ ἐπαγγελία*; viii. 3, 4, ix. 31, x. 5; Gal. ii. 21, iii. 18; Phil. iii. 9. Considering the bearing of the law upon sin, it must rather lead to the opposite of salvation, Gal. iii. 13, *Χριστὸς ἡμᾶς ἐξηγόρασεν*

ἐκ τῆς κατάρας τοῦ νόμου; ver. 10, ὅσοι ἐξ ἔργων νόμου εἰσὶν, ὑπὸ κατάραν εἰσὶν; Rom. vii. 13, τὸ οὖν ἀγαθὸν ἐμοὶ γέγονεν θάνατος. Nay more, it may be said to bear a causative relation to sin, Rom. vii. 8, χωρὶς γὰρ νόμον ἁμαρτία νεκρά, cf. ver. 9. Ver. 5, τὰ παθήματα τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν τὰ διὰ τοῦ νόμου; v. 20; 1 Cor. xv. 56, ἡ δύναμις τῆς ἁμαρτίας ὁ νόμος, though we cannot say, ὁ νόμος ἁμαρτία, Rom. vii. 7, cf. vv. 12, 14, 16. By the revelation and gift of grace, man's relation to the law as a criminal is done away. Rom. vii. 6, καταργήθημεν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου; ver. 4, ἐθανατώθητε τῷ νόμῳ διὰ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ (cf. vv. 2, 3); Gal. iv. 5. Cf. Gal. ii. 19, διὰ νόμον νόμῳ ἀπέθανον . . . Χριστῷ συνεσταυρώμαι. See also the antithesis, ὑπὸ νόμον . . . ὑπὸ χάριν, Rom. vi. 14, 15 (Gal. iv. 21, v. 18).

As to the combinations in which νόμος appears, we may mention νόμος ἔργων, Rom. iii. 27, cf. ἔργα νόμου, iii. 20, 28, ix. 32; Gal. ii. 16, iii. 2, 5, 10; νόμος δικαιοσύνης, Rom. ix. 31; νόμον πράσσειν, ii. 25; τελεῖν, ii. 27; πληροῦν, xiii. 8; Gal. v. 14; φυλάσσειν, vi. 13; τὸν νόμον ποιεῖν, v. 3; John vii. 19, cf. ποιητῆς τοῦ νόμου, Rom. ii. 13; ἀκροατῆς τοῦ ν., corresponding with ὑπὸ νόμον εἶναι, vi. 14, 15; 1 Cor. ix. 20; Gal. iv. 4, 5, v. 18; ἐξ ἔργων νόμου εἶναι, iii. 10, Rom. iv. 14; τὸν νόμον γινώσκειν, vii. 1, cf. John vii. 49; νόμον καταργεῖν, ἰστάναι, Rom. iii. 31. Comp. ἐν νόμῳ ἁμαρτάνειν, Rom. ii. 12, with ἐν νόμῳ δικαιοῦσθαι, Gal. iii. 11, v. 4.—Also 1 Cor. ix. 8; Gal. iii. 17, v. 23.—In the Epistle of James, ὁ νόμος and νόμος, in like manner, denote the law given by God to Israel, ii. 9, 10, 11, iv. 11, the πλήρωμα of which (Rom. xiii. 10; Lev. xix. 18), ii. 8, is called νόμος βασιλικός as its most glorious and chief precept, *love, ceterarum legum quasi regina* (Knapp). Over against it stands the νόμος ἐλευθερίας, ii. 12, i. 25, νόμος τέλειος ὁ τῆς ἐλευθερίας, evidently with reference to the Pauline phraseology, as Rom. vii. 3, ἐλευθέρα ἐστὶν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου, cf. Gal. ii. 4, v. 1, 13. See ἐλευθερία. (As St. James by this expression recognises the truth of St. Paul's representation, it is clear that in ii. 14 sqq. he does not oppose the Pauline doctrine of justification, but an abuse of it; see under ἔργον.) What St. James calls νόμος ἐλευθερίας is with St. Paul the νόμος Χριστοῦ, Gal. vi. 2.

Lastly, (III.) ὁ νόμος signifies the law in its written form, תּוֹרָה, or more fully סֵפֶר תּוֹרָה, Josh. viii. 31, etc.; סֵפֶר תּוֹרָה יהוה, 2 Chron. xvii. 9; סֵפֶר תּוֹרָה אֱלֹהִים, Deut. xxviii. 61. So Matt. xii. 5; Luke x. 26; John x. 34; 1 Cor. ix. 8. Yet it does not always mean the Pentateuch alone (see John xii. 34, xv. 25), as also תּוֹרָה does not stand for law only, but for the divine revelation which determined the life of the people generally, see e.g. Isa. i. 10, ii. 3, viii. 16, and elsewhere; so that God's revelation as a whole may be called the νόμος of Israel, especially as in its fixed and written form it claims a normative character. Elsewhere God's written and fixed revelation as a whole is designated ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται, Matt. v. 17, vii. 12, xi. 13, xxii. 40; Luke xvi. 16; Acts xiii. 15, xxiv. 14, xxviii. 23; Rom. iii. 21; καὶ οἱ ψαλμοί, Luke xxiv. 44.

Ἄνομος, ον, (I.) without law, lawless, e.g. Plato, *Polit.* 302 E, ἄνομος μοναρχία—

legibus carens. Thus, in contrast with ὑπὸ νόμον, 1 Cor. ix. 21, and with reference to νόμος in its scriptural sense as the expression of God's will and claims, τοῖς ἀνόμοις ἐγενόμην ὡς ἄνομος, μὴ ὦν ἄνομος θεοῦ, ἀλλ' ἔννομος Χριστοῦ. Its primary reference is to the divine order historically revealed in the O. T., of which the heathen were destitute, cf. Esth. iv. *add.*, ἐμίσησα δόξαν ἀνόμων καὶ βδελύσσομαι κοίτην ἀπεριτμήτων καὶ πάντος ἀλλοτρίου; Rom. ii. 12, ὅσοι γὰρ ἀνόμως ἤμαρτον, ἀνόμως καὶ ἀπολούνται. But in the latter passage, μὴ ὦν ἄνομος θεοῦ, νόμος denotes the divine order generally, cf. Rom. iii. 31, νόμον οὖν καταργοῦμεν διὰ τῆς πίστεως; μὴ γένοιτο, ἀλλὰ νόμον ἰστώμεν, with viii. 3, 4. So of the heathen, Acts ii. 23, διὰ χειρὸς ἀνόμων προσπήξαντες.—(II.) What is not in harmony with the law, what contradicts the law, a negative form for the thought expressed positively by παράνομος. Generally in biblical Greek it is used substantively; as an adj. it occurs in the N. T. only in 2 Pet. ii. 8; Xen. *Mem.* iv. 4. 13, νόμοι πόλεως . . . ὧς οἱ πολῖται συνθέμενοι ἃ τε δεῖ πράττειν καὶ ὧν ἀπέχεσθαι ἐγράψαντο. Νόμιμος . . . ὁ κατὰ ταῦτα πολιτευόμενος, ἄνομος δὲ ὁ ταῦτα παραβαίνων. Synonyms, ἄδικος, ἀσεβής, ἀνόσιος. Ἄδικος is predicated of the ἄνομος; ἀνόσιος is the strongest term, denoting presumptuous and wicked self-assertion. Xen. *Rep. Laced.* viii. 5, οὐ μόνον ἄνομον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀνόσιον θεῖς τὸ πυθοχρήστοις νόμοις μὴ πείθεσθαι. In biblical Greek, ἄνομος, ἀνομία are predicated of the sinner, in order to describe his sin as opposition to or contempt of the will of God; cf. the designation of the Antichrist as ὁ ἄνομος κατ' ἐξ., who is the incarnation of the utter renunciation of God's will, 2 Thess. ii. 8, with vv. 3, 4. The term often occurs in the LXX., but not as answering to any one Hebrew word. The participle of נָשָׂא is rendered ἄνομος, παράνομος, ἀσεβής. Cf. Ps. li. 15; Isa. i. 28, liii. 12 (Mark xv. 28; Luke xxii. 37).—נָשָׂא, Ps. civ. 36; 1 Sam. xxiv. 14; 1 Kings viii. 3; Hab. iii. 12.—נָשָׂא, Isa. xxix. 20, ἐξέλιπεν ἄνομος καὶ ἀπώλετο ὑπερήφανος καὶ ἐξωλοθρεύθησαν οἱ ἀνομοῦντες ἐπὶ κακία.—נָשָׂא, Isa. ix. 17, x. 6.—In the N. T. it occurs in 1 Tim. i. 9 still in the same sense.—The positive παράνομος, παρανομεῖν, παρανομία, which more frequently occurs in profane Greek, is but rarely used in O. T. Greek, and answers to no one particular Hebrew word. *Vid.* ἁμαρτάνω. In the N. T. we have only παρανομία in 2 Pet. ii. 16, and παρανομεῖν in Acts xxiii. 3.

Ἀνομία, ἡ, lawlessness, contempt of law. Positively, παράβασις. Plato, *Rep.* ix. 575 A, ἐν πάσῃ ἀναρχίᾳ καὶ ἀνομίᾳ ζῶν, opposed to δικαιοσύνη, Xen. *Mem.* i. 2. 24; ἄνθρωποι ἀνομία μᾶλλον ἢ δικαιοσύνη χρώμενοι. So also Matt. xxiii. 28; Rom. vi. 19; 2 Cor. vi. 14, τίς γὰρ μετοχὴ δικαιοσύνης καὶ ἀνομίας; Heb. i. 9. It answers not only to the general terms for sin, חָטָא, חַטְוֹת, עָוֶן, but also to other more special expressions, such as חַטְוֹת, Ps. lv. 10, εἶδον ἀνομίαν καὶ ἀντιλογίαν ἐν τῇ πόλει; Isa. liii. 9, ἀνομία . . . δόλος; Ezek. vii. 23; חָטָא, Ps. xxxvii. 1, lxxxix. 23; עָוֶן, Ps. v. 4, xlv. 9; Ezek. iii. 19; חָטָא, Ps. vii. 15.—It often seems to be parallel with ἁμαρτία. It denotes sin in its relation to God's will and law, like παράβασις, that which makes it guilt, cf. Rom. vii. 13, ἵνα γένηται καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ἁμαρτωλὸς ἢ ἁμαρτία διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς; v. 13, ἄχρι γὰρ νόμου

ἁμαρτία ἦν ἐν κόσμῳ, ἁμαρτία δὲ οὐκ ἐλλογεῖται μὴ ὄντος νόμου. Sin can be imputed, because it is ἀνομία. Hence 1 John iii. 4, πᾶς ὁ ποιῶν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, καὶ τὴν ἀνομίαν ποιεῖ, καὶ ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐστὶν ἡ ἀνομία. Cf. 1 John ii. 3, iii. 22, v. 2, 3; Ezek. xlii. 20, τὰ ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀνομίας = חַטָּאת, *guilt-offering*. Heb. viii. 12, x. 17; Tit. ii. 14; Rom. iv. 7; Matt. vii. 23, xiii. 41.—Now, as נְתִיבָה may denote God's revelation of His will as a whole for the guidance of the people (*vid.* νόμος), so ἀνομία sometimes signifies absolute estrangement therefrom; hence 2 Thess. ii. 7, τὸ μυστήριον τῆς ἀνομίας; Matt. xxiv. 12.

Ἐννομος, *ον*, strictly, what is within the range of law, then, based upon law, and governed or determined by the law; opposed to παράνομος. Aesch. *Suppl.* 379, δίκας οὐ τυγχάνουσιν ἐννόμου; Polyb. ii. 47. 3, τὴν ἐννόμον βασιλείαν εἰς τυραννίδα μεταστήσαι, cf. Xen. *Mem.* i. 2. 44. In the N. T. Acts xix. 39, ἐν τῇ ἐννόμῳ ἐκκλησίᾳ, *vid.* ἐκκλ.; 1 Cor. ix. 21, μὴ ὡς ἄνομος θεοῦ, ἀλλ' ἐννομος Χριστοῦ, cf. Gal. vi. 2; 1 Cor. iii. 23. Rarely in classical Greek of persons = just, true to law, *e.g.* Plat. *Rep.* iv. 424 E, ἐννομοὶ καὶ σπουδαῖοι ἄνδρες; Ecclus. Prol., ἡ ἐννομος βιωσις.

Νοῦς, *ός*, usually in the 2d declension, but in the N. T. and in later, especially patristic Greek, the gen. and dat. are of the 3d decl. νοός, νοί; the acc. νόα is not found in N. T. Greek, but in its stead νοῦν. The word belongs to the same root as γιγνώσκω, Latin *nosco*, and signifies (I.) the organ of mental perception and apprehension, the organ of conscious life; cf. Plut. *Mor.* 961 A, ἥ καὶ λέλεκται νοῦς ὁρῇ καὶ νοῦς ἀκούει, τᾶλλα κωφὰ καὶ τυφλά, ὡς τοῦ περὶ τὰ ὄμματα καὶ ὤτα πάθους, ἂν μὴ παρῇ τὸ φρονεῖν, αἰσθησιν οὐ ποιοῦντος. Hence νοῦς and ψυχὴ are often identified by the philosophers, cf. Aristot. *de Anima*, i. 2, who is inclined to make a distinction, and to describe νοῦς as δύναμις τις περὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν. The νοῦς is the organ of the consciousness preceding actions, or recognising and judging them; cf. especially the frequent ἐν νῷ ἔχειν τι; it is (a.) generally, the organ of thinking and knowledge—the understanding; or (b.) specially, the organ of moral thinking or contemplation, Soph. *Oed. R.* 600, οὐκ ἂν γένοιτο νοῦς κακὸς καλῶς φρονῶν; Hom. *Il.* ix. 554, χόλος νόον οἰδάνει (Luther, *Gemüth*). Hence (II.) νοῦς means thinking, or moral thinking and knowing, understanding—sense; thus, *e.g.*, νοῦν ἔχειν, to possess understanding, to be clever, Hom. *Od.* i. 3, πολλῶν δ' ἀνθρώπων ἶδεν ἄστεα καὶ νόον ἔγνω. Specially it means consideration, purpose, intention, decision, according to the connection in which it is used; and Homer joins βουλή, μῆτις, θυμός with it as synonyms. But with these significations we find it used almost exclusively in Homer.

The LXX. use the word so rarely, that no special range of meaning can be shown for it in their usage. They put it for נָחַם, Ex. vii. 23, οὐκ ἐπέστησε τὸν νοῦν αὐτοῦ οὐδὲ ἐπὶ τούτῳ; Isa. x. 7, ἀπαλλάξει ὁ νοῦς αὐτοῦ (Hebrew, נִבְּחַם יְהוָה, *it is in his mind to destroy*, preceded by וְיִשְׁחָדֵם, τῇ ψυχῇ οὐχ οὕτως λελόγισται); Job vii. 17, προσέχεις τὸν νοῦν εἰς τὸν ἄνθρωπον; Josh. xiv. 7, ἀπεκρίβην αὐτῷ λόγον κατὰ τὸν νοῦν αὐτοῦ—a misunderstanding of the Hebrew וְיִשְׁחָדֵם עַם יִשְׂרָאֵל דָּבָר; Luther, "and I brought him word again according to my conscience." It stands for נָחַם in Isa. xl. 13, τίς ἔγνω νοῦν κυρίου,

ἡγ' ἡγ' In other like places we have simply καρδιά, πνεῦμα (cf. 2^h = διάνοια). In the Apocrypha also νοῦς occurs but seldom, and without accurately defined meaning; Wisd. iv. 12, ῥεμβασμὸς ἐπιθυμίας μεταλλεῖ νοῦν ἄκακον, cf. Rom. xvi. 18, τὰς καρδίας τῶν ἀκάκων; Judith viii. 14, πῶς τὸν νοῦν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπιγνώσεσθε καὶ τὸν λογισμὸν αὐτοῦ κατανοήσετε. Parallel with βάθος καρδίας ἀνθρώπου οὐχ εὐρήσετε, καὶ λόγους τῆς διανοίας αὐτοῦ οὐ λήψετε; 2 Macc. xv. 8, ἔχοντας δὲ κατὰ νοῦν τὰ προγεγονότα αὐτοῖς ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ βοηθήματα. Wisd. ix. 15 goes quite beyond the range of biblical views and Scripture language, φθαρτὸν γὰρ σῶμα βαρύνει ψυχὴν καὶ βρίθει τὸ γεῶδες σκῆνος νοῦν πολυφροντίδα.

In the N. T., on the contrary, where the word occurs (besides Luke xxiv. 45, Rev. xiii. 18, xvii. 9) only in St. Paul's Epistles, a clear and developed meaning can be exhibited. Here νοῦς is the reflective consciousness (1 Cor. xiv. 14, 15, 19), as distinct from the impulse of the spirit arising without any act of consciousness, and manifest, for instance, in speaking with tongues. Ver. 14, ἐὰν γὰρ προσεύχωμαι γλώσση, τὸ πνεῦμά μου προσεύχεται, ὁ δὲ νοῦς ἄκαρπός ἐστιν (does and effects nothing); ver. 19, ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ θέλω πέντε λόγους διὰ τοῦ νοός μου λαλῆσαι, ἵνα καὶ ἄλλους κατηχήσω, ἡ μυρίους λόγους ἐν γλώσσῃ; Phil. iv. 7, ἡ εἰρήνη τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ ὑπερέχουσα πάντα νοῦν φρουρήσει τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν καὶ τὰ νοήματα ὑμῶν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. Νοῦς as such is not so much the ability to think and to reflect, it is the organ of moral thinking and knowing, the intellectual organ of moral sentiment; Rom. vii. 25, τῷ μὲν νοτ̄ δουλεύω νόμῳ θεοῦ, τῇ δὲ σαρκί, νόμῳ ἁμαρτίας; ver. 23, βλέπω δὲ ἕτερον νόμον ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν μου ἀντιστρατευόμενον τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ νοός μου, the organ of the spirit, and parallel with συνειδήσις in Tit. i. 15, μεμλάνται αὐτῶν καὶ ὁ νοῦς καὶ ἡ συνειδήσις; cf. Rom. vii. 25, τῷ μὲν νοτ̄ δουλεύω νόμῳ θεοῦ, with Rom. i. 9, τῷ θεῷ λατρεύω ἐν τῷ πνεύματι μου, and 2 Tim. i. 3, ᾧ λατρεύω ἐν καθαρᾷ συνειδήσει. Hence Eph. iv. 23, ἀνανεοῦσθαι τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ νοός ὑμῶν (see πνεῦμα, and the relation there described between the Spirit of God and the human πνεῦμα). It is represented as the organ of moral thought, knowledge, and judgment, in fact, as moral consciousness, in Rom. xiv. 5, ὃς μὲν κρίνει ἡμέραν παρ' ἡμέραν, ὃς δὲ κρίνει πᾶσαν ἡμέραν ἕκαστος ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ νοτ̄ πληροφορεῖσθω; xii. 2, μεταμορφοῦσθε τῇ ἀνακαινώσει τοῦ νοός, εἰς τὸ δοκιμάζειν ὑμᾶς τί τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ. As it represents the moral action of the spirit, it is also used for the perversion of this caused by the influence of the σὰρξ; hence Col. ii. 18, φυσιούμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ νοός τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ, and thus accordingly we must understand the word in Rom. i. 28, καθὼς οὐκ ἐδοκίμασαν τὸν θεὸν ἔχειν ἐν ἐπιγνώσει, παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς εἰς ἀδόκιμον νοῦν, ποιεῖν τὰ μὴ καθήκοντα; Eph. iv. 17, τὰ ἔθνη περιπατεῖ ἐν ματαιότητι τοῦ νοός αὐτῶν, ἐσκοτισμένοι τῇ διανοίᾳ ὄντες; 1 Tim. vi. 5, διαπατριῆσαι διεφθαρμένων ἀνθρώπων τὸν νοῦν καὶ ἀπεστερημένων τῆς ἀληθείας; cf. Plat. Legg. x. 888 A, τοῖς οὕτω τὴν διάνοιαν διεφθαρμένοις; 2 Tim. iii. 8, ἀνίστανται τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, ἀνθρωποι κατεφθαρμένοι τὸν νοῦν. — It also denotes consciousness not as a power, but as a habit of mind or opinion, 1 Cor. i. 10, κατηρτισμένοι ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ νοτ̄ καὶ ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ γνώμῃ; ii. 16, τίς γὰρ ἔγνω νοῦν κυρίου; . . . ἡμεῖς δὲ νοῦν Χριστοῦ ἔχομεν. Cf. Rom. xi. 34; Isa. xl. 13. — 2 Thess. ii. 2, εἰς τὸ μὴ ταχέως σαλευθῆναι

ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ νοὸς μηδὲ θροεῖσθαι, is difficult to explain. De Wette's interpretation of νοῦς here, "your conscious self-possession or composure of mind," would be a very happy one if a precedent for it could be found. But νοῦς can hardly be taken to denote clear consciousness as distinct from perplexity or confusion, nor can 1 Cor. xiv. 14 be cited in support of this meaning. Νοῦς seems to be used with the admissible meaning reflection, deliberation, in adverbial combinations only, such as νόφ, σὺν νόφ, etc. It denotes the faculty of the understanding in Luke xxiv. 45, διήνοιξεν αὐτῶν τὸν νοῦν τοῦ συνιέναι τὰς γραφάς. The understanding, Rev. xiii. 18, xvii. 9. Concerning its relation to the heart, see νοεῖν and νόημα.

Νοέω, to perceive, to observe, is the mental correlative of sensational perception, the conscious action of thought, or of thought coming into consciousness; *vid.* νοῦς. Homer well distinguishes between merely sensational perception (ἰδεῖν, ἀθρεῖν) and νοεῖν accompanied with an act of the understanding, and following the ἰδεῖν; τὸν δὲ ἰδὼν ἐνόησεν, *Il.* xi. 559; οὐκ ἴδεν οὐδ' ἐνόησεν. LXX. = 𐤇𐤁, Hiphil and Hithpael, 2 Sam. xii. 19; Prov. i. 2, 6, xxiii. 1. 𐤇𐤁𐤇, Hiphil, Prov. i. 3, xvi. 23; Isa. xlv. 18, and elsewhere, but not frequently, and not in the N. T. — (I.) To perceive, to observe, as distinct from mere sensation or feeling; Prov. xxiii. 1, νοητῶς νοεῖ τὰ παρατιθέμενά σοι. — (II.) To mark, to understand, apprehend, discern, synonymous with συνιέναι, Mark vii. 18; 2 Tim. ii. 7; Mark viii. 17. It may be distinguished from its synonym γινώσκειν (Plato, *Rep.* vi. 508 D, ἐνόησέ τε καὶ ἔγνω αὐτό), in that it signifies rather the relation to the object known, whereas γινώσκειν, answering to the iterative form, signifies the act of knowing; 2 Sam. xii. 19, ἐνόησε Δαυὶδ ὅτι τέθνηκε τὸ παιδάριον; Eph. iii. 4, νοῆσαι τὴν σύνεσίν μου; 2 Tim. ii. 7, νόει δ' λέγω; Eph. iii. 20, τῷ δυναμένῳ ὑπὲρ πάντα ποιῆσαι ὑπὲρ ἐκ περισσοῦ ὧν αἰτούμεθα ἢ νοοῦμεν; Matt. xv. 17, xvi. 9, 11; Mark vii. 18; 1 Tim. i. 7. With Rom. i. 20, τὰ ἀόρατα τοῦ θεοῦ ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου τοῖς ποιήμασιν νοούμενα καθορᾶται, cf. Wisd. xiii. 4, νοησάτωσαν ἀπ' αὐτῶν πόσῳ ὁ κατασκευάσας αὐτὰ δυνατότερός ἐστιν; Ecclus. xxxiv. 15, νόει τὰ τοῦ πλησίον ἐκ σεαυτοῦ; Heb. xi. 3, πλῆσται νοοῦμεν κατηρτίσθαι τοὺς αἰῶνας ῥήματι θεοῦ. — Without object, Matt. xxiv. 15; Mark xiii. 14, ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοεῖτω; Mark viii. 17. — In John xii. 40, ἵνα μὴ ἴδωσιν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς καὶ νοήσωσι τῇ καρδίᾳ (Isa. xlv. 18, ἀπημάρωθησαν τοῦ βλέπειν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς αὐτῶν καὶ τοῦ νοῆσαι τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῶν), it denotes independently the action of the νοῦς or καρδιά = to understand, to think, to reflect, as in Homer, νοεῖν φρεσί, *Od.* i. 322, and the like, and hence the participle νοῶν, νοήσας, *thoughtful, discerning*. It is peculiar to Scripture to refer the activity denoted by νοεῖν to the heart, John xii. 40; Isa. xlv. 18 (ver. 19, οὐκ ἐλογίσατο τῇ ψυχῇ αὐτοῦ, Hebrew 𐤇𐤁); 1 Sam. iv. 20, οὐκ ἐνόησεν ἡ καρδιά αὐτῆς = 𐤇𐤁 𐤇𐤁𐤇𐤁; Prov. xvi. 23, καρδιά σοφοῦ νοήσει τὰ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἰδίου στόματος. As the νοῦς is the organ of the spirit, it is at the same time a function of the heart; *vid.* καρδιά, and the relation there described between the spirit and the heart. It thus appears that the personal life of the man is concerned

in the νοεῖν; that it is therefore of a moral character, *vid.* νοῦς, μετανοεῖν. Comp. Heb. iv. 12, κριτικὸς ἐνθυμήσεων καὶ ἐννοιῶν καρδίας.

Νόημα, τό, the product of the action of the νοῦς (or of the καρδιά, see νοεῖν, cf. Phil. iv. 7, φρουρήσει τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν καὶ τὰ νοήματα ὑμῶν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ).—(I.) Thought, thinking, specially, *morally reflecting thought*, 2 Cor. iii. 14, ἐπωρώθη τὰ νοήματα αὐτῶν, iv. 4, ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου ἐτύφλωσε τὰ νοήματα τῶν ἀπίστων, xi. 3, μήπως . . . φθαρῇ τὰ νοήματα ὑμῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀπλότητος τῆς εἰς τὸν Χριστόν. The places cited in proof of the rendering *faculty of thinking*, or the *understanding*, may with equal propriety be referred to the meaning *thought* or *reflection*, e.g. Hom. Od. xviii. 215, οὐκέτι τοι φρένες ἔμπεδοι οὐδὲ νόημα. In Plat. Conv. 197 E, ἦν (sc. φῶδην) ἄδει (sc. ἔρωσ) θέλων πάντων θεῶν τε καὶ ἀνθρώπων νόημα, it is = *sense, opinion*, *vid.* (II.). Hence also in 2 Cor. x. 5, αἰχμαλωτίζοντες πᾶν νόημα εἰς τὴν ὑπακοὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ, it is not = *understanding* or *reason*, but as in 2 Cor. iii. 14, xi. 3, the singular denoting collectively what is there expressed by the plural.—(II.) Thought, purpose, opinion, way of thinking, as in Hom., Hes., Pind.; 2 Cor. ii. 11, οὐ γὰρ αὐτοῦ τὰ νοήματα ἀγνοοῦμεν; Bar. ii. 8, ἀποστρέψαι ἕκαστον ἀπὸ τῶν νοημάτων τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν τῆς πονηρᾶς; 3 Macc. v. 30; Phil. iv. 7.

Ἀνόητος, ον, (I.) passive, unthought of, inconceivable.—(II.) Usually active, one who does not think or reflect, slow of apprehension; Luke xxiv. 25, ἀνόητοι καὶ βραδεῖς τῇ καρδίᾳ. Gal. iii. 1, 3, those whose powers of thought are still undeveloped, cf. Plat. Gorg. 464 D, ἐν ἀνδράσιν οὕτως ἀνοήτους ὥσπερ οἱ παῖδες. So in Rom. i. 14, σοφοῖς τε καὶ ἀνοήτοις ὀφειλέτης εἰμὶ. Frequently it denotes a moral reproach (Luke xxiv. 25; Gal. iii. 1–3), especially in contrast with σώφρων, one who does not govern his lusts; thus Tit. iii. 3, ἡμεν γάρ ποτε καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀνόητοι, ἀπειθεῖς, πλανώμενοι, δουλεύοντες ἐπιθυμίαις; Plut. Mor. 22 C, τοῖς ἄφροσι καὶ ἀνοήτοις, οὓς δειλαίους καὶ οἰκτροὺς διὰ μοχθηρίαν ὄντας; 1063 A. Cf. Prov. xv. 21, xix. 1, see νοῦς. It is joined with substantives denoting things, such as γνώμη, δόξα, ἐλπίς, and occurs in a moral sense, τὰ ἀνόητα = ἀφροδίσια, Ar. Nuḗb. 416, οἶνον τ' ἀπέχει καὶ γυμνασίων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀνοήτων. So in 1 Tim. vi. 9, ἐπιθυμίαι πολλὰ ἀνόητοι. Cf. ἄνοια, 2 Tim. iii. 9, Luke vi. 2.

Διάνοια, ἡ, strictly a thinking over, meditation, reflecting (διανοεῖσθαι, to muse, think upon, reflect), is used in the same range, and with the same signification as the original νοῦς, and much oftener, save that the preposition gives emphasis to the act of reflection; and in keeping with the structure of the word, the meaning *activity of thinking* precedes the borrowed meaning *faculty of thought*. (It does not occur in Homer.) Like νοῦς, it denotes (I.) the *faculty of knowing*, the *understanding*, e.g. in Xen. Mem. iii. 12. 6, καὶ λήθη δὲ καὶ ἀθυμία καὶ δυσκολία καὶ μανία πολλάκις πολλοῖς διὰ τὴν τοῦ σώματος καχεξίαν εἰς τὴν διάνοιαν ἐμπίπτουσιν, cf. Ex. xxxv. 9, σοφὸς τῇ διανοίᾳ. In Plato, often like νοῦς for the soul, in contrast with σῶμα. Διάνοια is also the *organ of moral thought and reflection*, Plat. Phaedr. 256 C, ἅτε οὐ πάσῃ δεδογμένα τῇ διανοίᾳ πράττοντες.

Accordingly (II.) thinking, reflection, meditation (considering the structure of the word, the primary meaning), Plat. *Soph.* 263 E, ὁ ἐντὸς τῆς ψυχῆς πρὸς αὐτὴν διάλογος ἄνευ φωνῆς γεγόμενος τοῦτ' αὐτὸ ἡμῖν ἐπωνομάσθη διάνοια. Disposition, opinion, sentiment, thought, in Herodotus, Isocrates, Thucydides, and others.

As it is used much more frequently than νοῦς, we see how it happens that νοῦς occurs so seldom in the LXX. and διάνοια so often, and, indeed, as = לב, לבב, when a reflective exercise of the heart is meant or a conscious act is spoken of (Lev. xix. 17); though, of course, there is a rule guiding this transference of the word, *vid.* καρδία. Again, it is = לבב, Jer. xxxi. 33 (Heb. viii. 10, x. 16); לבב, Isa. lv. 9, cf. 1 Chron. xxix. 18, φύλαξον ταῦτα ἐν διανοίᾳ καρδίας λαοῦ σου εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, καὶ κατεύθυνον τὰς καρδίας αὐτῶν πρὸς σέ = תפוצ לבב לביביתך תפוצ. In the N. T. διαν. denotes (a.) the faculty of knowing, 1 John v. 20, δέδωκεν ἡμῖν διάνοιαν ἵνα γινώσκωμεν τὸν ἀληθινόν, cf. 1 Cor. ii. 16, τίς γὰρ ἔγνω νοῦν κυρίου . . . ; ἡμεῖς δὲ νοῦν Χριστοῦ ἔχομεν. Here it is not the natural faculty, but the faculty renewed and sanctified by the Holy Ghost, see 1 Cor. ii. 10–16; 2 Cor. iv. 6. Cf. Eph. i. 17, 18, ἵνα ὁ θεὸς . . . δώῃ ὑμῖν πνεῦμα σοφίας καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως ἐν ἐπιγνώσει αὐτοῦ, πεφωτισμένους τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τῆς διανοίας ὑμῶν, εἰς τὸ εἰδέναι κ.τ.λ., where τῆς διανοίας is not an unscriptural alteration (Harless) for the established reading τῆς καρδίας, but a mode of expression quite in keeping with the usage of the LXX.; cf. Eph. iv. 18. Διάνοια is specially the faculty of moral reflection, of moral understanding, or, like νοῦς, consciousness called into exercise by the moral affections (Luther, Gemüth), consciousness as the organ of the moral impulse; e.g. 1 Pet. i. 13, ἀναζωσάμενοι τὰς ὁσφύας τῆς διανοίας ὑμῶν; Heb. viii. 10, διδοὺς νόμους μου εἰς τὴν διανοίαν αὐτῶν, x. 16 (Jer. xxxi. 33); Matt. xxii. 37, ἀγαπήσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ καρδίᾳ σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ ψυχῇ σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ διανοίᾳ σου,—an addition to the original text, as is evident by comparing Mark xii. 30 and Luke x. 27 with Deut. vi. 5. This consciousness, too, as the perversion of this moral impulse, is expressed by διάνοια as well as by νοῦς, e.g. Eph. iv. 18, τὰ ἔθνη περιπατεῖ ἐν ματαιότητι τοῦ νοῦς αὐτῶν, ἐσκοτισμένοι τῇ διανοίᾳ ὄντες; hence Eph. ii. 3, ποιοῦντες τὰ θελήματα τῆς σαρκὸς καὶ τῶν διανοιῶν (= thoughts). Cf. Luke x. 27.—(b.) Sentiment, disposition, by itself, thought;—διάν. in its meaning under (a.) is a function of the heart, but here it is the product of the heart, Luke i. 51, ὑπερηφάνους διανοίᾳ καρδίας αὐτῶν; 2 Pet. iii. 1, διεγείρω ὑμῶν . . . τὴν ἐλκρινὴ διάνοιαν; Col. i. 21, ἐχθροὺς τῇ διανοίᾳ ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις τοῖς πονηροῖς.

Ἔννοια, ἡ, what lies in thought, pondering; then insight, understanding; ἐννοεῖν, to have in thought, to consider,—to understand, to recognise, a synonym with ἐνθυμεῖσθαι, Xen. *Cyr.* iv. 2. 3, ἐννοηθέντες δὲ, οἶά τε πάσχουσιν ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀσσυρίων . . . ταῦτα ἐνθυμουμένοις ἔδοξεν αὐτοῖς νῦν καλὸν εἶναι ἀποστήναι; An. ii. 4. 5, ἐγὼ ἐνθυμοῦμαι μὲν καὶ ταῦτα πάντα ἐννοῶ δ' ὅτι, εἰ νῦν ἄπιμεν, δόξομεν ἐπὶ πολέμῳ ἀπιέναι καὶ παρὰ τὰς σπονδὰς ποιεῖν; Mem. i. 7. 2, 3. Ἐνθυμεῖσθαι is = to weigh; ἐννοεῖν is = to consider, the conscious perception which decides the understanding. The signification of ἔννοια as

= *what lies in thought, thought*, divides itself especially into the two meanings—(I.) *thought, opinion, view, sentiment*; and (II.) *knowledge, understanding*. For the first, compare Xen. *Cyr.* i. 1. 1, ἔννοια ποθ' ἡμῖν ἐγένετο, *the thought occurred to us, the consideration*; Diod. Sic. xiv. 56, τὰς αὐτὰς ἐννοίας ἔχει περὶ τοῦ πολέμου; *Id.* ii. 30, ἐρμηνεύοντες τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τὴν τῶν θεῶν ἔννοιαν (*al. εὐνοϊαν*); Eurip. *Hel.* 1026; Isocrates, v. 150, τοιαύτην ἔννοιαν ἐμποιεῖν τινί. So in the N. T. 1 Pet. iv. 1, τὴν αὐτὴν ἔννοιαν ὀπλίσασθε; Heb. iv. 12, κριτικὸς ἐνθυμήσεων καὶ ἐννοιῶν καρδίας, a combination with which we may perhaps compare πάθη ἐπιθυμίας, πάθη answering to ἐνθυμήσεων, and ἐπιθυμίας to ἐννοιῶν. Delitzsch says, "ἐνθυμήσεις are the emotions, the notions or imaginations, arising in the heart (cf. Acts xvii. 29; Matt. ix. 4, xii. 25); ἔννοιαι are the trains of thought spinning themselves out in the self-conscious life." — In this ethical sense the word occurs in the LXX. perhaps only in Prov. xxiii. 19 in the plural, ἄκουε υἱέ, καὶ σοφὸς γίνου, καὶ κατεύθυνε ἐννοίας σῆς καρδίας. On the contrary, not in the singular, as in 1 Pet. iv. 1. Compare Wisd. ii. 14, ἐγένετο ἡμῖν εἰς ἔλεγχον ἐννοιῶν ὑμῶν. The explanation of Hesychius, ἔννοια βούλη, which is perhaps based upon Prov. iii. 20, τήρησον δὲ ἐμὴν βούλην καὶ ἔννοιαν, is invalidated by a comparison with Prov. i. 4, ἵνα δῶ . . . παιδὶ νέῳ αἰσθησιν τε καὶ ἔννοιαν = *insight, knowledge*, cf. v. 1, 2. Ἔννοια is = נִיב, נִיח, נִיח, נִיח. In Aristotle = *knowledge, understanding, representation*; Eth. Nicom. ix. 11, ἡ παρουσία τῶν φίλων ἡδεῖα οὖσα καὶ ἡ ἔννοια τοῦ συναλγεῖν ἐλάττω τὴν λύπην ποιεῖ, *communicatio doloris cogitatio*; x. 10, πάθει γὰρ ζῶντες . . . τοῦ καλοῦ καὶ ὡς ἀληθῶς ἡδέος οὐδ' ἔννοιαν ἔχοντες. Thus certainly oftenest in profane Greek.

Μετανοέω, the opposite of προνοεῖν, a word not often occurring in profane Greek, combines two meanings of the preposition, *to think differently after*, cf. Stob. *Floril.* i. 14, οὐ μετανοεῖν ἀλλὰ προνοεῖν χρὴ τὸν ἄνδρα τὸν σοφόν. But usually *to change one's mind or opinion*, Xen. *Hell.* i. 7. 19, οὐ μετανοήσαντες ὕστερον εὐρήσετε σφᾶς αὐτοὺς ἡμαρτηκότας τὰ μέγιστα εἰς θεοὺς τε καὶ ὑμᾶς αὐτούς; *to repent*, Lucian, *de saltat.* 84, ἀνανήψαντα μετανοῆσαι ἐφ' οἷς ἐποίησεν ὥστε καὶ νοσῆσαι ὑπὸ λύπης; cf. Ignat. *ad Smyrn.* 9, ἀνανήψαι καὶ εἰς θεὸν μετανοεῖν. LXX. = נִח, together with μεταμελεῖν, synonymous with ἐπιστρέφειν, cf. Jer. xviii. 8, καὶ ἐπιστραφή τὸ ἔθνος ἐκεῖνο ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν κακῶν αὐτῶν, καὶ μετανοήσω περὶ τῶν κακῶν ὧν ἐλογισάμην τοῦ ποιῆσαι αὐτοῖς; 1 Sam. xv. 29; Jer. iv. 28. נִח, as usually employed to denote *moral change or conversion*, is in the LXX. rendered by ἐπιστρέφειν and not by μετανοεῖν. In the Apocrypha, however, where the word also occurs but seldom, it is used to denote a moral change, Ecclus. xvii. 24 (19); xlvi. 15, ἐν πᾶσι τούτοις οὐ μετενόησεν ὁ λαός, καὶ οὐκ ἀπέστησαν ἀπὸ τῶν ἡμαρτιῶν. In the N. T., especially by St. Luke and in the Revelation, it denotes a change of moral thought and reflection (*vid. νοῦς*), which is said to follow moral delinquency primarily, μεταν. ἐκ τινος, Rev. ii. 21, ἐκ τῆς πορνείας; ver. 22, ix. 20, 21, xvi. 11; Acts viii. 22, ἀπὸ τῆς κακίας = *to repent of anything*, not only to forsake it, but *to change one's mind and apprehensions regarding it*. Then without addition = *to repent*

in a moral and religious sense, Matt. iii. 2, iv. 17, xi. 20, 21, xii. 41; Mark vi. 12; Luke x. 13, xi. 32, xiii. 3, 5, xv. 7, 10, xvi. 30; Acts ii. 38, xvii. 30; 2 Cor. xii. 21; Rev. ii. 5, 16, 21, iii. 3, 19, xvi. 9. The feeling of sorrow, pain, mourning, is thus included in the word; cf. Luke xvii. 3, 4, *ἐὰν ἐπτάκις τῆς ἡμέρας ἁμαρτήσῃ εἰς σέ καὶ ἐπτάκις ἐπιστρέψῃ λέγων Μετανοῶ*; 2 Cor. xii. 21, *μὴ . . . πενθήσω πολλοὺς τῶν προημαρτηκότων καὶ μὴ μετανοησάντων ἐπὶ τῇ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ*; vii. 9, *ἐλυπήθητε εἰς μετάνοιαν*. Synonymous with ἐπιστρέφειν in Acts iii. 19, *μετανοήσατε οὖν καὶ ἐπιστρέψατε*; xxvi. 20, *μετανοεῖν καὶ ἐπιστρέφειν εἰς τὸν θεόν*; cf. Acts xx. 21. Joined with πιστεῦειν, Mark i. 15.

Μετάνοια, ἡ, change of mind, repentance; Plut. *Mor.* 961 D, *αὐτοὶ δὲ καὶ κύνας ἁμαρτάνοντας καὶ ἵππους κολάζουσιν, οὐ διακενῆς, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ σωφρονισμῷ, λυπὴν δι' ἀλγηδόνης ἐμποιοῦντες αὐτοῖς, ἣν μετάνοιαν ὀνομάζομεν*. Seldom in the LXX., Prov. xiv. 15, *ἄκακος πιστεύει παντὶ λόγῳ, πανούργος δὲ ἔρχεται εἰς μετάνοιαν*, *bethinks himself*, Hebrew יִבְרַח יִבְרַח. Not often in the Apocrypha, but in a moral and religious sense, Wisd. xii. 10, *κρίνων δὲ κατὰ βραχὺ ἐδίδους τόπον μετανοίας, οὐκ ἀγνοῶν . . . ὅτι οὐ μὴ ἀλλαγῇ ὁ λογισμὸς αὐτῶν*, thus answering to the import of νοῦς for the moral and religious life; see what is said (under νοῦς) of the influence of the sinful nature upon the νοῦς. Also in Ecclus. xlv. 15, *Ἐνὼχ . . . ὑπόδειγμα μετανοίας ταῖς γενεαῖς*; Wisd. xi. 23, *παρορᾷς ἁμαρτήματα ἀνθρώπων εἰς μετάνοιαν* (cf. Acts xvii. 30); xii. 19, *διδῶς ἐπὶ ἁμαρτήμασιν μετάνοιαν*.

In the N. T., and especially in Luke, corresponding with μετανοεῖν, it is = repentance, with reference to νοῦς as the faculty of moral reflection; cf. 2 Tim. ii. 25, *δὴ αὐτοῖς ὁ θεὸς μετάνοιαν εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας*; Acts xx. 21, *ἡ εἰς τὸν θεὸν μετάν.*; cf. 2 Cor. vii. 9, *ἐλυπήθητε εἰς μετάνοιαν*, with ver. 10, *ἐλυπ. γὰρ κατὰ θεόν*; Acts xi. 18, *εἰς ζωήν*; 2 Cor. vii. 10, *εἰς σωτηρίαν*; Heb. vi. 1, *ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἔργων*. Combined with ἄφεσις ἁμαρτιῶν, Luke xxiv. 47; cf. βάπτισμα μετανοίας, Mark i. 4; Luke iii. 3; Acts xiii. 24, xix. 4; Matt. iii. 11. Elsewhere in Matt. iii. 8; Luke iii. 8, v. 32, xv. 7; Acts v. 31, xxvi. 20; Rom. ii. 4; Heb. vi. 6; 2 Pet. iii. 9. With Heb. xii. 17 compare Wisd. xii. 10. Lactant. vi. 24, "*Quem facti sui poenitet, errorem suum pristinum intelligit; ideoque Graeci melius et significantius μετάνοιαν dicunt, quam nos latine possumus resipiscientiam dicere, resipiscit enim ac mentem suam quasi ab insania recipit, quem errati piget, castigatque se ipsum dementiae et confirmat animum suum ad rectius vivendum; tum illud ipsum maxime cavet, ne rursus in eosdem laqueos inducatur.*"

Νουθετέω, to put in mind, to work upon the mind of one, with the accusative of the person, always with the idea of putting right, because some degree of opposition has to be encountered, and one wishes to subdue or remove it, not by punishment, but by influencing the νοῦς, therefore appearing even as synonymous with κολάζειν, cf. Plato, *Gorg.* 479 A, *μήτε νουθετεῖσθαι μήτε κολάζεσθαι, μήτε δίκην δίδοναι*; still though opposed to punishment, which it is intended to avoid, it in the issue precedes it. Compare 1 Sam.

iii. 13, *καὶ οὐκ ἐνουθέτει αὐτοὺς καὶ οὐδ' οὕτως*, of Eli's blameworthy leniency towards his sons, which could not in the least degree be firm. In 1 Cor. iv. 14, as against *ἐντρέπειν*, compare 2 Thess. iii. 15, *μὴ ὡς ἐχθρὸν ἡγείσθε, ἀλλὰ νουθετεῖτε ὡς ἀδελφόν*. Further, compare 1 Thess. v. 12 with ver. 14. It is accordingly equivalent to, **with kindly purpose to admonish, to put right, to warn, to remind and advise, in order to guard against and ward off wrong**, etc. Also = **to pacify**, Soph. *Oed. Col.* 1195, *νουθετούμενοι φίλων ἐπώδαις*, conjoined with *διδάσκειν*, Plato, *Legg.* viii. 845 B; Col. i. 28, iii. 16. Its fundamental idea is the well-intentioned seriousness with which one would influence the mind and disposition of another by advice, admonition, warning, putting right, according to circumstances. (In the quite general sense, *to instruct, to advise*, only seldom, Job xxxviii. 18, xxxiv. 3.) Job iv. 3, *εἰ γὰρ ἐνουθέτησας πολλοὺς καὶ χεῖρας ἀσθενοῦς παρεκάλεσας* = 79. Compare 1 Thess. v. 12.—Wisdom. xi. 11, *τούτους μὲν γὰρ ὡς πατὴρ νουθετῶν ἐδοκίμασας, ἐκείνους δὲ ὡς ἀπότομος βασιλεὺς καταδικάζων ἐξήτασας*; xii. 2, *τοὺς παραπίπτοντας κατ' ὀλίγον ἐλέγχεις καὶ . . . ὑπομimνήσκων νουθετεῖς ἵνα κ.τ.λ.*; xii. 26, *οἱ δὲ πανγυίοις ἐπιτιμήσεως μὴ νουθετηθέντες ἀξίαν θεοῦ κρίσιν πειράσουσιν*. In the N. T., besides the places already cited, Acts xx. 31; Rom. xv. 14. For the object and aim, see Col. i. 28.

Νουθεσία, ἡ, rarely in profane Greek for *νουθέτησις*; sometimes in Philo, Josephus, and later writers, **well-intentioned but serious correction, admonition**, Titus iii. 10, *αἵρετικὸν ἄνθρωπον μετὰ μίαν νουθεσίαν καὶ δευτέραν παραιτοῦ*.—1 Cor. x. 11, compare ver. 10; Eph. vi. 4, *ἐκτρέφετε τὰ τέκνα ἐν παιδείᾳ καὶ νουθεσίᾳ κυρίου*, where *κυρίου* is the genitive of the subject, the qualifying genitive. Compare Judith viii. 27, *εἰς νουθέτησιν μαστιγοῖ κύριος τοὺς ἐγγίζοντας αὐτῷ*. This *putting right*, or *correction*, just as the Lord uses it, is opposed to wrath, Wisdom. xvi. 5, 6, xi. 11, and the admonition answers to what precedes, *μὴ παροργίζετε τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν*, for *παροργίζειν*, *to irritate, to provoke to wrath*, implies and presupposes one's own anger. Compare 1 Cor. iv. 14. *Παιδεία* and *νουθεσία* alike have as their end the *ἄνθρωπος τέλειος*, Col. i. 28, Eph. iv. 13, but *νουθεσία* is intended to obviate deviations, and to establish the right direction of the *παιδεία*.—Wisdom. xvi. 6, *εἰς νουθεσίαν πρὸς ὀλίγον ἐταράχθησαν*.

Ο

Ὁδός, ἡ, (Γ.) **way, path**, Matt. ii. 12, and often, *ὁδός τινος*, *the way any thing goes, along which it moves*, e.g. *ὁδὸς ποταμοῦ*, *bed of a river*; *οἰόνων ὁδοί*, *the course of birds* (Sophocles); *ἡ ὁδὸς τῶν βασιλέων*, Rev. xvi. 12; *ὁδ. κυρίου*, Matt. iii. 3; Mark i. 3; Luke iii. 4; John i. 23; Mark i. 2; Luke i. 76, vii. 27. With genitive of the object, in Matt. x. 5, *ὁδὸς ἐθνῶν*; Heb. ix. 8, *μήπω πεφανερῶσθαι τὴν τῶν ἁγίων ὁδόν*, cf. x. 19, 20, *ἔχοντες παρῥησίαν εἰς τὴν εἴσοδον τῶν ἁγίων ἐν τῷ αἵματι Ἰησοῦ, ἣν ἐνεκαίνισεν ἡμῖν*

ὁδὸν πρόσφατον καὶ ζῶσαν; cf. Jer. ii. 8, and other places. So also in the combinations ὁδοὶ ζωῆς, Acts ii. 28, compare Gen. iii. 24, φυλάσσειν τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ ξύλου τῆς ζωῆς; Matt. vii. 13, 14, εὐρύχωρος ἡ ὁδὸς ἡ ἀπάγουσα εἰς τὴν ἀπώλειαν . . . τεθλιμμένη ἡ ὁδὸς ἡ ἀπάγουσα εἰς τὴν ζωὴν; Acts xvi. 17, καταγγέλλουσιν ὑμῖν ὁδὸν σωτηρίας; Rom. iii. 17, ὁδὸν εἰρήνης οὐκ ἔγνωσαν, which, according to the passage on which the expression is based, signifies *way to peace, to salvation*, not “way in which salvation is spread by those spoken of” (Philippi), compare Isa. lix. 8, $\text{סִלְכֵּי נְתִיבָה לְפָנֶיךָ}$; Luke i. 79, κατευθύναι τοὺς πόδας ἡμῶν εἰς ὁδὸν εἰρήνης. In the expression ὁδὸν θαλάσσης, Matt. iv. 15, ὁδὸν must, after the manner of the Hebrew דֶּרֶךְ , be construed with a prepositional force = *seawards*; the LXX., at least, have so rendered the primary passage in Isa. viii. 25, although the context in the Hebrew there admits of another explanation. Compare 1 Kings viii. 48, προσεύξονται πρὸς σὲ ὁδὸν γῆς αὐτῶν = *turned back to their own country, homewards*, Deut. i. 19; 1 Kings viii. 48 (Ezek. xviii. 5, ἀνάβλεψον . . . πρὸς βορρᾶν = הִנֵּה דֶרֶךְ). Analogous examples do not certainly occur elsewhere in profane Greek, except the prepositional *πέραν*, originally the accusative of *πέρα*, *the land on the other side*, Aesch. *Suppl.* 249. Compare Schenkl, *Griech.-deutsches Wörterb.*—(II.) **Way, going, course, journey**; 1 Thess. iii. 11; Matt. x. 10, and elsewhere.—(III.) Not unfrequently ὁδός is used in profane Greek as synonymous with *μέθοδος* = *way and manner*, how one does or attains anything, mostly particularized by the addition of the thing, as, *e.g.*, in Isocr. *ad Dem.* 2a, ὅσοι τοῦ βίου ταύτην τὴν ὁδὸν ἐπορεύθησαν; Pindar, *Ol.* viii. 13, πολλαὶ ὁδοὶ εὐπραγίας. Seldom absolutely, *the manner of acting*, etc., as in Thuc. iii. 64, ἄδικον ὁδὸν ἰέναι. In biblical Greek this usage is, comparatively speaking, much more frequent, especially ὁδός in the last-named sense without addition. There ὁδός, דֶּרֶךְ , signifies (*a.*) formally, *the way and manner* of doing or attaining something, *e.g.* ὁδοὶ ζωῆς, ὁδὸς εἰρήνης, σωτηρίας, in the places already quoted. Purely in a formal sense as = *μέθοδος*; without any further limitation, it might be said to occur only in 1 Cor. xii. 31, ζηλοῦτε δὲ τὰ χαρίσματα τὰ μείζονα καὶ ἔτι καθ’ ὑπερβολὴν ὁδὸν ὑμῖν δείκνυμι, if this does not refer to the ζηλοῦτε occurring in the first half of the verse. This, however, is rendered improbable by xiv. 1, διώκετε τὴν ἀγάπην, ζηλοῦτε δὲ τὰ πνευματικά. According to this, love, concerning which the apostle treats in xii. 31 sqq., is not the manner in which the gifts of the Spirit are to be sought after,—which is forbidden by xiii. 1, 2, 8–10,—but is something which does not require gifts, and without which gifts are worthless. The life of the Christian fellowship is to advance not in the development of gifts, but in the development of love; love it is that the apostle would bring before his readers, and therefore it is preferable to take ὁδός not as a formal limitation of the ζηλοῦν, but, as elsewhere, (*b.*) with a determinate reference, as *the way and manner of life, of walk, and of behaviour generally* (as in the places above cited from Thucydides), *the path in which life moves or should move* (a distinction as between ὁδός, I. and II.). Thus 1 Cor. iv. 17, ὃς ὑμᾶς ἀναμνήσει τὰς ὁδοὺς μου τὰς ἐν Χριστῷ; Jas. v. 20, ἐκ πλάνης ὁδοῦ αὐτοῦ; Jude 11, τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ Καὶν ἐπορεύθησαν; Acts xiv. 16,

εἶασεν πάντα τὰ ἔθνη πορεύεσθαι ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτῶν; Rom. iii. 16, σύντριμμα καὶ ταλαιπορία ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτῶν; Jas. i. 8; 2 Pet. ii. 15. Compare Isa. xxx. 31, αὕτη ἡ ὁδός, πορευθώμεν ἐν αὐτῇ. Akin to this is the expression ὁδός, ὁδοὶ δικαιοσύνης, inasmuch as the genitive is to be taken not as that of the subject, or of the object, but as denoting contents or quality, 2 Pet. ii. 21, κρεῖττον γὰρ ἦν αὐτοῖς μὴ ἐπεγνωκέναι τὴν ὁδὸν τῆς δικ., cf. Prov. xxi. 16, ἀνὴρ πλανώμενος ἐξ ὁδοῦ δικαιοσύνης; viii. 20, ἐν ὁδοῖς δικ. περιπατῶ; xii. 28, ἐν ὁδοῖς δικαιοσύνης ζωή, ὁδοὶ δὲ μνησικακῶν εἰς θάνατον; xvi. 31, στέφανος καυχήσεως γῆρας, ἐν δὲ ὁδοῖς δικαιοσύνης εὐρίσκεται; Matt. xxi. 12, ἦλθεν γὰρ Ἰωάννης πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐν ὁδῷ δικαιοσύνης (see ἔρχομαι), cf. 2 Pet. ii. 15, καταλιπόντες εὐθείαν ὁδόν; Acts xiii. 10; 2 Pet. ii. 2, δι' οὗς ἡ ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας βλασφημηθήσεται. The expressions, ἡ ὁδός, αἱ ὁδοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ, κυρίου, are analogous, inasmuch as they denote the ways which God would have men take, compare Ps. xxv. 12, τίς ἐστιν ἄνθρωπος ὁ φοβούμενος τὸν κύριον; νομοθετήσει αὐτῷ ἐν ὁδῷ ᾗ ἡρετίσατο. So Matt. xxii. 16, τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ διδάσκεις (Mark xii. 14; Luke xx. 21); Heb. iii. 10, ἀεὶ πλανῶνται τῇ καρδίᾳ· αὐτοὶ δὲ οὐκ ἔγνωσαν τὰς ὁδοὺς μου; Ps. xviii. 22, ἐφύλαξα τὰς ὁδοὺς κυρίου; Gen. xviii. 19, φυλάξουσιν τὰς ὁδοὺς κυρίου ποιεῖν δικαιοσύνην; Deut. x. 12; Ps. xxv. 4; Acts xiii. 10; compare Jer. vi. 16; Ps. xviii. 31, xxvii. 11; 1 Kings iii. 14. But those expressions also denote the ways which God Himself takes, His mode of procedure and action, Rom. xi. 33; Rev. xv. 3; also Acts xviii. 25, κατηχημένος τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ κυρίου. Ver. 26, ἀκριβέστερον ἐξέθεντο αὐτῷ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ ὁδόν, must, it seems, as more appropriate to the connection, be explained in this sense, the ways which God has taken (for the revelation and working out of His salvation, in order to carry out His saving purpose); compare ἐδίδασκεν ἀκριβῶς τὰ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ver. 25. There still remains (*c.*) the use of the word in the book of the Acts to denote the way or manner of life presented in the Christian community, Acts xxiv. 14, κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν ἣν λέγουσιν αἴρεσιν οὕτως λατρεύω τῷ πατρὶ θεῷ; xxii. 4, ταύτην τὴν ὁδὸν ἐδίωξα. Without closer qualification, Acts ix. 2, ἐάν τις εὕρῃ τῆς ὁδοῦ ὄντας; xix. 9, κακολογούντες τὴν ὁδὸν ἐνώπιον τοῦ πλήθους; ver. 23, xxiv. 22. In explanation of this expression reference can hardly be made to ἡθ. as denoting religious *cultus*, according to Amos viii. 14 (as explained by the Targums). Apart from the consideration suggested by Hitzig against this explanation, this passage is too isolated, and does not in the least show that ἡθ. by itself signifies a definite religious tendency or way. It is less difficult to prove an affinity with the usage of profane Greek, inasmuch as, at least in one indisputable passage, the word stands for philosophic systems or schools, Lucian, *Hermotim.* 46, ἔχεις μοί τινα εἰπεῖν ἀπάσης ὁδοῦ πεπειραμένον ἐν φιλοσοφίᾳ, καὶ ὃς τά τε ὑπὸ Πυθαγόρου καὶ Πλατῶνος καὶ Ἀριστοτέλους καὶ Χρυσίππου καὶ Ἐπικούρου καὶ τῶν ἄλλων λεγόμενα εἰδὼς τελευτῶν μίαν εἴλετο ἐξ ἀπασῶν ὁδῶν ἀληθῆ τε δοκιμάσας καὶ πείρα μαθὼν ὡς μόνῃ ἄγει εὐθὺ τῆς εὐδαιμονίας; compare Acts xxiv. 14.

Μεθοδεία, ἡ [μέθοδος, the following or pursuing of orderly and technical pro-

cedure in the handling of a subject; μεθοδεύω, *to go systematically to work*, to do or pursue something methodically and according to the rules of art, *e.g.* οἱ τὰ δημόσια τέλη μεθοδεύοντες, *to collect the taxes*,—in Du Cange. Of the rhetorical arts or tricks of speakers, Philo, *de vit. Mos.* 685 A, οὐχ ὅπερ μεθοδεύουσιν οἱ λογοθῆραι καὶ σοφισταί, πιπράσκοντες . . . δόγματα καὶ λόγους. Generally = *to overreach*, Polyb. xxxviii. 4. 16; cf. Chrys. on Eph. vi. 11, μεθοδεῦσαι ἐστὶ τὸ ἀπατῆσαι καὶ διὰ συντόμου ἐλεῖν; 2 Sam. xix. 27, μεθώδευσεν ἐν τῷ δούλῳ σου, מְהוֹדֵעַ בְּעַבְדִּי. So also μέθοδος = *cunning*, 2 Macc. xiii. 18, κατεπείρασε διὰ μεθόδων τοὺς τόπους; Artemid. iii. 25, ἀπάτη καὶ μέθοδος] = *overreaching, cunning, trickery*, as it appears only in Eph. iv. 14, vi. 11, and sometimes in ecclesiastical Greek. Hesych., τέχναι; Zonar., ἐπιβουλαί, ἐνέδραι, δόλοι; Eph. iv. 14, πρὸς τὴν μεθοδείαν τῆς πλάνης; vi. 11, στῆναι πρὸς τὰς μεθοδείας τοῦ διαβόλου; Luther, *cunning assaults*.

Οἶκος, ὁ, house, (I.) a dwelling, Matt. ix. 6, 7, and often. 'Ο οἶκος τοῦ θεοῦ denotes, first, the temple (already in Ex. xxiii. 19, xxiv. 26; Isa. vi. 24) as the place of God's gracious presence; cf. Ex. xxix. 45, xxv. 8, xxvii. 21, xl. 22, 24; 1 Kings viii. 18, οἰκοδομεῖν οἶκον τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ θεοῦ; Ezek. xliii. 4, δόξα κυρίου εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον; Acts vii. 49, ποῖον οἶκον οἰκοδομήσετέ μοι, λέγει κύριος, ἢ τίς τόπος τῆς καταπαύσεώς μου. So Matt. xii. 4, xxi. 13; Mark ii. 26, xi. 17; Luke xvi. 27, xix. 46; John ii. 16, 17; Acts vii. 47. 'Ο οἶκος by itself is used as a name for the temple in Luke xi. 51; cf. 2 Chron. xxxv. 5; Ezek. xliii. 4, 12, ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν, the temple of Israel; Matt. xxiii. 38, compare Ps. lxxxiv. 4; Isa. lxiv. 10, "our holy and beautiful house, wherein our fathers praised Thee, is burned up with fire" (Zunz). See my dissertation on Matt. xxiv. 25, p. 2. As ὁ οἶκος τοῦ θεοῦ is, secondly, a designation for the people of God, so οἶκος denotes (II.) a household or family, Thuc. i. 137; Xen. *Cyrop.* i. 6. 17 (more frequently οἰκία). Matt. x. 12; Luke i. 27, 69; Acts x. 2, xi. 14, xvi. 15, 31, xviii. 8; 1 Cor. i. 16; 2 Tim. i. 16, iv. 19; Tit. i. 11; Luke ii. 4, ἐξ οἴκου καὶ πατριᾶς Δαυὶδ; the twelve tribes were called φυλαί, and were divided into לְיִשְׁרָאֵל, πατριαί, gentes, and those constituting these πατριαί formed οἶκοι or families; cf. Num. i. 2; 1 Chron. xxiii. 11, xxiv. 6, and often. See Winer, *Realwörterb.* article "Stämme." Οἶκος Ἰσραήλ, Matt. x. 6; Acts ii. 36, vii. 42, cf. Luke i. 33. Acts vii. 46 is a common O. T. expression to denote the people with their progenitor (cf. Rom. ix. 6), see Ruth iv. 11.—'Ο οἶκος τοῦ θεοῦ is not always (as Delitzsch affirms on Heb. x. 21) the Scripture name for the church of God. In the few O. T. passages that can be cited in proof of this, it is not the church, but the temple of God which is meant; cf. Hos. viii. 1 with ix. 8, 15; Ps. lxix. 10 with John ii. 17. But in Num. xii. 7, which is referred to in Heb. iii. 2–4, Μωϋσής . . . ἐν ὄλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ μου πιστός ἐστι, מֹשֶׁה בְּבֵיתִי לֵבְיָנִי, οἶκος means not the people of God, but the stewardship of that which God provides for His people (hence οἶκος = domestic affairs; see (III.)). Its use to denote the church occurs first in the N. T., because the ἐκκλησία is that which the temple in the O. T. typified, the abode of God's presence, 1 Tim. iii. 15,

πῶς δεῖ ἐν οἴκῳ θεοῦ ἀναστρέφεσθαι, ἣτις ἐστὶν ἐκκλησία θεοῦ ζῶντος, cf. 1 Cor. iii. 16; 2 Cor. vi. 16; Eph. ii. 19; hence Heb. iii. 6, οὐ οἶκος ἐσμεν ἡμεῖς; 1 Pet. ii. 5, ὡς λίθοι ζῶντες οἰκοδομεῖσθε, οἶκος πνευματικός κ.τ.λ., cf. Eph. ii. 22, κατοικητήριον τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν πνεύματι. — Heb. x. 21, ἔχοντες . . . ἱερέα μέγαν ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ, does not (as is evident from ver. 19) refer to the church, but to the heavenly sanctuary; vid. ix. 11, x. 19; Ps. xxxvi. 9 (ἡ εἰκὼν τῶν πραγμάτων, ἡ μέζων καὶ τελειότερα σκῆνη). — (III.) Household concerns, Acts vii. 10; 1 Tim. iii. 4, 5, 12; Heb. iii. 2.

Οἰκεῖος, belonging to the house, akin to; synonymous with συγγενής, but denoting the closest kinship; opposed to ἀλλότριος, strange. In the N. T. as a substantive, οἰκεῖοι, kinsfolk, of the same household; Eph. ii. 19, οὐκέτι ἐστὲ ξένοι καὶ πάροικοι, ἀλλ' ἐστὲ συμπολίται τῶν ἁγίων καὶ οἰκεῖοι τοῦ θεοῦ, belonging to the household of God; cf. ver. 19, and οἶκος (II.); πάροικος, Lev. xxv. 23, ἐμὴ γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ γῆ, διότι προσήλυτοι καὶ πάροικοι ἐστὲ ἐνώπιόν μου. In 1 Tim. v. 8, εἰ δέ τις τῶν ἰδίων καὶ μάλιστα τῶν οἰκεῖων οὐ προνοεῖ, the word is also masculine; for if we take it as neuter, τὰ ἴδια denotes one's own private affairs, and τὰ οἰκεῖα would signify some special distinctively domestic affairs; but such a particularizing cannot be maintained, rather as τὰ ἴδια means private affairs; cf. Thuc. ii. 40, ἐνὶ δὲ τοῖς αὐτοῖς οἰκεῖων ἅμα καὶ πολιτικῶν ἐπιμέλεια. Accordingly ἴδιοι is = those belonging to us; οἰκεῖοι is = those most closely belonging to us, our nearest relatives. Cf. Isa. iii. 6, ὁ οἰκεῖος τοῦ πατρός = יְרֵאָה בְּנֵי. Cf. Gal. vi. 10, οἱ οἰκεῖοι τῆς πίστεως, with Polyb. v. 87. 3, οἶκ. τῆς ἡσυχίας; iv. 57. 4, λίαν οἰκεῖους ὄντας τῶν τοιούτων ἐγχειρημάτων; xiv. 9. 5, πάντα ἦν οἰκεῖα τῆς μεταβολῆς.

Οἰκέω, (I.) intransitively, to dwell, usually with ἐν following, as in Rom. vii. 17, 18, 20, viii. 9, 11; 1 Cor. iii. 16. In these places applied to moral and spiritual relations, Rom. vii. 17, 20, ἡ οἰκοῦσα ἐν ἐμοὶ ἁμαρτία; ver. 18, οὐκ οἰκεῖ ἐν ἐμοὶ ἀγαθόν; viii. 9, πνεῦμα θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν, as in 1 Cor. iii. 16, for which Herod. ii. 166, οὗτος ὁ νομος ἐν νήσῳ οἰκεῖ, cannot be cited, because there we must read, not νόμος, but νομός, *ragus*, as the preceding Καλασιρίων δὲ οἶδε ἄλλοι νομοὶ εἰσι and the following ἀντίον Βουβάστιος πόλιος oblige us to do (against Pape, *Wörterb.*). Of marriage relations, 1 Cor. vii. 12, οἰκεῖν μετ' αὐτοῦ; ver. 13, οἰκεῖν μετ' αὐτῆς, as in Soph. *Oed. R.* 990, Πόλυβος ἧς ὄκει μέτα. — (II.) Transitively, to inhabit; rarely in Homer, frequently in Herodotus and the Attic writers. 1 Tim. vi. 16, φῶς οἰκῶν ἀπρόσιτον. Comp. Gen. xxiv. 13; Prov. x. 30; 2 Macc. v. 17, vi. 2. Akin is the use of the participle ἡ οἰκουμένη, *sc. γῆ*; primarily, "the land inhabited by the Greeks, in contrast with barbarian countries" (Herod. iv. 110; Dem. p. 242. 1, 85. 17; Schaef. *App.* i. 477; Maetzner, *Lycurg.* 100); "and afterwards, when the Greeks became subject to the Romans, the entire *orbis Romanus*; and not till very late, the whole inhabited world," Passow, *Wörterb.* As to Scripture usage, in Ex. xvi. 35, ἡ οἰκουμένη seems to denote the land of Canaan; it is, however, clearly nothing but a clumsy rendering of the Hebrew אֶרֶץ נִחְבָּת, *land inhabited*, as contrasted with the wilderness. Also in Josephus, *Antt.* viii. 13. 4, περι-

πέμψας κατὰ πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην ζητήσοντας τὸν προφήτην Ἡλίαν; xiv. 7. 2, πάντων τῶν κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην Ἰουδαίων καὶ σεβομένων τὸν θεόν, ἔτι δὲ καὶ τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀσίας καὶ τῆς Εὐρώπης εἰς αὐτὸ συμφερόντων, it does not stand for Jewish land; compare for the first passage, 1 Kings xviii., and for the others, Acts xxiv. 5. It always denotes either *the whole inhabited earth, the whole world* in general, or this as it presents itself in the comprehensive unity of *the Roman Empire*. In the LXX. the former only, 2 Sam. xxii. 16; Ps. xviii. 16; Isa. xxxiv. 1; Ps. ix. 9, xx. 8, xlix. 1, xevi. 13 = לְכָל . So also in the Apocrypha, Wisd. i. 7; Bar. vi. 62, etc. On the contrary, in the N. T., both in this comprehensive sense, as in Heb. i. 6, Acts xvii. 31, compare Ps. ix. 9, and in the more limited sense of *the Roman Empire*, Luke ii. 1, ἐξῆλθεν δόγμα παρὰ Καίσαρος Αὐγούστου ἀπογράφεσθαι πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην, Acts xvii. 6,—a usage, however, which has nothing in common with the primary limitation of the word to the world of the Greeks as distinct from the lands of the barbarians, but which simply expresses the tendency to universality of the Roman Empire. Maintaining this, the question becomes superfluous whether the word signifies *the whole world* or *the Roman Empire*, in any of the other places in the N. T., Matt. xxiv. 14; Luke iv. 5, xxi. 26; Acts xi. 28, xix. 27, xxiv. 5; Rev. iii. 10, xii. 9, xvi. 14.—Peculiar to the N. T. is the designation ἡ οἰκουμένη ἡ μέλλουσα in Heb. ii. 5, as synonymous with αἰὼν μέλλων, yet differing therefrom as space differs from time, and chosen in Heb. ii. 5 with reference to i. 6, 10, 11. With nice distinction, the expression used is not ὁ κόσμος μέλλων, as against ὁ κόσμος οὗτος, because the word κόσμος already in itself possesses a moral import, and in keeping therewith can only be ὁ κόσμος οὗτος. See κόσμος.

Πάροικος, neighbouring. This is the classical sense of the word; but it does not occur in this meaning in the N. T. So also of παροιμία, παροικεῖν; the latter only in Ps. xciv. 17 = *to live neighbour to*. In later Greek, παροικεῖν is used of strangers who have no rights of citizenship, and who live anywhere, without a settled home, Diod. Sic. xiii. 47, οἱ παροικούντες ξένοι; Julian. c. Christ. 209 D, δουλεύσαι δὲ αἰεὶ καὶ παροικῆσαι. = נָּזַר , Gen. xii. 10, xix. 9; Ex. vi. 4, etc., cf. Deut. v. 14; Luke xxiv. 18; Heb. xi. 9; παροιμία, Ps. cxx. 5; 2 Esdr. viii. 35, οἱ υἱοὶ τῆς παροιμίας, $\text{בְּנֵי הַנָּזִירִים}$; Acts xiii. 17; 1 Pet. i. 17. **πάροικος, one who dwells in a place without the rights of home**, LXX. = נָּזַר ; Gen. xv. 13, **πάροιכון** ἔσται τὸ σπέρμα σου ἐν γῇ οὐκ ἰδίᾳ; Ex. ii. 22, **πάροικός** εἰμι ἐν γῇ ἀλλοτρίᾳ; xviii. 3; Lev. xxv. 35, 47; Ps. xxxix. 13, cxix. 19. (נָּזַר is often = *προσήμενος*, Ex. xii. 48; Lev. xix. 33; Num. ix. 14, xv. 14; Josh. xx. 9; Jer. vii. 6; Zech. vii. 1.) = $\text{בְּנֵי הַנָּזִירִים}$, Ex. xii. 45; Lev. xxii. 10, xxv. 6, **τῷ παροίκῳ** τῷ προσκειμένῳ πρὸς σέ, which in Gen. xxiii. 4, Ps. xxxix. 13 = *παρεπιδημος, one who abides a short time in a strange place*. $\text{בְּנֵי הַנָּזִירִים}$ means literally, *a dweller*, as distinct from נָּזַר , *one who halts or tarries on a journey*; but often both words are used together, e.g. Gen. xxiii. 4, Lev. xxv. 35, 47, in contrast with $\text{בְּנֵי הַנָּזִירִים}$, Num. ix. 14, xv. 30, or נָּזַר , Deut. i. 16. And hence, in 1 Pet. ii. 11, ὡς παροίκους καὶ παρεπιδήμους, both words conveying the same thought,—*παρεπιδη*

giving prominence to the homelessness already expressed in *πάροις*. See also Eph. ii. 19, *οὐκέτι ἐστὲ ξένοι καὶ πάροις*, where *πάροις* has the same force in relation to *ξένοι*. (Lev. xxv. 23, quoted under *οἰκείος*, is not a parallel instance here.) Elsewhere, in Acts vii. 6, *παροῖκος ἐν γῇ ἀλλοτρίᾳ*; vii. 29.

Οἰκοδόμος, *ὁ*, one who builds a house or anything, an architect; e.g. *οἶκ. φραγμῶν*, Isa. lviii. 12, 2 Kings xii. 11, and elsewhere. In the N. T. Acts iv. 11, *ὁ λίθος ὁ ἐξουθενηθεὶς ὑφ' ὑμῶν τῶν οἰκοδόμων* (Lachm. and Tisch. read this instead of *οἰκοδομούντων*, Ps. cxviii. 22; Matt. xxi. 42). Those who build the temple are thus named, and those also who build "the house of God" in its N. T. sense.

Οἰκοδομέω, to build a house, or, generally, to build anything; *πόλιν, πύργον, τάφους*, etc., Matt. vii. 24, 26, xxi. 33, xxiii. 29, xxvi. 61, xxvii. 40; Mark xii. 1, xiv. 58, xv. 29; Luke iv. 29, vi. 48, 49, vii. 5, xi. 47, 48, xii. 18, xiv. 28, 30, xvii. 28; John ii. 20; Acts vii. 47, 49. Metaphorically, in 1 Pet. ii. 5, *ὡς λίθοι ζῶντες οἰκοδομεῖσθε, οἶκος πνευματικός*; Matt. xxi. 42, *λίθον ὃν ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες*; Mark xii. 10; Luke xx. 17; 1 Pet. ii. 7, *vid. οἶκος*; Gal. ii. 18, *εἰ γὰρ ἂ κατέλυσα ταῦτα πάλιν οἰκοδομῶ*; Matt. xvi. 18, *ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ οἰκοδομήσω μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν*; Rom. xv. 20, of the labours of the apostles, *ἐπ' ἄλλον θεμέλιον οἰκοδομῶ*. This use of the word in reference to things to which it cannot literally be applied, is foreign to classical usage. In Xen. *Cyrop.* viii. 7. 15, *μὴ οὖν ἂ οἱ θεοὶ ὑφήγηται ἀγαθὰ εἰς οἰκειότητα ἀδελφοῖς μάταιά ποτε ποιήσητε, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ ταῦτα εὐθὺς οἰκοδομεῖτε ἄλλα φιλικὰ ἔργα*, the word is suggested by the preceding *οἰκειότης*. The N. T. use of the word can be explained only by the Hebrew of the O. T., where *בָּנָה*, *to build*, is used to denote the advancement of any one's welfare or prosperity; Mal. iii. 15, *καὶ νῦν ἡμεῖς μακαρίζομεν ἀλλοτρίους, καὶ ἀνοικοδομοῦνται πάντες ποιοῦντες ἄνομα, καὶ ἀντέστησαν τῷ θεῷ καὶ ἐσώθησαν*; Ps. xxviii. 5, *καθελεῖς αὐτοὺς καὶ οὐ μὴ οἰκοδομήσεις αὐτούς*; Jer. xlii. 10, xii. 16, xxxi. 4, *οἰκοδομήσω σε καὶ οἰκοδομηθήσῃ παρθένος Ἰσραὴλ*; xxxiii. 6, 7, *ιατρεύσω αὐτὴν καὶ ποιήσω καὶ εἰρήνην καὶ πίστιν . . . οἰκοδομήσω αὐτοὺς καθὼς καὶ τὸ πρότερον*. Jer. i. 10, xviii. 9; Job xxii. 23, *בָּנִיתִי יְהוָה בְּנִיתִי דָם*. (It will be observed that the word is used especially of prosperity brought about by God.) Cf. 1 Cor. viii. 1, *ἡ ἀγάπη οἰκοδομεῖ*; x. 23, *πάντα ἔξεστιν, ἀλλ' οὐ πάντα συμφέρει πάντα ἔξεστιν, ἀλλ' οὐ πάντα οἰκοδομεῖ*. In contrast with *καθαίρειν, καταλύειν*, cf. 2 Cor. x. 8, *ἡς (ἐξουσίας) ἔδωκεν ὁ κύριος εἰς οἰκοδομὴν καὶ οὐκ εἰς καθαίρεσιν ὑμῶν*; xiii. 10. In the N. T. it denotes an activity brought to bear upon the Christian's state, and tending to the advancement of the work of God (Rom. xiv. 19, 20); to growth in the grace and knowledge of Jesus Christ (2 Pet. iii. 18); to the development of the inner life (Eph. iv. 16), especially *within the Christian community*, where the process is said specially to be carried on. With *παρακαλεῖν*, 1 Thess. v. 11, *παρακαλεῖτε ἀλλήλους καὶ οἰκοδομεῖτε εἰς τὸν ἕνα*, see 1 Cor. xiv. 3, *ὁ προφητεύων ἀνθρώποις λαλεῖ οἰκοδομὴν καὶ παράκλησιν καὶ παραμυθίαν*; x. 23, cf. ver. 24; Rom. xiv. 19, cf. ver. 20; 1 Cor. xiv. 4, *ὁ λαλῶν γλώσση ἑαυτὸν*

οἰκοδομεῖ ὁ δὲ προφητεύων ἐκκλησίαν οἰκοδομεῖ; ver. 17. We have a catachresis (or forced use) of the word in 1 Cor. viii. 10, ἡ συνείδησις αὐτοῦ ἀσθενοῦς ὄντος οἰκοδομηθήσεται εἰς τὸ τὰ εἰδωλόθυτα ἐσθίειν. The middle, in Acts ix. 31, ἡ μὲν οὖν ἐκκλησία . . . οἰκοδομουμένη καὶ πορευομένη τῷ φόβῳ τοῦ κυρίου κ.τ.λ. Cf. οἰκοδομή, ἐποικοδομεῖν. See my treatise, *Ueber den biblischen Begriff der Erbauung*, Barmen 1863.

Οἰκοδομή, ἡ, unusual in profane Greek, literally, *the act of building, building as a process*, and hence also *that which is built, the building*. The latter in Matt. xxiv. 1; Mark xiii. 1, 2; 1 Chron. xxix. 1; Ezek. xl. 2. Metaphorically, 1 Cor. iii. 9, θεοῦ γὰρ ἔσμεν συνεργοί· θεοῦ γεώργιον, θεοῦ οἰκοδομή ἐστε; 2 Cor. v. 1, οἰκοδομὴν ἐκ θεοῦ ἔχομεν; comp. the preceding οἰκία and the οἰκητήριον following in ver. 2; Eph. ii. 21, πᾶσα οἰκοδομή συναρμολογουμένη αὐξεῖ εἰς ναὸν ἁγίον ἐν κυρίῳ, of the Christian fellowship. In its first meaning, *the act of building*, it harmonizes with the N. T. sense of οἰκοδομεῖν, *the advancement of God's work of grace within the Christian fellowship*, both in individuals and in the whole; Rom. xiv. 19, 20, τὰ τῆς εἰρήνης διώκωμεν καὶ τὰ τῆς οἰκοδομῆς τῆς εἰς ἀλλήλους. μὴ ἔνεκεν βρώματος κατάλυε τὸ ἔργον τοῦ θεοῦ; 2 Cor. x. 8, ἥς (ἐξουσίας) ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν ὁ κύριος εἰς οἰκοδομὴν καὶ οὐκ εἰς καθαίρεσιν ὑμῶν, as in xiii. 10; Eph. iv. 12, εἰς οἰκοδομὴν τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ μέχρι κ.τ.λ.; ver. 13. Ver. 16, ἐξ οὗ πάν τὸ σῶμα . . . τὴν αὐξήσιν τοῦ σώματος ποιεῖται εἰς οἰκοδομὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἐν ἀγάπῃ. Also in Rom. xv. 2; 1 Cor. xiv. 3, 5, 12, 26; 2 Cor. xii. 19; Eph. iv. 29.

Ἐποικοδομέω, *to build upon*, 1 Cor. iii. 10, ὡς σοφὸς ἀρχιτέκτων θεμέλιον τέθεικα, ἄλλος δὲ ἐποικοδομεῖ. ἕκαστος δὲ βλεπέτω πῶς ἐποικοδομεῖ; vv. 12, 14; Eph. ii. 20, ἐποικοδομηθέντες ἐπὶ τῷ θεμελίῳ τῶν ἀποστόλων κ.τ.λ. See οἶκος τοῦ θεοῦ of the Christian church. Hence generally = *to build up*, in the same sense as οἰκοδομεῖν; Acts xx. 32, παρατίθεμαι ὑμᾶς τῷ θεῷ καὶ τῷ λόγῳ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ, τῷ δυναμένῳ ἐποικοδομήσαι καὶ δοῦναι κληρονομίαν ἐν τοῖς ἡγιασμένοις πᾶσιν, the full accomplishment and perfecting of God's gracious work, the carrying on of the work already begun, Phil. i. 6. Comp. the difference of the tenses in Col. ii. 7, ἐν Χριστῷ περιπατεῖτε, ἐρρίζωμένοι καὶ ἐποικοδομούμενοι ἐν αὐτῷ. The word also occurs in Jude 20, ἐποικοδομοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς τῇ ἀγνωστῇ ὑμῶν πίστει, ἐν πνεύματι ἀγῶν προσευχόμενοι.

Οἰκονόμος, ὁ, *one who manages the house and the household affairs* (Plat., Xen., Aristot., Plut.), generally, *steward*. LXX. = מְשָׁלֵם, 1 Kings iv. 6, xvi. 9, xviii. 3; Isa. xxxvi. 3, 22; Luke xii. 42, xvi. 1, 3, 8; Gal. iv. 2; Rom. xvi. 23, ὁ οἶκόν. τῆς πόλεως, *chamberlain or governor*. Metaphorically applied in 1 Cor. iv. 1, οὕτως ἡμᾶς λογιζέσθω ἄνθρωπος ὡς ὑπηρέτας Χριστοῦ καὶ οἰκονόμους μυστηρίων θεοῦ; Tit. i. 7, δεῖ γὰρ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ἀνέγκλητον εἶναι ὡς θεοῦ οἰκονόμον; 1 Pet. iv. 10, εἰς ἑαυτοὺς τὸ χάρισμα διακονοῦντες ὡς καλοὶ οἰκονόμοι ποικίλης χάριτος θεοῦ. To understand this application of the term, we must remember that the οἰκονόμος stood in a twofold relationship, first to the Lord, to whom he was *answerable*, 1 Cor. iv. 2, Luke xvi. 1 sqq.; and, secondly, to

those with whom he had to deal in the Lord's name, Luke xii. 42, *τις ἄρα ἐστὶν ὁ πιστὸς οἰκονόμος ὁ φρόνιμος, ὃν καταστήσει ὁ κύριος ἐπὶ τῆς θεραπείας αὐτοῦ διδόναι ἐν καιρῷ σιτομέτριον* (with ver. 43, cf. Matt. xix. 28). With 1 Pet. iv. 10, cf. Matt. xxv. 14–30 and 1 Cor. xii. 28, vii. 14, 26.

Οἰκονομία, ἡ, administration of the house or of property (one's own or another's, Xen. *Oec.* 1); applied also to the administration of the affairs of state, Aristot. *Polit.* iii. 11, *ἡ βασιλεία πόλεως καὶ ἔθνους ἐνὸς ἢ πλείονος οἰκονομία*, Luke xvi. 2, 3, 4. Paul applies the word to the office with which he was entrusted, 1 Cor. ix. 17, *οἰκονομίαν πεπίστευμαι*, sc. τοῦ εὐαγγελίζεσθαι, ver. 16; cf. *οἰκονόμοι μυστηρίων θεοῦ*, iv. 1. It is not so easy to understand the word in the other passages where it occurs, Eph. i. 10, *γινώσκας ἡμῖν τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν ἣν προέθετο ἐν αὐτῷ εἰς οἰκονομίαν τοῦ πληρώματος τῶν καιρῶν*; iii. 2, *εἴ γε ἠκούσατε τὴν οἰκονομίαν τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς δοθείσης μοι εἰς ὑμᾶς*; iii. 9, 10, *φωτίσαι πάντας τίς ἡ οἰκονομία τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ ἀποκεκρυμμένου κ.τ.λ. ἵνα γνωρισθῇ νῦν . . . ἡ πολυποίκιλος σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ*; Col. i. 25, *ἧς (ἐκκλησίας) ἐγενόμην διάκονος κατὰ τὴν οἰκονομίαν τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν δοθείσάν μοι εἰς ὑμᾶς πληρῶσαι τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ*; 1 Tim. i. 4, *αἵτινες ζητήσεις παρέχουσιν μᾶλλον ἢ οἰκονομίαν θεοῦ τὴν ἐν πίστει*. In this last text the *οἰκονομία θεοῦ* clearly denotes that which was Timothy's duty, everything which hindered this he was to avoid; hence = *οἰκονομίαν οἴκου θεοῦ*, according to which we may explain Col. i. 25; the *τὴν δοθείσάν μοι* there may be compared with Luke xvi. 3, *ἀφαιρεῖται τὴν οἰκονομίαν ἀπ' ἐμοῦ*. In the passages from the Epistle to the Ephesians, however, the word manifestly does not denote a duty which the apostle had to perform. As the word may denote the action either of a commander or subordinate, Harless (on Eph. i. 10) takes the word in the first case to denote *regulation* and *arrangement*, and in the latter to signify *administration* and *performance*; but usage does not sanction this. *Οἰκονομία* denotes either (I.) actively, the administrative activity of the owner or of the steward (cf. Xen. *Oec.* 1); or (II.) passively, that which is administered, the administration or ordering of the house, or the arrangement, e.g., of a treatise or discourse (Plutarch). The most difficult passage is Eph. i. 9, 10, (*κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν αὐτοῦ, ἣν προέθετο ἐν αὐτῷ*) *εἰς οἰκονομίαν τοῦ πληρώματος τῶν καιρῶν*. The question is, What are we to regard as the object of *οἰκονομία*? Hofmann makes the *πλήρωμα τῶν καιρῶν* the object, and explains the expression in harmony with *οἰκονομεῖν τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν καιρῶν*, which is said to be analogous to the expression *οἰκονομεῖν τὴν ὕλην*, Lucian, *Hist. Conser.* 51, *a procedure directed to the fulness of times, i.e. which gives thereto an application corresponding with the design*. But *οἰκονομεῖν τὴν ὕλην* signifies not the applying, but the forming or moulding of the material, and thus *οἰκονομεῖν τὸ πλ. τ. κ.* would be *a procedure directed to the establishing of the fulness of times* (Storr and others), for which, at the most, *οἰκονομεῖν τοὺς καιροὺς* might be said. But, upon the whole, *τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν καιρῶν* is an utterly inappropriate object for *οἰκονομία*. The true object is to be found

in the relative ἣν προέθετο. It is the divine purpose which here is said to be administered. The genitive τοῦ πληρ. τ. κ. is not to be taken as a characteristic feature of this administration (Meyer),—which would have no meaning,—it denotes quite generally the relation of *pertaining to*; the administration of God's saving purpose pertaining to the fulness of the times, as Calov and Rückert rightly explain, *dispensatio propria plenitudini temporum*. Thus οἰκονομία here is to be taken as passive. The οἰκονομία in iii. 2, 9 also has reference to the administration of grace in the N. T.,—iii. 2, οἰκ. τῆς χάριτος, ver. 9, τοῦ μυστηρίου κ.τ.λ.,—inasmuch as salvation is made known and communicated to men according to the divine order and arrangement, and thus a further sanction is given to take the word passively in these places also.

Ὀλλυμι, fut. ὀλώ (cf. in the N. T. 1 Cor. i. 19 from the LXX.), ὀλέσω, aor. ὤλεσα; 2d perf. ὤλωλα, intransitive, like most perfects of this kind, with a middle signification, ὀλλυμαι, ὀλοῦμαι, ὠλόμην. Döderlein, *Hom. Gloss.* 2163, compares ὤλωλα with ἐλολύζω, *to cry, to howl*; but Curtius rejects this because of the difference in the stem-vowel (υ in ὀλολύζω). Schenkl (*Wörterbuch*) considers the primary form to have been ὀλνυμι, and that this may be akin to the Latin *volnus, vulnus*. The simple verb occurs for the most part in poetry, and ἀπόλλυμι in prose. It signifies, (I.) like the Latin *perdere*, in a stronger or weaker sense, (a.) *to ruin or destroy*, chiefly of living things, *to kill, to destroy*.—Soph. *Oed. Col.* 395, νῦν γὰρ θεοὶ σ' ὀρθοῦσι, πρόσθε δ' ὤλλυσαν; (b.) *to lose*,—the subject being the sufferer; Hom. *Od.* xix. 274, ἐταίρους ὤλεσε καὶ νῆα. Especially θυμόν, ψυχὴν, etc., = *to lose one's life*.—(II.) Middle and 2d perfect intransitively, *to perish, to die, to go to ruin*, of living beings, and generally in case of a violent death; also, without implying loss of life, ὤλωλα = *I am lost or ruined*. The fundamental thought is not by any means *annihilation*, but perhaps *corruption*, an injurious force, which the subject exerts or cannot hinder.—In the N. T. only ἀπόλλυμι occurs; but in the LXX. the simple verb often is used as = כָּנַס, Job iv. 11, Prov. i. 32, xi. 7; נָחַס, Job xviii. 11; נָחַס, Prov. ii. 22.

Ἀπόλλυμι, (I.) (a.) *to destroy, to ruin*; Homer uses it chiefly of death in battle; rarely in prose = *to kill*. Synon. διαφθεῖρειν; Plat. *Rep.* x. 608 E, τὸ μὲν ἀπολλύναι καὶ διαφθεῖρον πᾶν τὸ κακὸν εἶναι, τὸ δὲ σῶζον καὶ ὠφελοῦν τὸ ἀγαθόν. In the N. T. Matt. ii. 13, xii. 14, xxi. 41, etc., 1 Cor. i. 19, ἀπολώ τὴν σοφίαν τῶν σοφῶν (Isa. xxix. 14).—(b.) *To lose by decay*, or simply, *to lose* in contrast with λαμβάνειν, ἔχειν, εὕρισκεν (Plat. *Parm.* 163 D, *Phaed.* 75 E); Xen. *Hell.* vii. 4. 13, ἔφυγον καὶ πολλοὺς μὲν ἄνδρας, πολλὰ δὲ ὄπλα ἀπώλεσαν; Matt. x. 42, οὐ μὴ ἀπολέσῃ τὸν μισθὸν αὐτοῦ; Mark ix. 41; Luke xv. 4, 9; John xviii. 9, vi. 39; 2 John 8.—(II.) Middle and 2d perfect, ἀπόλωλα = *to go to ruin, to perish* (by force), in opposition to σωθῆναι. The form of imprecation, ἀπολοίμην, κακίστα ἀπολοίμην, is worthy of notice; cf. Job iii. 3, ἀπόλοιτο ἡ ἡμέρα. The 2d perf., *it is all over with me, I am ruined, I am lost*. Matt. viii. 25, σῶσον ἡμᾶς, ἀπολλύμεθα; ix. 17; Mark ii. 22, iv. 38; Luke xi. 51, xiii. 3, 5, 33, xv. 17, xxi. 18, θρῖξ ἐκ τῆς κεφαλῆς ὑμῶν οὐ μὴ ἀπόληται, cf. Acts xxvii. 34, v. 37; John vi. 12; 1 Cor. x.

9, 10, ἀπολ. ὑπό τινος, cf. Xen. *Cyrop.* vii. 1. 47.—Heb. i. 11; Jas. i. 11; Rev. xviii. 14, etc.; John vi. 27, ἡ βρώσις ἡ ἀπολλυμένη, *transitory food*, in contrast with ἡ μένουσα εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον; 1 Pet. i. 7, χρυσίον τὸ ἀπολλύμενον.—The use of the 2d perfect participle, τὸ ἀπολωλός, Luke xix. 10; Matt. xviii. 11, ἦλθε ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρ. σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός, is worthy of notice; it corresponds with the expression τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἀπολωλότα οἴκου Ἰσραὴλ, Matt. x. 6, xv. 24, cf. Luke xv. 4, 6. This expression is derived from Ezek. xxxiv. 4; Ps. cxix. 175, cf. Isa. liii. 6, and it means the sheep which are no longer in the fold, who are lost to the flock and to the shepherd, cf. 1 Sam. xix. 4, 20, hence = προβ. πλανώμενα, 1 Pet. ii. 25; Matt. xviii. 12–14. In the sphere of saving grace, to which Ps. xxiii. c. 3, xcv. 7 may be referred, it denotes those who are not within the pale of Christian blessings. It is doubtful, however, whether the distinctive N. T. use of ἀπόλλυσθαι is to be referred to this.

The application of the word (in the middle), which is peculiar to the N. T., and is without analogy in profane Greek, is to the future and eternal doom of man; and thus it is used specially by St. Paul and St. John, while hints only of this meaning occur in the synoptical Gospels. Thus John iii. 16, ἵνα πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτὸν μὴ ἀπόληται, ἀλλ' ἔχῃ ζωὴν αἰώνιον; x. 28, ζωὴν αἰώνιον δίδωμι αὐτοῖς καὶ οὐ μὴ ἀπόλωνται; Rom. ii. 12, ὅσοι ἀνόμως ἡμαρτον, ἀνόμως καὶ ἀπολούνται; 1 Cor. xv. 18, οἱ κοιμηθέντες ἐν Χριστῷ ἀπόλονται; viii. 11, ἀπόλλυται ὁ ἀσθενῶν . . . δι' ὃν Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν (cf. Rom. xiv. 15); i. 18, οἱ ἀπολλύμενοι, as against σωζόμενοι. So 2 Cor. ii. 15, iv. 3; 2 Thess. ii. 10; 2 Pet. iii. 9, μὴ βουλόμενός τις ἀπολέσθαι. Compare the corresponding use of the transitive in Jas. iv. 12, εἰς ἐστὶν ὁ νομοθέτης καὶ κριτής, ὁ δυνάμενος σῶσαι καὶ ἀπολέσαι; John vi. 39, ἵνα πᾶν ὃ δέδωκέν μοι μὴ ἀπολέσω ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἀλλὰ ἀναστήσω αὐτὸ ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμ. (xviii. 9, cf. xvii. 12). An indirect correspondence only is traceable in the use of the word in the synoptical Gospels, where the transitive ἀπόλλυμαι prevails (except in Matt. v. 29, 30, συμφέρει γάρ σοι ἵνα ἀπόληται ἐν τῶν μελῶν σου καὶ μὴ ὅλον τὸ σῶμα σου βληθῇ εἰς γέενναν). See Matt. x. 28, ὁ δυνάμενος καὶ ψυχὴν καὶ σῶμα ἀπολέσαι ἐν γέεννῃ; x. 39, ὁ εὐρὼν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἀπολέσει αὐτήν, καὶ ὁ ἀπολέσας τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἔνεκεν ἐμοῦ εὐρήσει αὐτήν; xvi. 25; Luke xvii. 33, ὃς ἐὰν ζητήσῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ περιποιήσασθαι, ἀπολέσει αὐτήν, καὶ ὃς ἐὰν ἀπολέσῃ, ζωογονήσει αὐτήν; Mark viii. 35, ἀπολέσει . . . σώσει; Luke ix. 24; ver. 25, τί γὰρ ὠφελεῖται ἄνθρωπος κερδήσας τὸν κόσμον ὅλον, ἑαυτὸν δὲ ἀπολέσας ἢ ζημιωθείς; cf. Mark viii. 37, τί γὰρ ἀντάλλαγμα τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ; Luke ix. 56, Received text (for ψυχὰς ἀπολέσαι some mss. read ψ. ἀποκτείνειν). The most striking parallel in the synoptical Gospels is the figurative expression in Luke xv. 24, 32, νεκρὸς ἦν καὶ ἔζησεν, καὶ ἀπολωλὸς καὶ εὐρέθη. We cannot say that ἀπολλ. is used in these passages exactly in the sense in which it occurs in the writings of St. Paul and St. John, viz. with reference to the everlasting salvation or misery of man. It is inexactly used both where it occurs as a strong synonym for ἀποκτείνειν (Matt. x. 27, 28), and where it stands as the antithesis of εὐρίσκειν. O. T. usage, moreover, furnishes no analogy. because none of the corresponding Hebrew

words (הרג, חרם, חרש) are used in this sense. In most places ἀπολλ. is simply a strong synonym for ἀποκτείνειν or ἀποθνήσκειν. In the Apocrypha, too, the word does not occur in the N. T. sense. The intransitive ἀπώλεια, ruin or destruction, occurs in some passages of the O. T. in close connection with Hades, and thus serves to denote the state after death; Prov. xv. 11, ἄδης καὶ ἀπώλεια—חַיָּת וְחַיָּת; Ps. lxxxviii. 12, μὴ διηγῆσεται τις ἐν τάφῳ τὸ ἔλεός σου, καὶ τὴν ἀληθειάν σου ἐν τῇ ἀπωλείᾳ, comp. ver. 13; Job xxviii. 22, ἡ ἀπώλεια καὶ ὁ θάνατος εἶπαν; xxii. 6, γυμνὸς ὁ ἄδης ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ, καὶ οὐκ ἔστι περιβόλαιον τῇ ἀπωλείᾳ. In these passages it is = חַיָּת. Considering that this word only occurs here and in Job xxxi. 12; that in post-biblical Hebrew it signifies Hades (חַיָּת, חַיָּתִית, חַיָּתִי, see Levy, *Chald. Wörterb.*, who quotes Isa. liii. 9, כְּמָוֶת חַיָּתִית, “the death of perfect annihilation, the extinction of future life”); that, judging from Rev. ix. 11, it must be a significant and distinctive word,—see Wetstein’s quotation from Emek Hammelech, xv. 3, “*infimus Gehennae locus est Abaddon . . . unde nemo emergit . . .*”—the most probable conclusion is, that the N. T. use, especially of the intrans. ἀπόλλυσθαι, denotes utter and final ruin and perdition. Nevertheless, we must always keep in mind the expression “lost sheep;” the state of the case may perhaps be rather, that the condition of the lost sheep obliges us to regard this ἀπόλλυσθαι as a state which may be reversed.—Συναπόλλυσθαι, Heb. xi. 31.

Ἀπώλεια, ἡ, (I.) transitively the losing or loss; Matt. xxvi. 8, εἰς τί ἡ ἀπώλεια αὐτῆς; Mark xiv. 4, cf. Theophr. *Char. Eth.* 15, ὅτι ἀπόλλυσι καὶ τοῦτο τὸ ἀργύριον = to squander; (II.) intransitively, perdition, ruin (Deut. iv. 26; Isa. xiv. 23, and often). In the N. T. of the state after death wherein exclusion from salvation is a realized fact, wherein man, instead of becoming what he might have been, is lost and ruined; cf. ἀπόλλυσθαι, often contrasted with γίγνεσθαι in Plato, *Parm.* 156, 163 D, E; *Rep.* vii. 527 B; *Conv.* 211 A; corresponding with חַיָּת, Job xxviii. 22, xxvi. 6; Ps. lxxxviii. 12; Prov. xv. 12. See ἀπόλλυμι. Rev. xvii. 8, μέλλει ἀναβαίνειν ἐκ τῆς ἀβύσσου καὶ εἰς ἀπώλειαν ὑπάγει; ver. 11. Opposed to σωτηρία, Phil. i. 28; ζωή, Matt. vii. 13. See Heb. x. 39, ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐκ ἐσμὲν ὑποστολῆς εἰς ἀπώλειαν, ἀλλὰ πίστεως εἰς περιποίησιν ζωῆς; Rom. ix. 22, σκευὴ ὀργῆς κατηρτισμένα εἰς ἀπώλειαν, cf. ver. 23, ἃ προητοίμασεν εἰς δόξαν; Phil. iii. 19; 1 Tim. vi. 9; Acts viii. 20; 2 Pet. ii. 1, 3, iii. 7, 16; ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας, John xvii. 12, is a name given to Judas, and to Antichrist, 2 Thess. ii. 3. We cannot correctly compare the passive expression with the active one מְחַיֵּית חַיָּת, Isa. i. 4, rendered by the LXX. rightly, υἱοὶ ἄνομοι, cf. υἱοὶ τῆς βασιλείας, and other like expressions; see υἱός.

Ἀπολλύων, Rev. ix. 11, a Greek name for the ἄγγελος τῆς ἀβύσσου; ὄνομα αὐτῷ Ἑβραϊστὶ Ἀβαδδὼν (*vid.* ἀπόλλυμι) = destroyer, from ἀπολλύω, a non-Attic form side by side with ἀπόλλυμι, occurring in later Greek in the N. T., Rom. xiv. 15.

Ὄνομα, τό, from the same root as νοῦς, γινώσκω, viz. ἴNO; originally perhaps ὄγνομα (Ion. οὔνομα), cf. the Latin *cognomen*; Sanscrit, *naman*, from gná—*noscere*; hence

equivalent to *sign* or *token*;—appellation, name, and, indeed, usually a proper name. In Homer, of persons only, afterwards of things also. In the N. T. (excepting in Mark xiv. 32; Luke i. 26; Rev. iii. 12, xiii. 17) of persons only, Matt. xxvii. 32; Mark v. 22; Luke i. 5, 27, and often. The mention of a name is introduced by the word *ὀνόματι* (Xen., Plat.; cf. Krüger, § xlvi. 15. 17), Matt. xxvii. 32, Luke i. 5, v. 27, etc., the name itself being in the same case as the substantive; the accusative *τοῦνομα* = *τὸ ὄνομα*, only in Matt. xxvii. 57. The usual and distinctive usage of the N. T. rests upon the significance of the name, and this corresponds with O. T. precedent. The Heb. *שם* means originally *sign* or *token*, cf. Isa. lv. 13 with *שם, עֵשׂתָּא עַיִן הַיָּד עַל הַיָּד*, *עֵשׂתָּא עַיִן הַיָּד עַל הַיָּד*, of the tower of Babel. The name is a sign or mark of him who bears it; it describes what is, or is said to be, characteristic of the man, and what appears as such, just as we find in Gen. ii. 20, of the naming of the animals by Adam, with the statement, *וַיִּקְרָא אָדָם שְׁמוֹת לְבְּהֵמָה*, *וְלַחַיִּים וְלָכָל הָרֶמֶשׂ הָאָרֶץ*, *וְלַחַיִּים וְלָכָל הָרֶמֶשׂ הָאָרֶץ*, *וְלַחַיִּים וְלָכָל הָרֶמֶשׂ הָאָרֶץ*; Gen. iii. 20, v. 2, 29, xvi. 11, xvii. 19, xxvii. 36, the names of Jacob's children, and many others. This specially appears in changes of name, as in Gen. xvii. 5, 15; Ruth i. 20, etc. Indications of this significance of a name are traceable in classical Greek, *e.g.* in the contrast sometimes drawn between the name and the thing or fact itself, *e.g.* Eurip. *Or.* 454, *ὄνομα, ἔργον δ' οὐκ ἔχουσιν οἱ φίλοι*, cf. Rev. iii. 1, *ὄνομα ἔχεις ὅτι ζῆς, καὶ νεκρὸς εἶ*. For this significance in the naming of a person, see Matt. i. 21, *καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν*. *αὐτὸς γὰρ σώσει τὸν λαὸν κ.τ.λ.*; vv. 23, 25; Luke i. 13, 31, 63, ii. 21; Mark v. 9, *λεγιὼν ὀνομά μοι, ὅτι πολλοί ἐσμεν*; Rev. xix. 12, 13, ix. 11, cf. xiii. 17, xv. 2, etc. Hence we find changes of name, and the addition of a new name, Mark iii. 16, *ἐπέθηκεν ὄνομα τῷ Σιμῶνι Πέτρον*, ver. 17, cf. Matt. xvi. 18; Luke ix. 54 sq.; Acts iv. 36, xiii. 6, 8; Phil. ii. 9, *ἐχαρίσατο αὐτῷ ὄνομα τὸ ὑπὲρ πάντων ὄνομα*; Heb. i. 4, *τοσοῦτω κρείττω γενόμενος τῶν ἀγγέλων ὅσῳ διαφορώτερον παρ' αὐτοὺς κεκληρονόμηκεν ὄνομα*. Hence, too, the import of such declarations as Rev. ii. 17, *τῷ νικῶντι δώσω . . . ὄνομα καινόν*; iii. 12, *γράψω ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ μου . . . καὶ τὸ ὄνομά μου τὸ καινόν*, xxii. 4. The name represents the person who bears it, see Phil. iv. 3, *ὡν τὰ ὀνόμ. ἐν βίβλῳ ζωῆς*; Luke x. 20; Acts i. 15, xix. 13, *ἐπεχέλησαν δέ τινες τῶν . . . ἐξορκιστῶν ὀνομάζειν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἔχοντας τὰ πνεύματα τὰ πονηρὰ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ*; xxvi. 9, *πρὸς τὸ ὄνομα Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Ναζωραίου πολλὰ ἐναντία πράξαι*; Eph. i. 21, *ὑπεράνω πάσης ἀρχῆς . . . καὶ παντὸς ὀνόματος ὀνομαζομένου κ.τ.λ.*; Lev. xviii. 12, and other places; and hence we may explain *βαπτίζειν εἰς τὸ ὄνομά τινος*, Matt. xxviii. 19; Acts xix. 5, cf. 1 Cor. i. 13, *ἢ εἰς τὸ ὄνομα Παύλου ἐβαπτίσθητε*; vv. 14, 15, where Paul says that he had himself baptized none, so that no one could say that they were baptized in his own name; cf. 1 Cor. x. 2, *πάντες εἰς τὸν Μωϋσῆν ἐβαπτίσαντο*; Rom. vi. 2, *εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν (vid. βαπτίζω)*. Still between *εἰς τὸ ὄνομά τινος* and *εἰς τινα* there is this difference,—the name expresses not *who*, but *what* one is; cf. Matt. x. 41, 42, *εἰς ὄνομα προφήτου, δικαίου, μαθητοῦ τινα δέχεσθαι*; Mark ix. 41, *ὅς γὰρ ἂν ποτίσῃ ὑμᾶς ποτήριον ὕδατος ἐν ὀνόματι ὅτι Χριστοῦ ἐστέ*; 1 Pet. iv. 16, *εἰ δὲ ὡς Χριστιανὸς, μὴ αἰσχυνέσθω, δοξαζέτω δὲ τὸν θεὸν ἐν τῷ*

ὀνόματι τούτῳ (*i.e.* "on account of this name of *Christian* for which he suffers"); Acts iii. 16, ἐστερέωσεν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ. Generally the name describes, for the sake of others, what the individual is; it expresses what he is *for another*, and hence the names Ishmael, Isaac, Jacob and his sons, Moses, the children of the prophet Isaiah (vii. 3, viii. 3, etc.), as is clear from the fact that the name is generally given by another, and when given by any one to himself, it is an account of his relationship to others. Rev. ii. 17, ὄνομα καινόν, ὃ οὐδεὶς οἶδεν εἰ μὴ ὁ λαμβάνων, is not an exception to this, but must be taken as analogous with 2 Sam. xii. 25, Nathan called Solomon's name Jedidiah יְהִיָּדִיד. The same applies to the altered names Abraham, Israel, Peter, and others. To baptize "in the name of," etc., means to baptize into that which the person named is for the baptized; and therefore it is not merely a designation of the person in whose name the rite is celebrated, but a full designation of his character and relationship. See Matt. xviii. 20, συνηγμένοι εἰς τὸ ἐμὸν ὄνομα. This is specially true when the name of God and of Christ is used. The *name of God* denotes all that God is for man, and this is said to be known by men so that they are said to know God accordingly; it is the expression *for men* of what God is. Hence 2 Sam. vi. 2, of the ark of the covenant, ἐφ' ἣν ἐπεκλήθη τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου τῶν δυνάμεων καθημένου ἐπὶ τῶν χειρῶν ἐπ' αὐτῆς. It is the representation of God which is expressed thereby. In His name God manifests Himself to men (Gen. xvi. 13), see especially Ex. vi. 3, "I appeared to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, אֶת־יְהוָה לֹא נִדְעָתִי בְּאֵל שַׁמַּי וְשֵׁם יְהוָה;" Ex. iii. 15, וְהָיָה שְׁמִי לְעֵלְמָה וְהָיָה לְךָ דָּר, —and where God's glory is manifest, His name is said to be there. Compare Ex. xx. 24, ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ οὗ ἐὰν ἐπονομάσω τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐκεῖ καὶ ἦξω πρὸς σέ, καὶ εὐλογήσω σε; 1 Kings v. 3, οὐκ ἠδύνατο οἰκοδομῆσαι οἶκον τῷ ὀνόματι κυρίου, cf. iii. 2, οἶκος τῷ κυρίῳ, Hebrew יְהוָה שְׁמֵי; viii. 43, ὅπως γινώσι πάντες οἱ λαοὶ τὸ ὄνομά σου, —and therefore God's name is the expression or revelation of what God is as the God of salvation (see δόξα, and compare the connection between the first and second petition in the Lord's prayer), and not only the expression, but the communication thereof, intended for the knowledge and use of men. See above, Ex. xx. 24; 1 Kings xiv. 21, ἦν (πόλιν) ἐξελέξατο κύριος θέσθαι τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἐκεῖ; 2 Kings xxi. 4, 7, xxiii. 27; 2 Chron. vi. 33, xxxiii. 4; Ps. xlviii. 11, κατὰ τὸ ὄνομά σου, ὁ θεός, οὕτως καὶ ἡ αἰνεσίς σου ἐπὶ τὰ πέρατα τῆς γῆς; Isa. xxvi. 8, "the desire of our soul is to Thy name and to the remembrance of Thee." Isa. xviii. 7; Jer. xiv. 9, וְהָיָה שְׁמִי עָלֶיךָ יְהוָה בְּקִרְבְּךָ יְהוָה; Isa. lii. 6, lxiii. 14, 16, 19, lxiv. 1; cf. John xvii. 6, ἐφανερώσά σου τὸ ὄνομα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις; ver. 26, xii. 28, δόξασόν σου τὸ ὄν. This explains the various ways in which the name of the Lord is spoken of, as also in Ex. xxiii. 21, where it is said of the angel who was to keep and guide Israel, שְׁמִי בְּקִרְבְּךָ. (It must be observed that אֱלֹהִים, as Oehler shows in Herzog's *Realencykl.* art. "Name," is not properly God's name.) The distinction between ὄνομα and δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ, κυρίου, is simply that the latter is the manifestation of that which God is towards us, and the former announces this so as to determine our relation towards Him (for the name is said to be uttered and hallowed by us. "We have not, indeed, already with the name itself the person, but that which leads to

this," Culmann, *Ethik*, p. 165). Thus in the N. T. the name of Christ signifies what Christ is, Mark vi. 14, *φανερὸν γὰρ ἐγένετο τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ*, and expresses this for us; it is the embodiment and presentation of what Christ is, demanding our recognition, see the texts already cited, Heb. i. 4; Phil. ii. 9; Acts iii. 16, iv. 12, *οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν ἄλλῳ οὐδενὶ ἢ σωτηρία· οὐδὲ γὰρ ὄνομά ἐστιν ἕτερον . . . τὸ δεδομένον ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἐν ᾧ δεῖ σωθῆναι ἡμᾶς*; ix. 15, *βαστάσαι τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐνώπιον ἐθνῶν*; Rev. ii. 3, *κρατεῖς τὸ ὄνομά μου*. Hence the expression *πιστεῦεν εἰς τὸ ὄν. αὐτοῦ*, John i. 12, ii. 23, iii. 18; 1 John v. 13; *τῷ ὀνόμ. τοῦ υἱοῦ τ. θ.*, 1 John iii. 23, cf. Acts iii. 16, *ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει τοῦ ὀνόμ. αὐτοῦ*. We must ever remember that what Christ is not only lies in His name, but is said to be present to us in the name whenever we use it; hence *ἐπικαλεῖσθαι τὸ ὄν. τ. κυρ.*, Acts ii. 21, and often; 2 Tim. ii. 19, *πᾶς ὁ ὀνομάζων τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου*. And this explains such expressions as John xx. 31, *ἵνα πιστεύοντες ζῶν ἔχητε ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ* (see John xvii. 5, 6); Rom. i. 5, *εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως . . . ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ*; Matt. xix. 29, *ὅστις ἀφῆκεν ἀδελφούς ἢ ἀδελφὰς . . . ἕνεκεν τοῦ ὀνόματός μου*, xxiv. 9; Mark xiii. 13; Luke xxi. 12, 17, *ἔσεσθε μισούμενοι . . . διὰ τὸ ὄνομά μου*; John xv. 21, cf. John xvii. 11, 12, *ἐτήρουν αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου*; Acts v. 41, ix. 16, xv. 26, xxi. 13. And particularly in the oft-occurring declaration that something is done "in the name" of God or of Jesus Christ, it is clearly meant that the name is the presentation of what He is. This *ποιεῖν τι ἐν ὀνόματι τινος* does not occur in profane Greek; and this is not (as Buttmann says, *Gramm. des N. T.* § 147. 10) because, through Oriental influence, a meaning strange and contrary to usage has been put into the preposition,—viz. that of the Hebrew *בְּ*, as denoting the instrument (of persons = *διὰ* with the genitive, *adjutus, opera*),—but because such a meaning of the word *ὄνομα*, and such a significance as belonging to *the name*, is foreign to profane Greek. It may be taken for granted that Christianity first introduced the use of the expression, *in the name of*, into our western languages. *בְּ* certainly, in *בְּשֵׁם*, does in some places denote the instrument, but only in the weakest sense. Thus Ps. cxviii. 10, 11, 12, *τῷ ὀνόματι κυρίου ἡμνᾶμεν αὐτούς*; Ps. liv. 3, *ὁ θεὸς, ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου σῶσόν με* (cf. Matt. ix. 34, *ἐν τῷ ἄρχοντι τῶν δαιμονίων ἐμβάλλειν τὰ δαιμόνια*). We shall not be far wrong if we take the *בְּ* in *בְּשֵׁם* in most cases simply as the *בְּ* of accompaniment, e.g. *λαλεῖν ἀλήθειαν ἐν ὀνόμ. κυρ.*, 1 Kings xxii. 16; 2 Chron. xviii. 15; 1 Sam. xvii. 45, *σὺ ἔρχῃ πρὸς μὲ ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ . . . καὶ ἐγὼ πορεύομαι πρὸς σὲ ἐν ὀνόμ. κυρίου θεοῦ*; Mic. iv. 5, *πορευσόμεθα ἐν ὀνόμ. κυρ.*; 1 Kings xviii. 32, *ᾠκοδόμησε λίθους ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου*; xviii. 24, *βοᾶτε ἐν ὀνόματι θεῶν ὑμῶν, καὶ ἐγὼ ἐπικαλέσομαι ἐν τῷ ὄν. κυρ. τοῦ θεοῦ μου*. The presentation of God denoted in the name brings the act or effect into immediate relation to Him as its cause; hence, frequently, *ἐπ' ὀνόμ.*, e.g. *εὐλογεῖν ἐπὶ τῷ ὄν. αὐτοῦ*, Deut. xxi. 5; *λαλεῖν, προφητεύειν ἐπὶ τῷ ὄν.*, Jer. xi. 21, xxvi. 16, 20; 2 Chron. xxxiii. 18. The actor may thus appear as the representative of the person referred to, e.g. 1 Kings xxi. 8, *ἔγραψε βιβλίον ἐπὶ τῷ ὄν. Ἀχαάβ*, though elsewhere another form of expression is chosen, Esth. viii. 8, *γράψατε καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐκ τοῦ ὀνόμ. μου*; ver. 8, *τοῦ βασιλέως ἐπιτάξαντος*; ver. 10, *διὰ τοῦ βασιλέως*.

The context, however, must in these cases contain a reference to this representative action or writing by proxy, and it must not be taken as the ordinary meaning of the phrase. The actor or speaker does not always represent truly the person to whom he refers; this reference of his is intended to imply that the person referred to authorizes the act or statement in question; see Jer. xiv. 19, *ψευδῇ οἱ προφηῇται προφητεύουσιν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου, οὐκ ἀπέστειλα αὐτοὺς καὶ οὐκ ἐνετειλάμην αὐτούς*; xxix. 23. The *ἐν ὄν.* is used just in the same way as this *ἐπ' ὄν.*, cf. 1 Sam. xxv. 5, *ἐρωτήσατε αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόμ. μου εἰς εἰρήνην*, with ver. 9, *λαλοῦσι τοὺς λόγους τούτους ἐν τῷ ὀνόμ. Δαυίδ*. Side by side with *εὐλογεῖν ἐπὶ τῷ ὄν.* we have *ἐν*, 2 Sam. vi. 18, 1 Chron. xvi. 2; *λαλεῖν, προφητεύειν ἐν ὄν.*, Zech. xiii. 3; 1 Chron. xxi. 19; Mic. iv. 5. The simple dative is also used in similar connections, *προφητεύειν τῷ ὄν.*, Jer. xxvi. 9, xxix. 21; *λαλεῖν τῷ ὄν.*, Jer. xlv. 16; Deut. xviii. 22, 7, cf. Matt. vii. 22; Jas. v. 10. In general, it may be said that reference is thus made to the cause to which the act or effect is traceable, to the person who sanctions it, or to the motive which occasions or determines it; comp. for this import of the dative, Winer, § xxxi. 6. This, beyond a doubt, is always the case when *ἐπὶ τῷ ὄν.* occurs; see Matt. xviii. 5, *ὅς ἂν δέξηται ἐν παιδίον τοιούτον ἐπὶ τῷ ὄν. μου*; Mark ix. 37; Luke ix. 48; Mark ix. 39, *ὅς ποιήσει δύναμιν ἐπὶ τῷ ὄν. μου*; Luke xxiv. 47, *κηρυχθῆναι ἐπὶ τῷ ὄν. αὐτοῦ μετάνοιαν καὶ ἄφεσιν ἁμ.*; Acts v. 28, *διδάσκειν ἐπὶ τῷ ὄν. Ἰησοῦ*; Matt. xxiv. 5, *πολλοὶ γὰρ ἐλεύσονται ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόμ. μου λέγοντες ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ Χριστός*; Mark xiii. 6; Luke xxi. 8; *βαπτίζειν ἐπὶ τῷ ὄν.*, Acts ii. 38. The same is true of the expression *ἐν ὀνόμ.*, Luke x. 17, *τὰ δαιμόνια ὑποτάσσεται ἡμῖν ἐν τῷ ὀνομ. σου*; Matt. xxi. 9, *ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόμ. κυρίου*, xxiii. 39; John v. 43, xii. 13; 1 Cor. vi. 11, *ἀπελούσασθε . . . ἐν τῷ ὀνόμ. τ. κυρ. Ἰησοῦ καὶ ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν*; Acts xvi. 18, *παραγγέλλω σοι ἐν ὀνόμ. Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐξελθεῖν ἀπ' αὐτῆς*; 2 Thess. iii. 6; Phil. ii. 10, *ἵνα ἐν τῷ ὀνόμ. Ἰησοῦ πάντων γόνων κάμψῃ*. So also *αἰνεῖν, δοξάζειν ἐν ὄν.*, and others, 1 Pet. iv. 16; Ps. cv. 31; 1 Chron. xvi. 10. This may amount to the statement of the means or instrument, e.g. Acts iv. 10, *ἐν τῷ ὀνόμ. Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ οὗτος παρέστηκεν ἰγνής*; Mark xvi. 17, ix. 38; Luke ix. 49; Acts iv. 7. (In this case, however, *διὰ τοῦ ὄν.* is also used, Acts iv. 30, *τέρατα γίνεσθαι διὰ τοῦ ὄν. τοῦ ἁγίου παιδός σου Ἰησοῦ*.) But the expression is very seldom used in this instrumental sense. *Ἐν ὀνόματι*, in its various applications, denotes that which characterizes or accompanies the act, the sphere (according to the Greek manner of thinking) in which it is performed (cf. Lys. in *Agor.* 130. 42, *ἀπέκτειναν ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ προφάσει, i.e. the pretext or reason*). So *εὐχαριστεῖν ἐν ὄν. τοῦ κυρ. ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, Eph. v. 20; *αἰτεῖν ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι*, John xiv. 13, 14, xv. 16, xvi. 23, 24, 26; *κρίνειν ἐν τῷ ὄν. τοῦ κυρ.*, 1 Cor. v. 4. As *εὐχαριστεῖν ἐν ὄν. Χριστοῦ* cannot mean, to give thanks in Christ's stead, no more (to refer to a seemingly profound explanation) can *αἰτεῖν ἐν ὄν. Χριστοῦ* signify a prayer in which the person praying appears as the representative of Christ. Rather is it a prayer for which Christ Himself appears, which Christ mediates,—a prayer based upon the truth that Christ is our Mediator, and intercedes for us. *Κρίνειν ἐν τῷ ὄν. τοῦ κυρ.*, 1 Cor. v. 4, comp. Ps.

lxxxix. 13, 17, ἀγαλλιᾶσθαι ἐν ὧν. The word also furnishes the reason in John x. 25 ; 1 Pet. iv. 14 ; Jas. v. 14 ; John xiv. 26, and other places.

Ο Π, root of the future of ὁράω, ὄψομαι ; aorist passive, ὤφθην ; future passive, ὀφθήσομαι.

Πρόσωπον, τό = τὸ πρὸς τοῖς ὠφὶ μέρος, the front face, as μέτωπον, the forehead = τὸ μετὰ τοὺς ὠπας. In Homer and the Attic writers πρόσωπον signifies the face, and, in a wider sense, the aspect, august appearance ; usually of persons, rarely of animals ; applied still more seldom to things. See Lexicons. Then the forward part, the front (inasmuch as the face indicates the direction), usually, of an army ; also of ships, etc. Not till later Greek, often in Polybius, the person ; in Lucian, person or character which appears upon the stage. Lucian, *De calumn.* 6, akin to the signification mask, visor ; in Demosthenes, Lucian, Pollux, comp. the Latin *persona*. " *Pro homine ipso, quatenus aliquam personam sustinet*, Aristot. *Rhet.* ii. 517 ; Epicur. *Stob. Ecl.* i. 218, *et innumeris Polybii, Dionysii, aliorumque locis ;* ἐκεῖνα τὰ πρόσωπα, illi, *Longin.* xiv. 56 ; *θηλυκὸν πρ.*, *Artem.* ii. 36 ; *Melamp. Div.* p. 462 ; *ιερατικὸν πρ.*, *Apsines, Τέχν.* 287 ; *ἐλεεινόν*, *Synes. Ep.* 154, 293, *et saepissime apud Jurisconsultos graecos.*" *Lob. Phryn.* 380. In this sense in ecclesiastical Greek, as a synonym with ὑπόστασις, ἰδιότης of the Trinity. In biblical Greek, however, it seems nowhere to occur in this sense, not even in the combination πρόσωπον λαμβάνειν ; see under (II.). Apart from a few peculiarly figurative combinations, which may be traced to the Hebrew usage of פָּנִים, the N. T. usage coincides with that of profane Greek. It denotes (I.) face, countenance ; Matt. vi. 16, 17, xvii. 2, 6, xxvi. 39, 67 ; Luke ix. 29 ; Rev. x. 1 ; Acts vi. 15 ; 2 Cor. xi. 20, and often. The face shows the direction, and the direction indicates the goal, the intention, purpose, without, however, fully defining it ; comp. 1 Pet. iii. 12, ὀφθαλμοὶ κυρίου ἐπὶ δικαίους καὶ ὦτα αὐτοῦ εἰς δέησιν αὐτῶν, πρόσωπον δὲ κυρίου ἐπὶ ποιούντας κακά ; comp. Rev. xx. 11, οὐ ἀπὸ προσώπου ἐφυγεν κ.τ.λ. Hence the plastic expressions, for which there are no analogies in profane Greek, Luke ix. 51, αὐτὸς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ἐστήριξε τοῦ πορεύεσθαι εἰς Ἱερ. Still more strange and striking is ver. 53, τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ἦν πορευόμενον εἰς Ἱερ., comp. Jer. xlii. 15, εἰς ἡμεῖς δώτε τὸ πρόσωπον ὑμῶν εἰς Αἴγυπτον ; ver. 17, οἱ θέντες τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτῶν εἰς γῆν Αἴγ. ἐνοικεῖν ἐκεῖ ; 2 Sam. xvii. 11, τὸ πρόσωπόν σου πορευόμενον ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν. With the countenance the person also turns to one, and hence the prepositional combinations with εἰς, ἐν, κατὰ, πρό, ἀπό = before one ; 2 Cor. viii. 24, τὴν ἐνδειξιν τῆς ἀγάπης ὑμῶν . . . ἐνδεικνύμενοι εἰς πρόσωπον τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν, cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 720, ἐς πρόσωπόν τινος ἀφικνεῖσθαι, to come under the eyes of ; 2 Cor. ii. 10, κεχάρισμαι . . . ἐν προσώπῳ Χριστοῦ ; Rev. vi. 16, κρύψατε ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ κ.τ.λ., xx. 11, xii. 14 ; Acts iii. 20, v. 41, vii. 45 ; κατὰ πρόσωπον, before the eyes, beneath the eyes of, iii. 13 ; 2 Cor. x. 1, 7 ; comp. Gal. ii. 11, κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτῷ ἀντέστην, from which the ἀντιστήναι κατὰ πρόσωπόν τινος, Deut. vii. 24, ix. 2, Judg. ii. 14, 2 Chron. xiii. 7, differs only in this, that in the former κατὰ πρόσωπον is used adverbially, as in Polyb. xxv. 5. 2, κατὰ

πρ. λέγειν, to say to one's face; Plut. *Caes.* 17, ἡ κατὰ πρόσωπον ἔντευξις, *oral converse*. More generally, in Luke ii. 31, *πρὸ προσώπου τινός*; Matt. xi. 10; Mark i. 2; Luke i. 76, vii. 27, ix. 52; Acts xiii. 24, *πρὸ προσώπου τῆς εἰσόδου αὐτοῦ*, in the presence of; comp. Heb. ix. 24, ἐμφανισθῆναι τῷ πρ. τοῦ θεοῦ. By turning the face to one, the person indicates his presence; comp. above, 2 Sam. xvii. 11, 2 Cor. x. 1, *κατὰ πρόσωπον*, as against *ἀπὸν*, Acts xx. 25, οὐκέτι ὄψεσθε τὸ πρ. μου, xx. 38. In the countenance the person is recognised, therein his idiosyncrasy expresses itself; Gal. i. 22, ἀγνοούμενος τῷ πρ.; Col. ii. 1; 1 Thess. ii. 13, iii. 10; Acts vi. 15, εἶδον τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ὥσει πρ. ἀγγέλου; 1 Cor. xiii. 12, *πρόσωπον πρὸς πρόσωπον βλέπειν*, comp. Gen. xxxii. 31.—2 Cor. iii. 7, μὴ δύνασθαι ἀτενίσαι εἰς τὸ πρ. Μωϋσέως διὰ τὴν δόξαν τοῦ πρ. αὐτοῦ, comp. vv. 13, 18 with ver. 15. Hence also 2 Cor. iv. 6, *πρὸς φωτισμὸν τῆς γνώσεως τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν προσ. Χριστοῦ*, not = *person*. This is what is denoted by *πρόσωπον τοῦ θεοῦ*, the presence, the distinguishing glory of God; Heb. ix. 24; Matt. xviii. 10; Rev. xxii. 4; 1 Sam. xiii. 12; 1 Kings xiii. 6; Dan. ix. 13; Lam. iv. 16; Ps. xxxi. 13, xlii. 6; Ex. xxxiii. 14, comp. xxxiii. 20, 23. The word now extends itself,

(II.) To the general signification *look, appearance, form*, Pindar and the Tragedians, yet comparatively rarer in profane Greek than in biblical, Matt. xvi. 3, τὸ πρ. τοῦ οὐρ.; Luke xii. 56; Acts xvii. 26; Jas. i. 11, ἡ εὐπρέπεια τοῦ προσώπου τοῦ χόρτου ἀπόλετο. It is more than probable that the biblical expression *λαμβάνειν πρόσωπον*, denoting *party regard to the outward appearance*, Luke xx. 21, Gal. ii. 6, Ecclus. iv. 22, xxxii. 13, is akin to this meaning, so that *πρ.* is not here to be taken in the sense of *person*. The expression had its origin in the Hebrew עֵצָה נֶפֶשׁ, as opposed to עֵצָה נֶפֶשׁ, 1 Kings ii. 16, 17, 20; 2 Chron. vi. 42. This very antithesis makes it probable that עֵצָה, like *πρ.*, must be taken as meaning *appearance* or *look*. It tells in favour of this, further, that עֵצָה cannot be shown to signify *person*, and never even with suffixes is used to denote the person, but always expresses more or less the person's presence in some way vouchsafed; see under (I.). A comparison, however, of the parallel expression *βλέπειν εἰς πρ., ὁρᾶν εἰς πρ.*, Mark xii. 14, Matt. xxii. 16, 1 Sam. xvi. 7, comp. Luke xx. 21, as also the *θαυμάζειν πρόσωπα*, Jude 16, raises the probability to a certainty. Comp. Job xxxiv. 19, where *θαυμάζειν πρ.* is = עֵצָה נֶפֶשׁ. This also explains the *δόξα προσώπου*, Ecclus. xxxii. 15.—No other place where the signification *person* can be thought suitable occurs in the N. T. The only other passage quoted, 2 Cor. i. 11, *ἵνα ἐκ πολλῶν προσώπων τὸ εἰς ἡμᾶς χάρισμα διὰ πολλῶν εὐχαριστηθῇ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν*, is shown to be no exception, because the *διὰ πολλῶν* forbids our finding in *ἐκ πολλῶν πρ.* nothing but a designation of persons; rather is it to be compared with John xvii. 1, Luke xviii. 13, ix. 29, and other places, and to be construed as *πολλῶν πρόσωπα*; the entire expression, with emphasis, brings out prominently the free and joyous *εὐχαριστεῖσθαι*. Not in the Gospel or the Epistles of John.

Προσωποληψία, ἡ, respect of persons, partiality, only in N. T. and ecclesiastical Greek. Rom. ii. 11; Eph. vi. 9; Col. iii. 25; Jas. ii. 1. In like manner *προσω-*

πολήμπτως, προσωπολημπτέω, Acts x. 34, Jas. ii. 9; ἀπροσωπολήμπτως, 1 Pet. i. 17.

Ὁργή, ἡ, primarily denotes force or impulse in a psychological sense (cf. ὀργάω, *to raise, to force*, e.g. plants; or of the passions of brutes, natural involuntary animal impulses), excitement of feeling in general, or of particular impulses; e.g. ὀργὰς ἐπιφέρειν τινί = *to love, to bend one's inclination towards*, Thuc. viii. 33, Schol., τὸ ἐπιφέρειν ὀργὴν ἐπὶ τοῦ χαρίζεσθαι καὶ συγχωρεῖν ἔταπτον οἱ ἀρχαῖοι. In Attic Greek it especially signifies wrath, not the affection itself (θυμός), but its active outgo against any one, the opposition of an involuntarily roused feeling. Thus in Plato, *Euthyphr.* 7, ἐχθρά and ὀργαί are used together; Thuc. ii. 11, δι' ὀργῆς αἱ ἐπιχειρήσεις γίνονται; Diog. Laert. vii. 113, ὀργή, τιμωρίας ἐπιθυμία τοῦ δοκοῦντος ἡδικηκέναι οὐ προσηκόντως; Mark iii. 5; Eph. iv. 31; Col. iii. 8; 1 Tim. ii. 8. Comp. Rom. xii. 19, μὴ ἑαυτοὺς ἐκδικοῦντες, ἀλλὰ δότε τόπον τῇ ὀργῇ; xiii. 4, ἕκδικος εἰς ὀργὴν τῷ τὸ κακὸν πράσσοντι; ver. 5; Jas. i. 19, 20, as opposed to πραΐτης. That ὀργή is not the passive affection, but the active opposition, is evident from Jas. i. 20, ὀργὴ γὰρ ἀνδρὸς δικαιοσύνην θεοῦ οὐ κατεργάζεται.—In the other N. T. passages the word denotes the wrath of God, as opposed to ἔλεος, Rom. ix. 22, σκεῦα ὀργῆς . . . ἐλέους; not God's wrath in general, and as variously manifested, but God's wrath as it exists, and will in the future be manifested, against sin, whose effect is the antithesis of the bestowal of salvation, and finally excludes man from redemption. See Heb. iii. 11, iv. 3, ὥμοσα ἐν τῇ ὀργῇ μου εἰ εἰσελεύσονται εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσίν μου; 1 Thess. v. 9, οὐκ ἔθετο ἡμᾶς ὁ θεὸς εἰς ὀργὴν ἀλλὰ εἰς περιποίησιν σωτηρίας; cf. i. 10, Ἰησοῦν τὸν ῥυόμενον ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τῆς ὀργῆς τῆς ἐρχομένης. Hence Rom. ii. 5, ἡμέρα ὀργῆς καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως δικαιοκρισίας τοῦ θεοῦ; ver. 8; cf. also i. 18, ἀποκαλύπτεται ὀργὴ θεοῦ ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ, with ver. 16 (τὸ εὐαγγέλιον), δύναμις θεοῦ ἐστὶν εἰς σωτηρίαν. By ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ θεοῦ, Col. iii. 6; Eph. v. 6, ἔρχεται . . . ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς ἀπειθείας, we must understand God's bearing towards those who in Rom. i. 18 are described as ἄνθρωποι οἱ τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐν ἀδικίᾳ κατέχοντες, at the final close of the history of redemption. This historical reference gives occasion to the expression φυγεῖν ἀπὸ τῆς μελλούσης ὀργῆς, Matt. iii. 7; Luke iii. 7, ἡ ὀργὴ ἡ ἐρχομένη; 1 Thess. i. 10. Thus ὀργή by itself denotes this wrath of God; Rom. v. 9, δικαιωθέντες . . . σωθησόμεθα δι' αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς ὀργῆς (manifest in the imputation and punishment of sin, in contrast with δικαιοῦν); iv. 15, νόμος ὀργὴν κατεργάζεται; see Ecclus. xxiii. 16; Rom. iii. 5, μὴ ἄδικος ὁ θεὸς ὁ ἐπιφέρει τὴν ὀργὴν, cf. vv. 4, 6, ix. 22, θέλων ὁ θεὸς ἐνδείξασθαι τὴν ὀργὴν . . . ἤνεγκεν ἐν πολλῇ μακροθυμίᾳ σκευὴ ὀργῆς κατηρτισμένα εἰς ἀπώλειαν, a statement which may be understood rightly by remembering that God's wrath belongs to the end of the dispensation of grace. (The expression in John iii. 36, ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ θεοῦ μένει ἐπ' αὐτόν, corresponding with the ἤδη κέκριται of ver. 18, is to be explained conformably with St. John's views generally; he regards the final future as already beginning to be realized in the present, *vid.* κρίνειν, ζωή.) Also Eph. ii. 3, ἡμεν τέκνα φύσει ὀργῆς, has

obviously a reference to the ὀργή ἢ μέλλουσα (φύσει—which is to be explained according to the preceding ἀνεστράφημεν ποτε ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν—limits the expression as compared with the σκευή ὀργῆς of Rom. ix. 22; and τέκνα ὀργῆς no more denotes those who are utterly and finally lost, than does the υἱοὶ τῆς βασιλείας of Matt. viii. 12 denote those who cannot possibly be lost). Comp. also Rev. vi. 16, 17, xi. 18, ἦλθεν ἡ ὀργή σου καὶ ὁ καιρὸς τῶν νεκρῶν κριθῆναι; xiv. 10, xvi. 19, xix. 15. In only one passage is mention made of a revelation of wrath in time which finally and utterly excludes from salvation, viz. 1 Thess. ii. 16, ἔφθασεν ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ἡ ὀργή εἰς τέλος; cf. Heb. iii. 11, iv. 3; Luke xxi. 23, ἔσται ὀργή τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ.—The declarations of the O. T. refer to the revelation of wrath in general, and without definitely fixing the time and manner of it, excepting, however, a few places, e.g. Zeph. ii. 3. Ὁργή by itself is used to denote God's wrath in Ecclus. vii. 16, cf. xxiii. 16.

Ὁρίζω (from ὅρος, *boundary*), to bound, to put limits to, see Num. xxxiv. 6; Josh. xiii. 27, xv. 11, xviii. 19. Transferred from the relations of space to those of time, it means, *to determine the time*; cf. Plat. *Legg.* ix. 864 E, δν χρόνον ὁ νόμος ὥρισεν; Joseph. *Antt.* vi. 5. 3, εἰς τὸν ὠρισμένον καιρὸν. So Acts xvii. 26, ὀρίσας προστεταγμένους καιροὺς καὶ τοὺς ὁροθεσίας τῆς κατοικίας αὐτῶν; Heb. iv. 7, ἡμέραν. Then generally, *to establish, to determine*, e.g. νόμον, θάνατον, ζημίαν, etc.; Prov. xvi. 30; Acts xi. 29, ὥρισαν . . . πέμψαι = *to resolve or decree*, Luke xxii. 22, κατὰ τὸ ὠρισμένον; Acts ii. 23, ἡ ὠρισμένη βουλή τοῦ θεοῦ. Very rarely in profane Greek it occurs with a personal object and two accusatives. In the N. T. Acts xvii. 31, μέλλει κρίνειν τὴν οἰκουμένην ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ ἐν ἀνδρὶ ᾧ ὥρισεν. See Acts x. 42, αὐτὸς ἐστὶν ὁ ὠρισμένος ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ κριτὴς ζώντων καὶ νεκρῶν. As an example from profane Greek, is cited Meleag. *Anthol. Pal.* xii. 158. 7, σὲ γὰρ θεὸν ὥρισε δαίμων, *to appoint or determine to*. With two accusatives, also ζημίαν τὸν θάνατον, Dinarch. xcvi. 6. It was erroneously stated in the first edition that this did not mean a declaration or decree with reference to any one, but appointment to a relationship or function. Though this latter may not be excluded, inasmuch as it may be the consequence of the declaration or decree in question, it cannot be proved that ὀρίζειν in these cases signifies anything more than *the declaration or authoritative appointment concerning a person*, perhaps working upon the object. This latter is not implied in the passage quoted from Meleager, cf. Eurip. *Hell.* 1670, ὀρίζειν θεόν = *to introduce the worship of a god*. Other examples, on the contrary, lead to the meaning, *to declare any one as something*. Cf. Xen. *Mem.* iv. 6. 4, ὁ τὰ περὶ τοὺς θεοὺς νόμιμα εἰδὼς ὀρθῶς ἀν εὐσεβῆς ὠρισμένος εἴη. So especially in the middle, Xen. *Mem.* iv. 6. 6, ὀρθῶς ἀν ὀριζόμεθα δικαίους εἶναι τοὺς εἰδότας τὰ περὶ ἀνθρώπους νόμιμα; *Hell.* vii. 3. 12, ὀρίζονται τοὺς εὐεργέτας ἑαυτῶν ἀνδρας ἀγαθοὺς εἶναι; Plato, *Theaet.* 190 D, 187 C; Aristotle, *Eth.* iii. 6, τὸν φόβον ὀρίζονται προσδοκίαν κακοῦ. It depends entirely upon the connection whether a declarative or a determinative decision is meant, whether it means *to declare for or to something, to determine that one is something, or that one is to be*

something. The latter is evidently the meaning in the two places quoted, Acts xvii. 31, x. 42. But the connection of Rom. i. 3, τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ τοῦ γενομένου ἐκ σπέρματος Δαβὶδ κατὰ σάρκα, τοῦ ὀρισθέντος υἱοῦ θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει κατὰ πνεῦμα ἀγιοσύνης ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν, shows that here it is = *declared as the Son of God*, i.e. that *He is*, not that *He was to be*, for this latter would not be in keeping with the preceding τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ τοῦ γενομένου, and would require a preceding περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ or Χριστοῦ. Hofmann *in loc.* urges that the aorist requires the rendering, *who has been appointed to this, to become the Son of God in power*, and that the other explanation would require the perfect participle; but the very opposite may with far greater justice be affirmed, if we compare Acts x. 42,—see Curtius' *Gramm.* §§ 492, 502,—even if the context admitted his rendering. In Rom. i. 4 also it is not merely a *declaration* that is meant, τοῦ ὀρισθέντος υἱοῦ θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει . . . ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν, for the resurrection accomplished the exaltation of the man Christ Jesus, the return of the man “born of a woman” to the divine glory, and therefore the exaltation of our human nature thereto; see Acts xiii. 33; Heb. i. 5, v. 5; see also γεννάω.

Προορίζω, to determine or decree beforehand. It occurs but rarely, and late. In biblical Greek in the N. T. only (I.) with a thing as its object, 1 Cor. ii. 7, ἣν (σοφίαν) προώρισεν ὁ θεὸς πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων εἰς δόξαν ἡμῶν. Followed by the accusative with the inf. = to ordain beforehand (like ὀρίζειν, *sq. acc. c. inf.*), Acts iv. 28, ὅσα . . . ἡ βουλή σου προώρισεν γενέσθαι. — (II.) With a personal object, a double accus. or a second accus. understood is required (see ὀρίζειν), as in Rom. viii. 29, οὓς προέγνω, καὶ προώρισεν συμμόρφους τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, cf. Eph. i. 5, προορίσας ἡμᾶς εἰς υἰοθεσίαν; i. 11, ἐν ᾧ καὶ ἐκληρώθημεν προορισθέντες . . . εἰς τὸ εἶναι κ.τ.λ., ver. 12. This predestination in Rom. viii. 30, οὓς δὲ προώρισεν, τούτους καὶ ἐκάλεσεν, is clearly to be explained by ver. 29, and the words there occurring are to be supplied. For προορίζειν is simply a formal and not (like προγινώσκειν, ver. 29) an independent conception, complete in itself. The matter to be considered when the word is used is not *who* are the objects of this predestination, but *what* they are predestined to. This second object of the verb, as it has been called, forms an essential part of the conception expressed by it; what is called the first object, i.e. the persons who, is an accidental one, a contingency belonging to history, whereas προορίζειν itself precedes history. See προγινώσκειν, ἐκλέγειν.

Ὀσιος, *a, on*; also ὁ, ἡ, Plat. *Legg.* viii. 831; Dion. Hal. *A. R.* v. 71, τὴν ὄσιον ἀρχήν; 1 Tim. ii. 8, ἐπαίρειν ὁσίους χεῖρας = holy. It seems primarily to denote the piety which is based upon divine as well as human right, whether the word be used to demand such a piety, or is predicated of those who possess it. *Od.* xvi. 423, οὐδ' ὅσῃ κακὰ ράπτειν ἀλλήλοισιν, i. q. nefas; Aesch. *Sept.* 1010, ἱερῶν πατρῶν ὄσιος ὦν μομφῆς ἀτὲρ τέθνηκεν, as opposed to ἐπιорκοὶ καὶ ἄδικοι. Thus Xen. *Cyrop.* vii. 5. 56, χωρίον ὄσιον, means a *holy place* which is to be revered as such, and must not be violated or wantonly entered; Aristoph. *Lys.* 743, ὦ πότνι' Εἰλείθυι', ἐπίσχες τοῦ τόκου ἑνὸς ἂν εἰς ὄσιον

ἀπέλθῃ χωρίον, a place, access to which is secured by right and precedent, and with reference to this χωρίον βέβηλον is called ὅσιον. We find the word joined with δίκαιος; e.g. Legg. ii. 663 B, ζῆν τὸν ὅσιον καὶ δίκαιον βίον, may be explained by Plat. Gorg. 507 B, περὶ μὲν ἀνθρώπους τὰ προσήκοντα πράττων δίκαι' ἂν πράττοι, περὶ δὲ θεοὺς ὅσια; Polyb. xxiii. 10. 8, παραβῆναι καὶ τὰ πρὸς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους δίκαια καὶ τὰ πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς ὅσια; cf. Luke i. 75 under ὁσιότης. Du Cange, "Observat. Goarus ad Eucholog. p. 402, qui nunc Confessor in Latinorum officiis habetur, si monachus sit ὅσιον, si communem in civitate vitam duxerit, δίκαιον νυμφευρῶν." Joined with ἱερός, e.g. Thuc. ii. 52, ἐς ὀλιγορίαν ἐτράποντο καὶ ἱερῶν καὶ ὁσίων ὁμοίως; Plat. Legg. viii. 878 B, κοσμεῖν τὴν πόλιν καὶ τοῖς ἱεροῖς καὶ τοῖς ὁσίοις, where ὅσιος denotes things humanly sacred, like *pro aris et focis dimicare*; Cic. in Phil. 2, *repetebant praeterea deos penates, patrios, aras, focos, larem familiarem*. See ἅγιος.

The LXX. use ὅσιος sometimes for הַיָּהוָה, הַיָּהוָה, הַיָּהוָה, but usually as = הַיָּהוָה, a word which in Jer. iii. 12 = ἐλεήμων; Prov. ii. 8 = εὐλαβούμενος; Ps. lxxxix. 29, 2 Chron. vi. 41, הַיָּהוָה = οἱ υἱοὶ σου, and Ps. cxxxii. 9, 16 = οἱ ὅσιοί σου; Mic. vii. 2 = εὐσεβής; but everywhere else it is = ὅσιος. The meaning of הַיָּהוָה is to be defined according to הַיָּהוָה (see Hupfeld on Ps. iv. 4). This word, which is = *good-will, kindness*, is used to denote God's holy love towards His people Israel, "both as the source and as the result of His sovereign choice and covenant with them" (Hupfeld *in loc.*); when applied to men (compare Gen. xxi. 23, where the LXX. = *δικαιοσύνη*), "it does not denote the corresponding covenant disposition of Israel towards God (not even in 2 Chron. vi. 42, cf. Isa. lv. 3, lvii. 1), but almost exclusively love and mercifulness towards others who are united with us in the same holy covenant. It is generally used of love descending from above to those beneath, and not of love ascending." הַיָּהוָה, used of God, Jer. iii. 12 and Ps. cxlv. 17, is a passive form denoting what belongs to the הַיָּהוָה, one who is gifted with הַיָּהוָה; and used of men in relation to God, it describes their position in virtue of the הַיָּהוָה of God. We find הַיָּהוָה used absolutely in Ps. cxlix. 1, 5 only; elsewhere it has always suffixes relating to God. As those specially in whom this relation attains its normal manifestation are designated by the word (see Rom. ix. 6, 7; Ps. l. 5), another meaning akin thereto is put into it, viz. *pious, sanctus*; vid. 2 Sam. xxii. 26; Ps. xviii. 26, μετὰ ὁσίου ὁσιωθήσῃ, so the parallel, Ps. xcvii. 10, οἱ ἀγαπῶντες τὸν κύριον, cf. Ps. xxxi. 34, ἀγαπήσατε τὸν κύριον πάντες οἱ ὅσιοι αὐτοῦ; Ps. lxxix. 2, δοῦλος. — הַיָּהוָה = ὅσιος, Deut. xxxiii. 8; 2 Sam. xxii. 26; Ps. xviii. 26, iv. 4, xii. 2, xxxii. 6, xliii. 1, lxxxvi. 2; Jer. iii. 3; Ps. cxlv. 17, xvi. 8, cxlix. 1, 5, l. 5, lxii. 11, lxxix. 2; 2 Chron. vi. 41; Ps. cxxxii. 9, cxlv. 10, xxx. 5, xxxi. 24, xxxvii. 28, lxxxv. 9, xcvii. 10, cxvi. 15, cxxxii. 16, cxlviii. 14, cxlix. 9.

There is no more appropriate word in Greek than ὅσιος as a fit rendering of הַיָּהוָה, inasmuch as it denotes a holiness established by right or custom; but חַסִּיד "must not be taken as implying any praiseworthy virtue or merit, but simply an hereditary advantage," Hupfeld. It must be observed, however, that in profane Greek ὅσιος is used of persons only when

it stands by itself, or when *δικαίος* also is predicated of them, and where stress is laid upon their relationship to God; we do not find it used with *ἱερός* (see above); *ῥῥῥ* is used only of persons. Still, in the LXX. we have the expression (Isa. lv. 3) *τὰ ὅσια Δάβιδ*, *God's covenant tokens to David*, God's holy and covenant love as shown to David in particular. Deut. xxix. 19, *ὅσιά μοι γένοιτο* = *לְחֵן וְחֶסֶד*; *vid.* Wisd. vi. 10, *οἱ φυλάξαντες ὁσίως τὰ ὅσια*; 2 Macc. xii. 45, *ὅσια καὶ εὐσεβῆς ἡ ἐπίνοια*.

It may seem strange that this word is used so rarely, comparatively speaking, in the N. T. It occurs only in Acts ii. 27, xiii. 35, in a quotation from Ps. xvi. 8, *οὐ δώσεις τὸν ὅσιον σου κ.τ.λ.*; Heb. vii. 26, *τοιούτος ἡμῖν ἔπρεπεν ἀρχιερεὺς, ὅσιος, ἄκακος κ.τ.λ.*—clearly in the theocratic sense of the O. T. *ῥῥῥ*; Rev. xv. 4, xvi. 5, of God, as in Jer. iii. 12; Ps. cxlv. 17. As to Acts xiii. 34, *τὰ ὅσια Δαβίδ*, from Isa. lv. 3, see above. With 1 Tim. ii. 8, *προσεύχεσθαι ἐπαίροντας ὁσίους χεῖρας*, cf. Ps. xxxii. 6, xvi. 8, 1. In Tit. i. 8 it occurs among the graces specified as necessary in the bishop, side by side with *δίκαιος*. We do not find it used as a personal designation for the partakers of the new covenant, though we might expect it to be so. Instead of it, instead of the O. T. *ἐκλογή*, answering to the Hebrew *ῥῥῥ*, we have the N. T. term *οἱ ἅγιοι*. (The Hebrew *עֲבָדֶיךָ* occurs but rarely in the O. T.; as a substantive only in Deut. xxxiii. 3; Ps. xvi. 3, xxxiv. 10, lxxxix. 6, 8; Job v. 1, cf. xv. 15; as a predicate, in a few other places.) A fuller N. T. expression is *ἅγιοι καὶ ἡγαπημένοι*, Col. iii. 12, and this latter may be regarded as the appropriate substitute for the O. T. word.

The adverb *ὁσίως* is used by itself in classical Greek as = the Latin *juste, pure*; *ἰσίως θύειν* = *rite*; often joined with *δικαίως*, e.g. Plat. *Rep.* i. 331 A, *ὃς ἂν δικαίως καὶ ὁσίως τὸν βίον διαγάγῃ*; 1 Thess. ii. 10, *ὁσίως καὶ δικαίως καὶ ἀμέμπτως ὑμῖν ἐγενήθημεν*; Wisd. vi. 10, *οἱ φυλάξαντες ὁσίως τὰ ὅσια ὁσιωθήσονται*.

Ὅσιότης, ἡ, holiness manifesting itself in the discharge of pious duties,—in religious and social life, e.g. Diod. Sic. *Exc.* 546. 52, *τῆς τε πρὸς γονεῖς ὁσιότητος καὶ τῆς πρὸς θεοὺς εὐσεβείας*; Plat. *Eutyphr.* 14 E, *ἐπιστήμη ἅρα αἰτήσεως καὶ δώσεως θεοῖς ἡ ὁσιότης ἂν εἴη*; Schol. *ad Eurip.* λέγεται τὸ πρὸς θεὸν ἐξ ἀνθρώπων γενόμενον δίκαιον. It appears side by side with *σωφροσύνη* and *δικαιοσύνη*, Plat. *Prot.* 329 C. Only twice in the N. T. joined with *δικαιοσύνη*, Luke i. 75, *λατρεύειν τῷ θεῷ ἐν ὁσιότητι καὶ δικ. ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ*; Eph. iv. 24, *ὁ καινὸς ἄνθρ. ὁ κατὰ θεὸν κτισθεὶς ἐν δικ. καὶ ὁσιότητι τῆς ἀληθείας*. In accordance with what has been said of *ὅσιος*, it denotes the spirit and conduct of one who is joined in fellowship with God. Afterwards *ὁσιότης* was used as an ecclesiastical title, or term of respect.

Ἀνόσιος, unholy, profane, without piety; also in a passive sense, e.g. *νεκὸς ἀνόσιος*, of an unburied corpse.—LXX. Ezek. xxii. 9, *ἀνόσια ποιεῖν*; Wisd. xii. 4. In the N. T. only 1 Tim. i. 9 with *βέβηλος*; 2 Tim. iii. 2, *γονεῦσιν ἀπειθεῖς, ἀχάριστοι, ἀνόσιοι*.

Οὐρανός, ὁ, heaven, Hebrew *שָׁמַיִם*, probably a plural of abstraction, like *אֱלֹהִים*, *חַיִּים*, *עֲבָדֶיךָ*, Job xvi. 19, cf. *αἰῶνες, τὰ ἅγια*, etc. Hence also the plural, unused in profane

Greek, οἱ οὐρανοί (perhaps = all that is heaven), which cannot, however, be urged in proof of any opinion concerning heaven. The only expression (we may here remark) which implies a plurality of heavens (2 Cor. xii. 2, ἕως τρίτου οὐρανοῦ) may itself have been derived from this use of the plural; see under (II.). The singular and plural are used so similarly and interchangeably, that we can hardly suppose any difference of meaning between them.

(I.) In a *physical* sense, the **overarching, all-embracing heaven**, beneath which is the earth and all that is therein; the phrase ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρ. implying not so much a dependence, as a certain unity in what is thus designated, Luke xvii. 24 (see Winer, 522; Prov. viii. 22); Col. i. 23, ἡ κτίσις ἡ ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανόν; Acts ii. 5, ἀπὸ παντὸς ἔθνους τῶν ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρ.; iv. 12, οὐδὲ γὰρ ὄνομά ἐστιν ἕτερον ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανόν. Cf. מְשִׁיחַ הַתַּיִם, Eccles. i. 13, ii. 3, iii. 1. The term **heaven** is a comprehensive one, excluding *earth*; the earth itself is called ἡ ὑπ' οὐρανόν, Prov. viii. 28, Job xviii. 4, ii. 2, xxxiv. 13 = אֶרֶץ הַתַּיִם, cf. Job xxxviii. 13; Ex. xvii. 14; Ps. xxxvi. 6.—It is the place of the stars, Matt. xxiv. 29, Heb. xi. 12, Rev. vi. 13, *et al.*; of the clouds, Matt. xxiv. 30, *et al.*; the sphere whose powers and phenomena influence the earth, Matt. xvi. 2, 3, xxiv. 29 (*vid.* δύναμις), Jas. v. 18. Used together with the earth, it denotes *the entire creation*, Matt. v. 18, xxiv. 35; Mark xiii. 31; Luke xii. 56, xvi. 17; Acts xiv. 15; Jas. v. 18. Cf. Acts iv. 24, ὁ ποιήσας τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς; Plat. *Euthyd.*, πρὶν οὐρανὸν καὶ γῆν γενέσθαι. (See also Eph. i. 10; Col. i. 16, 20.) The plural, Matt. xxiv. 29, 31; Mark xiii. 25; 2 Pet. iii. 5, 7, 10, 12, 13.—Cf. 2 Pet. iii. 7, οἱ νῦν οὐρανοὶ καὶ ἡ γῆ; ver. 13, καινοὺς οὐρανούς καὶ γῆν καινὴν . . . προσδοκῶμεν; Rev. xxi. 1.

(II.) With the heaven which arches over and compasses the earth, religion associates the dwelling-place of God; Matt. v. 34, θρόνος ἐστὶν τοῦ θεοῦ; Acts vii. 49; Rev. xi. 19, ὁ ναὸς τ. θ. ἐν τῷ οὐρ., so that side by side with the expression οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς κύριος, Acts xvii. 25, Matt. xi. 25, we find the other characteristic phrase, ὁ θεὸς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, Rev. xi. 13; מְשִׁיחַ הַתַּיִם, Neh. i. 5, 4, προσεύχεσθαι ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ οὐρ., ii. 4, and other places; Gen. xxiv. 7; comp. Ps. xcvi. 5. Hence the expression so often used by our Lord in Matthew, especially ὁ πατήρ μου, ὑμῶν, ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρ., Matt. v. 16, 45, 48, vi. 1, 9, vii. 11, 21, x. 32, 33, xii. 50, xvi. 17, xviii. 10, 14, 19, xxiii. 9. In Mark, only xi. 25, 26. It does not occur in Luke; only ὁ πατήρ ὁ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ δώσει, xi. 13. In xi. 2 the reading is uncertain. John does not use the phrase. It denotes, first, God's exalted majesty, cf. Ps. cxv. 3, ii. 4, xi. 4; Eccles. v. 1; 2 Chron. xx. 6; Heb. viii. 1, ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θρόνου τῆς μεγαλωσύνης ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς; Ps. lxxviii. 13, ὁ ἐπουράνιος = יְיָ, as also in the profane sphere, cf. Aristot. *de mund.*, τοῦ κόσμου τὸ ἄνω, θεοῦ οἰκητήριον. This elevation and entire superiority of heaven to earth gives rise to a great variety of sayings and modes of expression; as, for example, Rom. i. 18, ἀποκαλύπτεται ὀργὴ θεοῦ ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ; Col. iv. 1, ἔχετε κύριον ἐν οὐρανῷ; Heb. vii. 26, ὑψηλότερος τῶν οὐρανῶν; John iii. 13, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὁ ὢν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ. It gives significance to signs as "from heaven," Matt. xvi. 1 (cf. Matt. xxiv. 30), especially to God's revelations and to

His words, cf. Heb. xii. 25, εἰ γὰρ ἐκεῖνοι οὐκ ἐξέφυγον ἐπὶ γῆς παραιτησάμενοι τὸν χρηματίζοντα, πολὺ μᾶλλον ἡμεῖς οἱ τὸν ἀπ' οὐρανῶν ἀποστρεφόμενοι. What is from heaven is from God, and is of infinite importance to earth and to mankind as candidates for heaven (comp. Bengel on Matt. vi. 10, *coelum est norma terrae*), see Matt. xxi. 25, τὸ βάπτισμα Ἰωάννου πόθεν ἦν; ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἢ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων; cf. ver. 26, ἐὰν εἴπωμεν ἐξ οὐρ., ἐρεῖ ἡμῖν διατὶ οὕτως οὐκ ἐπιστεύσατε αὐτῷ; John iii. 13. Cf. φωνὴ ἐξ οὐρ., Luke iii. 22; Mark i. 11; Gal. i. 8, ἐὰν ἡμεῖς ἢ ἄγγελος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ εὐαγγελίζεται ὑμῖν, and other places. Hence Christ's ascension to heaven means His exaltation to divine honour and glory, Mark xvi. 19, Luke xxiv. 51, Acts i. 10, 11, ii. 34, see also John iii. 13; Heb. iv. 14, viii. 1, ix. 24, 1 Pet. iii. 22, and requires from men full recognition of and submission to Christ, comp. Acts ii. 34-36 with Eph. i. 20-22, Phil. ii. 9-11. But more than loftiness and superiority belongs to heaven. It implies another and a higher order of things, different from the order of earth; just as the angels, the inhabitants of heaven, differ from men, Matt. xxii. 30, ὡς ἄγγελοι ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ εἰσίν. (Heaven is the abode of the angels, Matt. xxiv. 30; Mark xii. 25, xiii. 32; Luke ii. 15, xv. 7, 10, xxii. 43; Gal. i. 8; John i. 52; it is even the abode of the evil angels down to a certain time, see Luke x. 18; Rev. xii. 7, 8; Eph. vi. 12.) That heaven denotes a higher order, is evident from 1 Cor. xv. 47, ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος ἐκ γῆς χοϊκός, ὁ δεύτερος ἄνθρωπος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ (another reading, ἄνθρ. ὁ κύριος ἐξ οὐρ.), cf. vv. 48, 49; John i. 52. Hence, as earth implies transitoriness, heaven denotes permanence, Matt. vi. 20, θησαυρίζετε ὑμῖν θησαυροὺς ἐν οὐρανῷ, ὅπου οὔτε σῆς οὔτε βρῶσις ἀφανίζει; Luke xii. 23; Mark x. 21; 2 Cor. v. 1, ἐὰν ἡ ἐπίγειος ἡμῶν οἰκία τοῦ σκηνοῦς καταλυθῇ . . . ἔχομεν οἰκίαν . . . αἰώνιον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, cf. ver. 2; Phil. iii. 20; Col. i. 5; 1 Pet. i. 4, εἰς κληρονομίαν ἀφθαρτον καὶ ἀμίαντον καὶ ἀμάραντον, τετηρημένην ἐν οὐρανοῖς; Heb. x. 34. Cf. Heb. xii. 28, βασιλείαν ἀσάλευτον παραλαμβάνοντες; 2 Cor. iv. 18. We find a presentiment of this characteristic of heaven in the profane sphere, e.g. Aristot. *de coel.* i. 3, πάντες γὰρ ἄνθρωποι περὶ θεῶν ἔχουσι ὑπόληψιν, καὶ πάντες τὸν ἀνωτάτω τῷ θεῷ τόπον ἀποδιδόασιν, καὶ βάρβαροι καὶ Ἕλληνες, ὅσοι περ εἶναι νομίζουσι θεούς, δῆλονότι ὡς τῷ ἀθανάτῳ τὸ ἀθάνατον συνηρημένον. The moral difference between heaven and earth, corresponding with this natural difference (Matt. vi. 12, γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς), affects the use of the word less when this representation is prominent in other ways (see ἄνω, γῆ).

While both in the classics and in the O. T. *exaltation* and *glory* are the features of heaven, the N. T. with its higher knowledge recognises a still deeper meaning, arising both from the fact that heaven is God's dwelling-place, and that it implies a higher order of things. The absence of this deeper thought in the O. T. is in keeping with O. T. eschatology.

As heaven is God's dwelling-place, man's relationship to God is also his relationship to heaven, and sinful man is described as an alien from heaven as well as from God; Luke xviii. 13, οὐκ ἤθελεν οὐδὲ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἐπᾶραι εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν. Cf. xv. 18, 21, ἡμαρτον εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν. Hence prayer is directed heavenwards, Mark vi. 41, vii. 34;

John xvii. 1, and often. See also Matt. xviii. 18, xvi. 19. Hence, too, heaven is the place of the blessings of salvation (the place of blessedness), which possess the character of heaven as of a higher order of things. See Col. i. 5; 1 Pet. i. 4; John iii. 13, and especially the frequent designation of God's kingdom occurring in Matthew, βασιλ. τῶν οὐρανῶν, *vid.* βασιλεία. Cf. Matt. v. 12, μισθὸς ὑμῶν πολὺς ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς; Mark x. 21, ἔξεις θησαυρὸν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ; Heb. xii. 23, ἐκκλησία πρωτοτόκων ἀπογεγραμμένον ἐν οὐρανοῖς; Luke x. 20; Rev. xi. 12; and the blessing of salvation itself comes down from heaven, John vi. 31 sqq. Ver. 33, ὁ γὰρ ἄρτος τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστὶν ὁ καταβαίνων ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ζωὴν διδοὺς τῷ κόσμῳ; ver. 32, οὐ Μωϋσῆς δέδωκεν ὑμῖν τὸν ἄρτον ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ἀλλ' ὁ πατὴρ μου δίδωσιν ὑμῖν τὸν ἄρτον ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τὸν ἀληθινόν; and in the final consummation of human redemption the city of God is said to come down out of heaven, Rev. xxi. 2, 10. See ἐπουράνιος.

As to the relation of the plural to the singular, there is hardly any difference traceable; cf. *e.g.* Mark x. 21 with Matt. v. 12; Mark xii. 25 with Matt. xxii. 30. It is to be observed that in Matthew, Paul's Epistles, Hebrews, 2 Peter, the plural occurs oftener than the singular; but in Mark only in i. 10, 11, xi. 25, 26, xiii. 25, and in Luke's writings only in Acts ii. 34, vii. 56, where the reading is unquestioned, while in Luke vi. 35, x. 20, xi. 2, xxi. 26, the reading is doubtful. The plural does not occur in John's Gospel, in Rev. only in xii. 12; in his Epistles the word occurs only in the spurious verse, 1 John v. 7, in the singular. Mention is made of a plurality of heavens only in 2 Cor. xii. 2, ἀρπαγέντα ἕως τρίτου οὐρανοῦ. We may compare ver. 4, ἡρπάγη εἰς τὸν παράδεισον, with Rev. ii. 7, xxi. 2, 10, according to which Paradise is in heaven, at least in the place where God's glory is specially revealed, cf. Rev. xxi. 23;—comp. also Heb. iv. 14, διεληλυθότα τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, with ix. 24, εἰσῆλθεν ὁ Χριστὸς εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν· νῦν ἐμφανισθῆναι τῷ προσώπῳ τοῦ θεοῦ, from which it would seem that Paul distinguishes three concentric circles; heaven in the physical sense, which arches over and compasses the earth; heaven in a general religious sense, as contrasted with earth and earthly things; and heaven, again, as the place of the central, gracious and beatific presence of God in Paradise. It is not inconceivable that the use of the plural may have suggested the expression "the third heaven" to the apostle. As to the relation of heaven to the omnipresence of God, so often insisted upon elsewhere in Scripture, we must distinguish between God's omnipresence and His gracious presence, exactly as between omnipresence and revelation.

Οὐράνιος, heavenly, especially of the gods. Not in the LXX. In the N. T., στρατιὰ οὐράνιος, of angels, Luke ii. 13; οὐράνιος ὀπτασία, Acts xxvi. 19, cf. ver. 13; cf. οὐράνια σημεῖα, in a physical sense, Xen. *Cyr.* i. 6. 2. Elsewhere only in Matt., ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος, vi. 14, 26, 32, and v. 48, xxiii. 9; Rec. text, ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. Then ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ οὐράνιος, Matt. xv. 13, xviii. 35. As to the import of this expression, see οὐρανός.

Ἐπουράνιος, heavenly, what pertains to or is in heaven (not *above* the heavens); chiefly of the gods; later also, *e.g.* τὰ ἐπουράνια καὶ τὰ ὑπὸ γῆν ζητῶν, Plat. *Apol.* 19b = *portents of heaven*, μετέωρα. In the LXX. Ps. lxviii. 13 as a substantival, ὁ ἐπουράνιος = ַיְשׁ. In the N. T. Matt. xviii. 35, ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ ἐπουράνιος. The meaning of this word is determined according to the various meanings of *heaven*. Thus τὰ ἐπουράνια means the heavenly, as what is raised above earth, = οἱ οὐρανοί; Eph. iii. 10, ταῖς ἀρχαῖς καὶ ταῖς ἐξουσίαις ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις, cf. 1 Cor. iv. 9 with Eph. vi. 12, τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις, see Rev. xii. 7, 8. Then it signifies what pertains to heaven, as to a higher and more divine order of things, 1 Cor. xv. 40, σώματα ἐπουράνια; vv. 48, 49; Heb. xii. 22, Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἐπουράνιος; Eph. i. 20, ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις; John iii. 12, τὰ ἐπουρ., as against τὰ ἐπίγεια, that order of things which includes the blessings of complete salvation; so κλήσις ἐπουράνιος, Heb. iii. 1; δωρεὰ ἐπουρ., vi. 4, xi. 16, κρείττονος ὀρέγονται [πατρίδος], τοῦτ' ἐστὶν ἐπουρανίου. Hence τὰ ἐπουράνια denote those blessings collectively; Eph. i. 3, ὁ εὐλογήσας ἡμᾶς ἐν πάσῃ εὐλογίᾳ πνευματικῇ ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις; Eph. ii. 6, συνεκάθισεν ἐν τοῖς ἐπ.; Heb. viii. 5, σκιᾷ λατρεύουσιν τῶν ἐπ.; ix. 23, αὐτὰ τὰ ἐπουράνια.—Phil. ii. 10, οἱ ἐπουρ., things which come within the range of this order. As to the threefold expression here used, ἐπουράνιοι καὶ ἐπίγειοι καὶ καταχθόνιοι, cf. Hom. *Il.* viii. 16, τόσσον ἔνερθ' Ἀἰδέω, ὅσον οὐρανός ἐστ' ἀπὸ γαίης; *vid.* γῆ.

Ὁ φεῖλω, to be indebted, to owe, *τινὶ τι*; with an infinitive following, to be under obligation to.

Ὁ φεῖλημα, τό, debt (τὸ ὀφειλόμενον, Matt. xviii. 30, 34); that which one owes or is bound to; Plat. *Rep.* i. 332 C, διανοεῖτο μὲν γὰρ, ὅτι τοῦτ' εἴη δίκαιον τὸ προσήκον ἐκάστῳ ἀποδιδόναι, τοῦτο δὲ ὠνόμασε ὀφειλόμενον. So Rom. iv. 4, ὁ μισθὸς οὐ λογίζεται κατὰ χάριν ἀλλὰ κατὰ ὀφείλημα. — Thus in Matt. vi. 12 the word is used as synonymous with παράπτωμα, ἁμαρτία; and the question arises, what representation is implied in it, for the word is not thus used in classical Greek nor in the LXX. With Matt. vi. 12, ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰ ὀφειλήματα ἡμῶν, ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφήκαμεν τοῖς ὀφειλέταις ἡμῶν, cf. ver. 14, ἐὰν γὰρ ἀφήτε τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν; Luke xi. 4, ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν, καὶ γὰρ αὐτοὶ ἀφίμεν παντὶ ὀφείλοντι ἡμῖν. It would seem, as occurring here, and as compared with Matt. xviii. 28–30, to denote sin simply in a one-sided negative way, as dereliction of duty; but ὀφείλημα is not the duty omitted, but the duty still to be rendered,—to be rendered, that is, by satisfaction. Even the Platonic expression, *Cratyl.* 400 C, ἕως ἂν ἐκτίσῃ τὰ ὀφειλόμενα, as parallel to δίκην διδόναι,—of the soul in the prison-house of the body,—indicates that guilt is to be understood in the sense of penalty to be paid, or satisfaction (cf. Lexicons on *τίνειν*, *ἐκτίνειν*; John xix. 7, ὀφείλει ἀποθανεῖν); and so the Aramaean, from which the expression is borrowed. In the Targums we often meet with ܐܢܐ = ܐܢܐ, ܐܢܐ; but ܐܢܐ literally means, *to owe*, *to be guilty*, and this in the sense of *liability to punishment*; and the Pael ܐܢܐ, “to make sinful,” “to

lead astray," and also, "to declare guilty," "to condemn," *e.g.* Isa. xxxiv. 5, עמא רחייבית לרינא, "a people whom I have condemned to punishment;" Hithpa., "to become sinful," "to be led astray,"—"to be condemned;" חוב, חובא, *guilt, sin,—punishment*; and in like manner *guilt = debitum, officium debitum, obligatio, duty*, as opposed to שׂר, *power, permission, freedom*, *e.g.* Berach. 27b, תפלה ערבית רשות או חובה, *preces vespertinae suntne libertas vel debitum?* חוב, *the guilty*, especially of flagrant transgressors who, if any, deserve punishment (cf. ὀφειλέτης, Luke xiii. 4). So Levy, *Chald. Wörterb. über die Targumim*; Buxtorf, *Lex. chald., talm.*, etc. Sin accordingly is ὀφείλημα, *because it imposes on the sinner the necessity of making atonement, of rendering satisfaction* (*vid. ὑπόδικος*), or of undergoing punishment. This is also the matter treated of in Matt. xviii. 21 sqq. — Cf. חוב, Piel; Dan. i. 10, חֲבֵיבֵיכֶם אֶת־רִאשֵׁי לַמֶּלֶךְ; Theodot., καταδικάσατε τὴν κεφαλὴν μου τῷ βασιλεῖ. The Greeks called a *crime* by the synonymous χρέος, showing that they regarded it as *an offence that must be expiated*. In perfect contrast to Matt. vi. 12 stands the prayer of Apollonius of Tiana (Philostr. *vit. Ap.* i. 11, quoted by Tholuck on the Sermon on the Mount), ὦ θεοί, δοίητέ μοι τὰ ὀφειλόμενα.

Ὁ φειλέτης, ὁ, the debtor, he who owes anything, who is under obligation on any account, Matt. xviii. 24; Rom. i. 14, viii. 12, xv. 27; Gal. v. 3. — But in Matt. vi. 12, Luke xiii. 4 = one who deserves punishment, and must expiate his guilt, Aram. חוב; see above. Luke xiii. 4, δοκεῖτε ὅτι αὐτοὶ ὀφείλονται ἐγένοντο παρὰ πάντας ἀνθρώπους,—with reference to a supposed divine judgment that had been inflicted. The milder synonym ἁμαρτωλός is significantly chosen in ver. 2.

II

Πατήρ, τρός, ὁ, father; in the plural, ancestors; also as an honourable style of address on the part of juniors to their seniors. It is figuratively used of the first originators or establishers of an institution, of an act, etc., of the founders of a state of things, *e.g.* Plato, *Menex.* 240 E, οὐ μόνον τῶν σωμάτων τῶν ἡμετέρων πατέρας . . . ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς ἐλευθερίας. With this, however, we must not take Rom. iv. 11, 12, 16–18 as parallel,—ver. 11, εἰς τὸ εἶναι Ἀβραάμ πατέρα πάντων τῶν πιστευόντων, as ver. 12 shows, καὶ πατέρα περιτομῆς τοῖς οὐκ ἐκ περιτομῆς μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς στοιχοῦσιν τοῖς ἔχουσιν τῆς ἐν ἀκροβυστίᾳ πίστεως τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἀβραάμ,—for here the point treated of is not a relationship of time, but far rather a moral fellowship of life which unites with Abraham, as the σπέρμα, vv. 13, 16, shows; comp. Gal. iii. 1 sqq., as also John viii. 33, 37, 39, 41, 42, 44. Περιτομή is, like ἐκλογή, not the name of the act, but of the people of God named according thereto.

Upon the whole, the usage of the N. T. does not differ from that of profane Greek. Peculiar only is the designation of God as Father, which is not intended to express simply a natural relationship between God and men, like the Greek πατήρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε of

Jupiter, comp. Joseph. *Antt.* iv. 8. 24, πατήρ τοῦ παντὸς ἀνθρώπων γένους (comp. Heb. xii. 9, τοὺς μὲν σαρκὸς ἡμῶν πατέρας, as against τῷ πατρὶ τῶν πνευμάτων), and which is not the relationship arising from the divine πρόνοια and εὐνοια. Comp. Tholuck on Matt. vi. 9, "What the heathen included in this name appears from Diod. Sic. *Bibl.* v. 72, πατέρα δὲ (αὐτὸν προσαγορευθῆναι) διὰ τὴν φροντίδα καὶ τὴν εὐνοίαν τὴν εἰς ἅπαντας, ἔτι δὲ καὶ τὸ δοκεῖν ὥσπερ ἀρχηγὸν εἶναι τοῦ γένους τῶν ἀνθρώπων. Plutarch also, in like manner, *De superst.* 6, contrasts the τυραννικόν with the πατρικόν, and says that the δεισιδαίμων wrongly recognises the first only in the Godhead." The N. T. designation of God as Father gives the deepest and fullest expression to the special covenant relation of a fellowship of love established by God, and therewith, at the same time, of a new fellowship of life, comp. υἱός, τέκνον, ἀδελφός. Hence it is already manifest that, with reference to the O. T., this designation of God is a distinctively New Testament one; and this not merely as if, in contrast with some O. T. particularism, the view which was not foreign to heathendom was here adopted, according to which God is said to be the universal Father. On the contrary, the O. T. history and revelation themselves prepare the way for this N. T. designation, and it is not a weakening and generalizing, but a free filling up and deepening of the O. T. view. Even in the O. T. the paternal relationship of God to Israel is insisted upon as the concentration of the whole O. T. economy of grace, Deut. xxxii. 6; Isa. lxiii. 16; Jer. xxxi. 9; Mal. i. 6, ii. 10; Jer. iii. 4, 19; oftener still Israel's relation as God's children, Ex. iv. 22; Deut. xiv. 1, xxxii. 19; Isa. i. 2; Jer. xxxi. 20; Hos. i. 10, xi. 1. Comp. John viii. 41, ἓνα πατέρα ἔχομεν τὸν θεόν. (On Ps. lxxxix. 27, 28, comp. υἱός (III).) But this arises from that special covenant relation which God by His elective love established between Himself and the whole people, upon which not only Israel's position as a nation, but, above all, the hope of redemption rests. It is characteristic of the apocryphal books that they not only simply maintain this view, as in Tob. xiii. 4, καὶ θεὸς αὐτὸς πατήρ ἡμῶν εἰς πάντας τοὺς αἰῶνας, comp. Isa. lxiii. 16, but generalize it, and from the special covenant relation evolve a natural relationship, as in Ecclus. xxiii. 1, πάτερ καὶ δέσποτα ζωῆς μου; ver. 4, πάτερ καὶ θεὸς ζωῆς μου. Here we trace the influence of the heathen view, and it is no less manifest in the deepening of it to an individual child-consciousness, cf. Wisd. xiv. 3, ἡ δὲ σὴ πάτερ διακυβερνᾷ πρόνοια. We cannot compare this with Ps. lxviii. 6, where God is specially called the widows' Father. Once only does πατήρ appear as the expression of individual filial consciousness, Wisd. ii. 16, where of the righteous it is said, ἀλαζονεύεται πατέρα θεόν, and this expresses in anticipation an apprehension of the O. T. promises which St. Paul presents in 2 Cor. vi. 18. (Singular and difficult is Ecclus. li. 10, ἐπεκαλεσάμην κύριον πατέρα κυρίου μου, to be compared with Ps. cx. 1 (?). On Job xxxiv. 36, see Delitzsch. There יְיָ is not — my father, but as an idiom or dialect, and — I pray beseechingly, from another root, perhaps אָב, after the Arabic.) Upon the whole, this designation of the covenant relation is rare in the O. T.; we find it only in the places quoted, and the representation does not govern the entire life and thinking, as in the N. T. This appears still in the

post-biblical literature of the synagogue likewise. "Very generally," indeed, "the *individual* name **father** occurs in the Rabbinical writings in the centuries after Christ. It occurs in prayers and in the Kaddisch, with a national reference. Yet it is observable that a certain shyness shrinks from the use of it even as predicate of the *community*. The Targumist, on Jer. iii. 4, 19, translates יְיָ only by יְיָוִי, and Isa. lxiii. 16 only in the manner of a comparison, 'Thou art our Lord, and Thy goodness is abundant towards us, like that of a father to his children.' Judging from the instances before us, we cannot but believe that the **constant** use of the *πατήρ ὑμῶν* in Christ's discourses to His disciples must have been something quite new and unusual." Tholuck on Matt. vi. 9. If, now, we compare 2 Cor. vi. 18, *καὶ ἔσομαι ὑμῖν εἰς πατέρα καὶ ὑμεῖς ἔσεσθέ μοι εἰς υἱοὺς καὶ θυγατέρας, λέγει κύριος παντοκράτωρ*,—a passage which does not occur thus anywhere in the O. T., and which is manifestly nothing but a summarizing of the O. T. promises (see above, Wisd. ii. 16),—we are led to find in that designation of God as *Father* on the lips of Christ a like comprehensive and summarizing reference to the O. T., and specially to the O. T. covenant relation bearing upon the promises. What is new and distinctive is not only the use of the name **father** itself, but its *individual* application, *πατήρ ὑμῶν*, not *ἡμῶν* (so only in Matt. vi. 9), *σοῦ* (so, with the singular pronoun, only in Matt. vi. 4, 6, 18); and, moreover, not the fact that this application of the word is confined to the circle of the disciples, but that it indicates a relationship now realized which was in the O. T. the subject of promise. Thus the word *πατήρ* assumes the same relation to the O. T. as, e.g., *βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν*. This view is further conclusively confirmed by the fact that this individualizing of the fatherhood of God, instead of generalizing it, *narrows it to the circle of the disciples*, comp. Luke xii. 32, *μὴ φοβοῦ, τὸ μικρὸν ποίμνιον ὅτι εὐδόκησεν ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν δοῦναι ὑμῖν τὴν βασιλείαν*; Matt. x. 20, *οὐ γὰρ ὑμεῖς ἐστε οἱ λαλοῦντες, ἀλλὰ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν τὸ λαλοῦν ἐν ὑμῖν*. It would be too much to say that Christ never used this designation in addressing the multitudes; comp. Matt. xxiii. 9 with ver. 1, and the passages in the Sermon on the Mount with Matt. v. 1, 28. The expression occurs further in Matt. v. 16, 45, 48, vi. 1, 4, 6, 8, 14, 15, 18, 26, 32, vii. 11, 21, x. 29, xviii. 14; Mark xi. 25, 26; Luke vi. 36, xii. 30. But it is for the disciples in particular that the word has especial weight and value, comp. John xx. 17, the only place where *πατήρ ὑμῶν* occurs in John,—*πορεύου δὲ πρὸς τοὺς ἀδελφούς μου, καὶ εἰπὲ αὐτοῖς· Ἀναβαίνω πρὸς τὸν πατέρα μου καὶ πατέρα ὑμῶν*; Matt. xiii. 43, *τότε οἱ δίκαιοι ἐκλάμψουσιν . . . ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῶν*. This already leads on to that inner and special fatherly relationship of God which comes into view in the N. T. filial relationship of believers as the **children of God**, and which constitutes the sum and substance of the evangelic announcement, 1 John iii. 1; Rom. viii. 15; Gal. iv. 6; comp. *θεὸς πατήρ ἡμῶν*, Rom. i. 7; 1 Cor. i. 3; 2 Cor. i. 2; Gal. i. 4; Eph. i. 2; Phil. i. 2, iv. 20; Col. i. 2; 1 Thess. i. 1, 3, iii. 11, 13; 2 Thess. i. 1, 2, ii. 16; 1 Tim. i. 2; Philem. 3. (With Eph. iv. 6, *εἰς θεὸς καὶ πατήρ πάντων*, comp. vv. 3–5.) But further, the above view, which regards this *πατήρ* in Christ's mouth as strictly and distinctively

a N. T. expression, and as denoting the central fulfilment of the promises, is confirmed by the fact that *ὁ πατήρ ἡμῶν* is clearly parallel with the *ὁ πατήρ μου*, comp. Matt. vii. 11, 21, x. 29, 32, 33, xviii. 10, 14, 19, xx. 23, with xiii. 43, and others. Still more clearly does this appear in the absolute *ὁ πατήρ* side by side with *ὁ πατήρ μου*, Matt. xi. 27, comp. xxiv. 36 with xxv. 34, xxvi. 39, where Christ manifestly, in adopting the relation of children, co-ordinates the disciples not with Himself, but with each other; and it is specially significant that Christ never, except in giving the Lord's prayer, says *πατήρ ἡμῶν*. The relationship, therefore, in which He stands to the Father is one peculiar to Himself (and this is important also for the understanding and limitation of the expression *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*), Luke ix. 26, xi. 13. In the Synoptics, *ὁ πατήρ*, Matt. xi. 25, 26, 27, xxviii. 19; Mark xiii. 22; Luke ix. 26, x. 21, 22, xi. 2, 13. *Ὁ πατήρ μου*, Matt. vii. 21, x. 32, 33, xi. 27, xii. 50, xv. 13, xvi. 17, xviii. 19, 35, xx. 23, xxv. 34, xxvi. 29, 39, 42, 53 (Mark viii. 38, xiv. 36); Luke ii. 49, x. 22, xxii. 29, xxiv. 49 (xxii. 42, xxiii. 46). Comp. Acts i. 4, 7. In John especially this absolute *ὁ πατήρ* occurs as denoting the relation subsisting between Christ and the Father, and at the same time God's relation to the disciples. Comp. John iv. 21, 23, v. 45, vi. 27, x. 15, xiv. 8, 9, 13, 16, xv. 16, 26, xvi. 3, 25, with xx. 17. This last passage specially shows that Christ's relation as Son to the Father lies at the basis of the wider fatherhood of God, comp. John v. 17, 18, *πατέρα ἴδιον ἔλεγεν τὸν θεόν*. The passages in John are, i. 14, 18, xiii. 1, 3, iii. 35, v. 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 26, 30, 36, 37, 45, vi. 27, 37 (39 Rec. text), 44, 45, 46, 57, viii. 16, 18, 27, 29, x. 15, 17, 30, 36, 38, xii. 26, 49, 50, xiv. 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 16, 24, 26, 28, 31, xv. 9, 16, 26, xvi. 3, 15, 16, 17, 23, 25, 26, 27, 28, 32, xviii. 11, xx. 21. In many of these places *ὁ πατήρ* is primarily only = *ὁ πατήρ μου*, but in many the term also includes clearly God's relation to the disciples; it is an appellation of God which in Christ's mouth, and for those to whom He speaks, has special significance, and discloses to them their relation to God. We may compare also *ὁ πατήρ μου* in John ii. 16, v. 17, 43, vi. 32, 40, 65, viii. 19, 28, 38, 49, 54, x. 18, 25, 32, 37, xiv. 2, 7, 12, 20, 21, 23, 28, xv. 1, 8, 10, 15, 23, 24, xvi. 10 (xvii. 1, 5, 11, 21, 24, 25), xx. 17. The wider and more comprehensive *ὁ πατήρ* manifestly rests upon the *ὁ πατήρ μου*, that which God is for Christ He is also (in Christ and for Christ's sake, cf. John xiv. 6 sqq.; 1 John ii. 22, 23) for others (comp. John i. 12). Especially compare the *ὁ πατήρ* in the mouth of the evangelist, John i. 14, 18, xiii. 1, 3, and 1 John i. 2, 3, ii. 1, 13, 15, 16, 22, 23, 24, iii. 1, iv. 14 (v. 7, Rec. text); 2 John 3, 4, 9. (So also Acts ii. 33.) Instead of this we find *ὁ πατήρ μου* in Rev. ii. 27, iii. 5, 21, comp. *ὁ πατήρ αὐτοῦ*, i. 6, xiv. 1. Precisely the same view meets us, only more objectively put, in the apostolic epistles, where—besides the *θεὸς πατήρ ἡμῶν* (see above); *θεὸς ὁ πατήρ*, 1 Cor. viii. 6; *θεὸς πατήρ*, Gal. i. 1, 3; Eph. vi. 23; Phil. ii. 11; Col. iii. 17; 1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Tim. i. 2; Tit. i. 4; 1 Pet. i. 2; 2 Pet. i. 17 (2 John 3); Jude 1; *ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατήρ*, 1 Cor. xv. 24; Eph. v. 20 (Col. iii. 17, Rec. text); Jas. i. 27, iii. 9; *ὁ πατήρ*, Rom. vi. 4; Eph. ii. 18, cf. Rom. viii. 15;

Gal. iv. 6 ; 1 Pet. i. 17—we have the full designation, ὁ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, Rom. xv. 6 ; 2 Cor. i. 3, xi. 31 ; Eph. i. 3, iii. 14 ; Col. i. 3 2 Pet. i. 3. (For more on this, see υἱός, τέκνον.) The ὁ πατὴρ τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν, 2 Cor. i. 3 ; τῆς δόξης, Eph. i. 3 ; τῶν φώτων, Jas. i. 17, are more closely attributive limitations of the name (φῶς in the last-named passage denotes *all blessing*, see φῶς). If πατήρ is thus the distinctively N. T. designation of God, and if the explanation here given be correct, that in this name is concentrated the fulness of O. T. promise, then is πατήρ the proper equivalent for the O. T. אֱלֹהִים, and compensates for the other inadequate substitute, יְיָ, κύριος, which does not occur, as the O. T. designation of God, in a manner so thoroughly marking every utterance as does יהוה in the O. T. and πατήρ in the New. In keeping with this also is the fact that יהוה, apart altogether from the linguistic explanation of it, is in the O. T. the special name for God in the economy of grace (cf. Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* i. 87 sq.), and this in the N. T. is ὁ πατήρ.

Πατριά, ἡ, what is called after the father, belongs to, or springs from him (adj. πάτριος)—family, descendants,—so in Herod. as synonymous with γένεσις, ii. 143, cf. 146 ; iii. 75. Then the stock, race, or tribe, synonymous with φυλή, Herod. i. 200, εἰς τῶν Βαβυλωνίων φυλαὶ τρεῖς. Beyond these places it does not seem to be used in profane Greek. More frequently, on the contrary, in the latter sense in biblical Greek. In the LXX. as = אֲבֹתָם, Ex. vi. 15 ; Deut. xxix. 18 ; Lev. xxv. 10. It most completely answers to אֲבֹתָם, Ex. vi. 25, αὐταὶ αἱ ἀρχαὶ πατριᾶς Λευιτῶν κατὰ γενέσεις αὐτῶν. Num. i. 18—ii., compare ver. 16 ; here, as often when the context permits, it answers to the simple אֲבֹתָם, compare generally, Ex. xii. 3, vi. 25. It is in general narrower than φυλή, אֲבֹתָם, and denotes the association of families of the race and house, within the lineage or stock ; conjoined with οἶκοι πατριῶν, πατριᾶς, and thus the series from the general to the particular would be φυλή, πατριά, οἶκος. Ex. xii. 3 ; Num. i. 2, iv. 20, ii. 2 ; 2 Chron. xvii. 14, comp. Num. i. 16, xvii. 3 ; αἱ πατριαὶ τῶν φυλῶν, Num. xxxii. 28, comp. xxxi. 26 ; Josh. xix. 51 ; Num. i. 44. See Judith viii. 2 ; Tob. v. 10, 11 ; 3 Esdr. i. 4, v. 4, and elsewhere. So Luke ii. 4, ἐξ οἴκου καὶ πατριᾶς Δαυίδ. In a wider sense = people, nationality, race ; Acts iii. 25, ἐν τῷ σπέρματί σου ἐνευλογηθήσονται πάντες αἱ πατριαὶ τῆς γῆς ; Gen. xii. 3 = אֲבֹתָם אֲבֹתָם, comp. Ps. xxii. 28, xcvi. 7. In 1 Chron. xvi. 28 the combination αἱ πατριαὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν. The explanation of Eph. iii. 14, 15, κάμπτω τὰ γόνατά μου πρὸς τὸν πατέρα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἐξ οὗ πάντα πατριά ἐν οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς ὀνομάζεται, is difficult, *from whom all that is called after a father, that bears his name, i.e. the name of a πατριά, אֲבֹתָם*. For, apart from the thought—somewhat far-fetched, and difficult to make anything of in this passage—that the relation between father or progenitor and race or progeny is to be taken as meaning generally divine origin, πάντα πατριά, since πατήρ is not left undefined, but is named, can only mean those πατριαὶ who are to be traced to *this πατήρ*, the πατριά of the children of God. Thus the comprehensive πατριαὶ ἐν οὐρανοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς—comp. Heb. xii. 22, 23—

gains special significance in a context which concludes with a reference to the consummation and to eternity, vv. 19–21, cf. iv. 13, and there is no unavoidable necessity to understand by πατριά ἐν οὐρανοῖς specially the angels as אֱלֹהִים יְיָ. Thus Luther's translation, *over all who bear the name of children*, recommends itself as best.

Πείθω, πείσω, ἔπεισα. In poetry also the 2d aor. ἔπιθον, Hom. πέπιθον. Passive or middle, πείθομαι, πείσομαι, ἐπείσθην (Hom. ἐπιθόμην), with the 2d perf. πέποιθα, which, however, occurs very rarely in Attic prose. Probably akin to the German "binden." See Curtius, p. 236.

(I.) Actively, to persuade, to win by words, to influence; Matt. xxvii. 20, xxviii. 14; Acts xii. 20, xiii. 43, xviii. 4, xix. 26, as opposed to violence, 2 Cor. v. 11, ἀνθρώπους πείθομεν, cf. Xen. *Mem.* i. 2. 45, οἱ ὀλίγοι τοὺς πολλοὺς μὴ πείσαντες, ἀλλὰ κρατοῦντες. This meaning is further determined by the context, e.g. to appease, to pacify, to quiet; Acts xiv. 19, cf. Xen. *Hell.* i. 7. 4, τοιαῦτα λέγοντες ἔπειθον τὸν δῆμον; 1 John iii. 19, πείσομεν τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν; Matt. xxviii. 14, ἐὰν ἀκουσθῇ τοῦτο ἐπὶ τοῦ ἡγεμόνος, ἡμεῖς πείσομεν αὐτὸν καὶ ἡμᾶς ἀμερίμους ποιήσομεν. To gain any one, to win for oneself, e.g. τοὺς δικαστὰς ἀργυρίῳ. Comp. δῶρα θεοὺς πείθει, Hes. in Plat. *Rep.* iii. 390 E; Eurip. *Med.* 964, πείθειν δῶρα καὶ θεοὺς λόγος, for which view see ἰλάσκεσθαι as synonymous with ἀρέσκειν. So Gal. i. 10, ἄρτι ἀνθρώπους πείθω ἢ τὸν θεόν; ἢ ζητῶ ἀνθρώποις ἀρέσκειν. That to which one is persuaded is expressed by ἵνα, Matt. xxvii. 20; by the infinitive, Acts xiii. 43, xxvi. 28; the accusative (to persuade one to something), xix. 8, πείθων τὰ περὶ τῆς βασ. τ. θ.; cf. the double accusative, xxviii. 23, πείθων αὐτοὺς τὰ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ (Tisch. in both places omits the τὰ) = to speak with winning words concerning; cf. Soph. *O. C.* 1442, μὴ πείθ' ἀ μὴ δέ.

(II.) The medial passive (cf. Krüger, § 52. 6), to suffer oneself to be persuaded or convinced; Acts xvii. 4, xxi. 14; Luke xvi. 31, εἰ Μωϋσέως καὶ τῶν προφητῶν οὐκ ἀκούουσιν, οὐδὲ ἐάν τις ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῇ, πεισθήσονται; to be convinced, Acts xxvi. 26; Luke xx. 6; Rom. viii. 38, xiv. 14, xv. 14; 2 Tim. i. 5, 12; Heb. vi. 9, xiii. 18. With the relative dative, τινί (not the dynamical, for this as a rule occurs only impersonally), to be persuaded in favour of any one, to yield assent to, to follow, obey, or trust him; Acts xxviii. 24, οἱ μὲν ἐπείθοντο τοῖς λεγομένοις, οἱ δὲ ἠπίσταντο; xxvii. 11, τῷ ναυκλήρῳ ἐπείθετο μᾶλλον ἢ τοῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ Παύλου λεγομένοις; v. 36, 37, 40; to obey, Jas. iii. 3; Rom. ii. 8; Heb. xiii. 17; Gal. v. 7; to trust or confide in, Acts xxiii. 21.—The use of the 2d perf. πέποιθα = to be convinced of, to have an assurance concerning, to confide or trust to, is more comprehensive than the perf. pass. πέπεισμαι, to be persuaded, to believe. (a.) Formal. The person or thing concerning which I am convinced is as a rule put in the dative in classical Greek; the subject-matter of belief is expressed by the infinitive, Phil. i. 14. Comp. 2 Cor. x. 7, εἰ τις πέποιθεν ἐναντὶ Χριστοῦ εἶναι. Also without the dative with the accusative and infinitive following, Rom. ii. 19, πέποιθας σεαυτὸν ὁδηγὸν εἶναι. Cf. Soph. *Aj.* 769, πέποιθα τοῦτ' ἐπισπάσειν κλέος, I cherish the hope of attaining this honour;

Phil. i. 6, πεποιθὼς αὐτὸ τοῦτο, ὅτι; i. 25. For the rest, biblical Greek is different, for we find such constructions as πεποιθέναι ἐπὶ τινι, ὅτι, Luke xviii. 9; ἐπὶ τινα ὅτι, 2 Thess. iii. 4; 2 Cor. ii. 3; εἰς τινα ὅτι, Gal. v. 10. (b.) Without further definition, to put one's confidence in, to entrust oneself to, to commit or surrender oneself; πεπ. τινί, Philem. 21; ἐπὶ τινι, Heb. ii. 13; 2 Cor. i. 9; Luke xi. 22; Mark x. 24; ἐπὶ τινα, Matt. xxvii. 43; ἐν τινι, Phil. ii. 24, iii. 3, 4. In a religious sense, Matt. xxvii. 43; Mark x. 24; 2 Cor. i. 9; Phil. iii. 3, 4; Heb. ii. 13. Cf. πεποιθήσις. — Πείθεσθαι or πεποιθέναι answers in the LXX. to the Hebrew נָסַב, נָסַח.

Πεποίθησις, confidence, trust. Only in later Greek (Josephus, Philo, Sext. Empir.), Lob. *Phryg.* 294, πεποιθήσις οὐκ εἴρηται, ἀλλ' ἦτοι πιστεύειν ἢ πεποιθέναι; LXX. 2 Kings xviii. 20; Aquila, Ps. iv. 9, εἰς πεποιθήσιν καθίσσεις με; LXX., ἐπ' ἐλπίδι κατ' ὀκισίας με; Aquila and Theodot., Hos. ii. 18, where the LXX. have ἐλπίς; Symmachus, εἰρήνη. In the N. T. 2 Cor. i. 15, iii. 4, viii. 22, x. 2; Eph. iii. 13; Phil. iii. 4.

Ἀπειθής, ες, disobedient (not letting oneself be persuaded, hard, stubborn), e.g. κακὸς καὶ ἀπειθὴς χῶρος, of the under world, Ath. xiii. 597 B, if it be not here, as sometimes, used in an active sense, *uninviting, unattractive*, Rom. i. 30; 2 Tim. iii. 2, γονεῦσιν ἀπειθεῖς; Acts xxvi. 19, ἀ. τῇ οὐρανίᾳ ὀπτασίᾳ. Without further limitation in the LXX., of one who rejects or resists God's will and revelation (*vid.* ἀπειθεῖν) = נִרְבָּ, Num. xx. 10, ἀκούσατέ μου οἱ ἀπειθεῖς, the words of Moses to the murmuring people at the waters of strife; Jer. v. 23, τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ ἐγενήθη καρδία ἀνήκοος καὶ ἀπειθής, καὶ ἐξέκλιναν, cf. Isa. xxx. 9; Zech. vii. 12; נִרְבָּ, Deut. xxi. 18. — Ecclus. xvi. 6, ἔθνος ἀπειθέες, parallel συναγωγὴ ἁμαρτωλῶν; Ecclus. xlvii. 21. — So in the N. T. Luke i. 17, ἐπιστρέψαι ἀπειθεῖς ἐν φρονήσει δικαίων; Tit. i. 16, βδελυκτοὶ ὄντες καὶ ἀπειθεῖς; iii. 3, ἀνόητοι, ἀπειθεῖς, πλανώμενοι.

Ἀπειθέω, to be disobedient, as opposed to πείθωμαι, to allow oneself to be persuaded, to obey; Plat. *Phaedr.* 271 B, ἡ μὲν πείθεται, ἡ δὲ ἀπειθεῖ; cf. Rom. ii. 8, ἀπειθοῦσιν μὲν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, πειθομένοις δὲ τῇ ἀδικίᾳ; Acts xvii. 5, οἱ ἀπειθοῦντες Ἰουδαῖοι, as contrasted with ver. 4, καὶ τινες ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐπεισθήσαν; xix. 9, ὥς δὲ τινες ἐσκληρύνοντο καὶ ἠπείθουν, in contrast with ver. 8, πείθων τὰ περὶ τῆς βασιλ. τ. θ. Hence the beautiful antithesis of 1 Pet. iii. 1, ἵνα καὶ εἴ τινες ἀπειθοῦσιν τῷ λόγῳ . . . ἄνευ λόγου κερδηθῇσονται. Very often in the LXX., and always in the N. T., it is used to denote the behaviour of those who turn away from God's revealed will, who not only have been disobedient to His will and command, Josh. v. 6, Deut. i. 26, but have rejected the offers of His grace; cf. Isa. xxxvi. 5, ἐπὶ τίνα πέποιθας ὅτι ἀπειθεῖς μοι; Deut. ix. 23, ἠπειθήσατε τῷ ῥήματι κυρίου . . . καὶ οὐκ ἐπιστεύσατε αὐτῷ. (Hence, in short, to have no faith; Ecclus. xli. 2, ἀπειθοῦντι καὶ ἀπολωλεκότι ὑπομονήν, cf. i. 28?) Heb. iv. 6, οἱ πρότερον εὐαγγελισθέντες οὐκ εἰσῆλθον διὰ ἀπειθειαν; 1 Pet. iv. 17, τῶν ἀπειθούντων τῷ τοῦ θεοῦ εὐαγγελίῳ. It has reference to all man's relations to God, Deut. ix. 7, ἀπειθοῦντες διετελεῖτε τὰ πρὸς κύριον; ver. 24, ἀπειθοῦντες ἦτε τὰ πρὸς κύριον ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμέρας ἧς ἐγνώσθη ἡμῖν. Hence

the antithesis of πιστεύειν, John iii. 36, ὁ πιστεύων εἰς τὸν υἱόν, as against ὁ δὲ ἀπειθῶν τῷ υἱῷ; Acts xiv. 1, ὥστε πιστεῦσαι πολὺ πλῆθος; ver. 2, οἱ δὲ ἀπειθοῦντες Ἰουδαῖοι; 1 Pet. ii. 7, ὑμῖν τοῖς πιστεύουσιν . . . ἀπειθοῦσιν δέ; Heb. iii. 18, ὥμοσα μὴ εἰσελεύσεσθαι εἰς τὴν κατὰπανσιν αὐτοῦ τοῖς ἀπειθήσασιν, cf. ver. 19, οὐκ ἠδυνήθησαν εἰσελθεῖν δι' ἀπιστίαν. Comp. ὑπακοή πίστεως. This must not be regarded as a weaker meaning of the word, but it is used to designate *unbelief* as a perverse, contradictory, and disobedient resistance against God's revelation of grace, cf. Isa. lxxv. 2; Rom. x. 21, ἐξεπέτασα τὰς χεῖράς μου πρὸς λαὸν ἀπειθοῦντα καὶ ἀντιλέγοντα; xi. 31, ἠπειθήσαν τῷ ὑμετέρῳ ἐλέει; to this resistance πείθειν or πείθεσθαι (see above) stands in full contrast.—More directly defined in John iii. 36, τῷ υἱῷ; Rom. xi. 30, τῷ θεῷ; 1 Pet. ii. 8, iii. 1, τῷ λόγῳ; iv. 17, τῷ εὐαγγ.; Rom. ii. 8, τῇ ἀληθείᾳ; xi. 31, τῷ ἐλέει. Used absolutely in Acts xiv. 2, xvii. 5, xix. 9; Rom. x. 21, xv. 31; Heb. iii. 18, xi. 31; 1 Pet. ii. 7, iii. 20. ἀπιστεῖν is more rare; but ἄπιστος, ἀπιστία are more frequent than ἀπειθής, ἀπειθεία.—In the texts quoted from the LXX. it is = עָרַב, as also Isa. l. 5, lxiii. 10; Deut. xxxii. 51; = עָרַב, Josh. v. 6; = עָרַב, Isa. xxxvi. 5; = עָרַב, Isa. lxxv. 2; Hos. ix. 15.

Ἀπειθεία, ἡ, disobedience. Not in the LXX. In the N. T. corresponding in its use with the verb; unbelief which opposes the gracious word and purpose of God; a stronger term than the synonym ἀπιστία (Heb. iii. 18, 19); hence οἱ υἱοὶ τῆς ἀπειθείας, Eph. ii. 2, v. 6; Col. iii. 6; also in Heb. iv. 6, 11; Rom. xi. 30, 32.

Πιστός is originally most probably a verbal adjective from πείθειν, πείθεσθαι, so that it may be taken actively or passively, according to the different meanings of πείθεσθαι—to obey, hence *submissive, faithful*;—to confide in, hence *confiding*. Cf. Xen. *Hell.* ii. 4. 30, τὴν χώραν οἰκείαν καὶ πιστὴν ποιεῖσθαι; ii. 3. 29; Tit. i. 6, τέκνα ἔχων πιστά, cf. with 1 Tim. iii. 4, τέκνα ἔχον ἐν ὑποταγῇ. From this meaning, *submissive, tractable*, arises the so-called passive signification *faithful, one whom we may trust, trusty*; e.g. ὄρκια πιστά, τεκμήρια πιστά; μάρτυς, ἄγγελος, φύλαξ, ἐταῖρος πιστός. Still its direct connection with the verb was soon in common usage lost sight of, and πιστός was taken as parallel with πίστις, the tokens above named of its original meaning *submissive* occurring comparatively seldom. (We can, however, still trace them in ἄπιστος, ἀπιστεῖν.) In describing the usage of this word, therefore, it will be best to adhere to the common distinction between an active and passive signification, as in the case of verbal adjectives generally; compare, e.g., *res considerata*, "a thing well considered;" *homo consideratus*, "a thoughtful, considerate person." Accordingly, (I.) *faithful, trusty*, of one on whom we may rely, whom we may believe. Primarily, of persons, δοῦλος, Matt. xxiv. 45, xxv. 21, 23; οἰκόνομος, Luke xii. 42, 1 Cor. iv. 2; διάκονος, Eph. vi. 21, Col. i. 7, iv. 7. Cf. Luke xvi. 10–12, xix. 17; 1 Cor. iv. 17; Col. iv. 9; 1 Tim. i. 12; 1 Cor. vii. 25; 2 Tim. ii. 2; 1 Pet. v. 12; Rev. ii. 10, 13. The sphere in which the faithfulness is or is to be manifested, is denoted by ἐν, 1 Tim. iii. 11, Luke xvi. 10, 12, xix. 17; ἐπί, with

the accusative, Matt. xxv. 21, 23; by the accus. simply, Heb. ii. 17, πιστὸς ἀρχιερεὺς τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν, εἰς τὸ ἰλάσκεσθαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας τοῦ λαοῦ, to which we may less fitly compare Prov. xxv. 13, ἄγγελος πιστὸς τοὺς ἀποστείλαντας αὐτόν (where the accus. is governed by the ὠφελεῖ understood), than 1 Sam. ii. 35, ἀναστήσω ἐμαντὸν ἀρχιερέα πιστόν, ὃς πάντα τὰ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ μου καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ μου ποιήσει.—Of God, 1 Cor. i. 9, πιστὸς ὁ θεός, δι' οὗ ἐκλήθητε κ.τ.λ., cf. ver. 8, ὃς καὶ βεβαιώσει ὑμᾶς ἕως τέλους κ.τ.λ.; 1 Cor. x. 13; 2 Cor. i. 18; 1 Thess. v. 24; 2 Thess. iii. 3; 2 Tim. ii. 13; Heb. x. 23, xi. 11; 1 John i. 9, πιστός ἐστιν καὶ δίκαιος, cf. Deut. xxxii. 4, θεὸς πιστὸς καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἀδικία ἐν αὐτῷ, δίκαιος καὶ ὁσιος κύριος; 1 Pet. iv. 19, ὡς πιστῷ κτιστῇ παρατιθέσθωσαν τὰς ψυχὰς. In all these passages God's faithfulness is manifest in His dealings as the God of salvation, viz. that He is the God of grace, and will continue so, and proves Himself to be this by the accomplishment of His gracious work; that He is a God whom we may trust, cf. the Hebrew נֶאֱמָר, *vid.* πίστις, and this is of importance in our conception of faith, *vid.* ἀπιστεῖν. This signification enables us to explain the otherwise difficult text, 2 Tim. ii. 13.—Of Christ, ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστός, Rev. i. 5, iii. 14, xix. 11.—Next, of things, *trustworthy, sure, firm, certain, what one may rely on or believe.* Thus, *e.g.* οἶκος, 1 Sam. ii. 35; διαθήκη, Ps. lxxxix. 29, cf. Isa. lv. 3, διαθήσομαι ὑμῖν διαθήκην αἰώνιον, τὰ ὅσια Δαυὶδ τὰ πιστά (Acts xiii. 34); τόπος, Isa. xxii. 23, 25; ὕδωρ, xxxiii. 16. In the N. T. (except in 3 John 5, πιστὸν ποιεῖς ὃ ἐὰν ἐργάσῃ εἰς τοὺς ἀδελφούς) only ὁ λόγος, 1 Tim. iii. 1; 2 Tim. ii. 11; Tit. i. 9, iii. 8; joined with πάσης ἀποδοχῆς ἄξιος, 1 Tim. i. 15, iv. 9; with ἀληθινός, Rev. xxi. 5, xxii. 6.—In the LXX. and Apocrypha the word occurs in this passive sense only, answering to the Hebrew נֶאֱמָר, נֶאֱמָר.

In the N. T., on the contrary, (II.) the active signification, which seldom occurs in profane Greek, is frequently met with, viz. *confiding*, or like the N. T. πίστις, πιστεύειν = *faithful*. For this sense in profane Greek, see Soph. *O. C.* 1031, ἀλλ' ἔσθ' ὅτῳ σὺ πιστὸς ὦν ἔδρας τάδε, and a few other places in the Tragic poets; Plat. *Legg.* vii. 824; Acts xvi. 15, κεκρίκατέ με πιστὴν τῷ κυρίῳ εἶναι; 1 Pet. i. 21, πιστοὺς εἰς θεόν, where some read πιστεύοντας; John xx. 27, μὴ γίνου ἄπιστος, ἀλλὰ πιστός; Acts xvi. 1; 1 Cor. vii. 14; 2 Cor. vi. 15; Gal. iii. 9; Col. i. 2; 1 Tim. iv. 10, 12, v. 16, vi. 2. As a substantival, οἱ πιστοί, the faithful; Acts x. 45, οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς πιστοί; Eph. i. 1; 1 Tim. iv. 3, τοῖς πιστοῖς καὶ ἐπεγνωκόσιν τὴν ἀλήθειαν; iv. 12; Rev. xvii. 14, οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ κλητοὶ καὶ ἐκλεκτοὶ καὶ πιστοί. See πίστις. In the sense of *faithful*, the word does not occur in Matt., Luke, 1 and 2 Thess., 2 Tim., Titus, Heb., 1 and 3 John. Πιστός does not occur at all in Mark, Rom., Phil., Philem., 2 John.

Πιστόω, to make faithful; in the passive, either to guarantee, to give bail for oneself, to become security for; or, to be made faithful, to put trust in, to confide; 2 Tim. iii. 14, cf. Ps. lxxviii. 11, 41.

Πίστις, ἡ, faith, a word of the greatest significance in the formation and history

of N. T. language, nay, of the language of Christendom; for in it all formative elements—the precedents of the O. T., the signification of the word as religiously used in classical Greek, and its special fitness for summing up and presenting in one term the Christian view of truth—combine, on the one hand, to make it an appropriate watchword for the spirit of the N. T., and, on the other hand, to put into it a very full and specific meaning.

In classical Greek, *πίστις*—like *πιστός*, from *πείθειν*, though not derived therefrom, but more probably from a common stem, and according to the analogy of *πιστός*—signifies, primarily, the trust which I entertain, which one puts in any person or thing; and as parallel therewith, the conviction one has, and confidently or in good faith cherishes (*opinion*, syn. *δόξα*). Akin to the signification trust is the somewhat rarer meaning fidelity, as pledged or entertained, e.g. Herod. vii. 281, *τηρεῖν τὴν πίστιν καὶ τὸν ὄρκον*; Dio Cass. *Exc.*, *τὴν πρὸς Νέρωνα πίστιν ἐτήρησε*; Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 12, *μηδεμίαν γυναῖκα τηρεῖν τὴν πρὸς ἓνα πίστιν*; Polyb. i. 7. 9, *πίστιν διατηρεῖν* (see Kypke, *Obs. scr. ad 2 Tim.* iv. 8). Hence pledge of fidelity, security, promise, pledge, oath, e.g. Thuc. v. 45, *πίστιν δοῦναι τινί*, to give security; Soph. *Oed. C.* 1632, *δός μοι χερὸς σῆς πίστιν*, and, parallel hereto, means of conviction, demonstration, proof (Plato, Aristotle).—For the first meaning, trust, see Herod. iii. 24, *πίστι λαμβάνειν τινά*, cordially and in good faith to make a friend of one; Soph. *Oed. C.* 950, *πίστιν ἴσχειν τινί*, to bestow confidence on one; Xen. *Hier.* iv. 1, *ἄνευ πίστεως τῆς πρὸς ἀλλήλους*. Also, in a passive sense, the trust which one enjoys, which is vouchsafed, the credit or credence which one meets with, e.g. Aristot. *Eth.* x. 8, *ἔχει τὴν πίστιν*, a thing merits or wins credence; often in Polyb., but upon the whole rarely elsewhere. Parallel to the signification trust, as already observed, is the other meaning conviction (comp. *πελθεσθαι*), belief; Dem. 300. 10, *πίστιν ἔχειν τινός*, to believe in anything; *πίστιν περὶ τινος*, and others. It means a conviction which is based upon trust, not upon knowledge,—an opinion cherished with confidence, synon. with *δόξα* (see below), as distinct from clear and conscious knowledge; so that, in this sense, *ὁ πιστεύων* stands over against *εἰδώς*, and *πίστις* over against *ἐπιστήμη*; cf. Plat. *Rep.* x. 601 E, *τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἄρα σκεύους ὁ μὲν ποιητὴς πίστιν ὀρθὴν ἔξει* (syn. *δόξα ὀρθή*, 602 A) *περὶ κάλλους τε καὶ πονηρίας*, ξυνὼν τῷ εἰδότηι καὶ ἀναγκαζόμενος ἀκούειν παρὰ τοῦ εἰδότος, ὁ δὲ χρώμενος ἐπιστήμῃ. In this sense *πίστις* is used in the sphere of religion to denote belief in the gods, and the acknowledgment of them which is not based upon practical or theoretic knowledge. This meaning appears especially in Plut. *Mor.* 756 B, *δοκεῖς . . . τὰ ἀκίνητα κινεῖν τῆς περὶ θεῶν δόξης ἣν ἔχομεν*, *περὶ ἐκάστου λόγον ἀπαιτῶν καὶ ἀπόδειξιν ἀρκεῖ γὰρ ἢ πατριος καὶ παλαιὰ πίστις*, ἥς οὐκ ἔστιν εἰπεῖν οὐδ' ἀνευρεῖν τεκμήριον ἐναργέστερον . . ., ἀλλ' ἔδρα τις αὕτη καὶ βάσις ὑφ' ἑστώσα κοινὴ πρὸς εὐσεβείαν ἐὰν ἐφ' ἑνὸς ταράττηται καὶ σαλεύηται τὸ βέβαιον αὐτῆς καὶ νενομισμένοι, ἐπισφαλὴς γίγνεται πᾶσι καὶ ὑποπτος; 402 E, *τὴν δὲ εὐσεβῆ καὶ πατριον μὴ προέσθαι πίστιν*; Plat. *Legg.* 976 C, D, *δύ' ἐστὸν τὸ περὶ θεῶν ἄγοντε εἰς πίστιν*; Eurip. *Med.* 413, 414, *θεῶν δ' οὐκέτι πίστις ἄραρε*. It is characteristic that the verb *πιστεύειν* is not used of this belief,—as it is of believing in the N. T.,—but instead of it the verb *νομίζειν*, denoting

a general *opinion* and acknowledgment; cf. Xen. *Mem.* i. 1. 1, οὐς ἡ πόλις νομίζει θεοὺς οὐ νομίζων; Plat., Herod., and others. (For the development of the N. T. conception, see πιστεύω.)

Now it is just this element of faith, an *acknowledgment* which is distinct from εἰδέναι, that we find likewise in the N. T. conception, both in Paul's writings and elsewhere; 2 Cor. v. 7, διὰ πίστεως γὰρ περιπατοῦμεν, οὐ διὰ εἶδους (see εἶδος); Heb. xi. 27, πίστει κατέλιπεν Αἴγυπτον . . . τὸν γὰρ ἀόρατον ὡς ὁρῶν ἐκατέρησεν; xi. 1, ἔστιν δὲ πίστις ἐλπιζομένων ὑπόστασις, πραγμάτων ἔλεγχος οὐ βλεπομένων; Rom. iv. 18, παρ' ἐλπίδα ἐπ' ἐλπίδι ἐπίστευσεν; John xx. 29, μακάριοι οἱ μὴ ἰδόντες καὶ πιστεύσαντες; 1 Pet. i. 8, εἰς ὃν ἄρτι μὴ ὁρῶντες πιστεύοντες δὲ κ.τ.λ. Comp. also, in Rom. xv. 13, the relation between πιστεύειν and ἐλπίς; comp. with Rom. viii. 24, 25. Still this is not the essential or main element in the conception, but, so to speak, more an accident of it; for in the exercise of faith only is it shown to be at the same time a relation to the invisible. See John iv. 42, xi. 45; 1 Tim. iv. 3, τοῖς πιστοῖς καὶ ἐπεγνωκόσιν τὴν ἀλήθειαν; Philem. 6, and other places. The main element (as appears under πιστεύω) is twofold, or indeed threefold, viz. a *conviction*, which is not, like the profane πίστις, merely an opinion held in good faith without reference to its proof (cf. 1 Pet. iii. 15, ἔτοιμοι δὲ αἰεὶ πρὸς ἀπολογίαν παντὶ τῷ αἰτοῦντι ὑμᾶς λόγον περὶ τῆς ἐν ὑμῖν ἐλπίδος; i. 21, ὥστε τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν καὶ ἐλπίδα εἶναι εἰς θεόν), but a full and convinced *acknowledgment* of God's saving revelation or truth (cf. 2 Thess. ii. 11, 12); a *cleaving* thus demanded of the person who acknowledges to the object acknowledged, therefore *personal fellowship* with the God and Lord of salvation (so especially in John), and *surrender to Him*; and lastly, a *behaviour* of unconditional and yet perfectly intelligent and assured *confidence*;—all these elements appear, each prominent according to the context, and especially in the representations of the Acts of the Apostles.

Now, since *that* word is used to denote *faith* which in the religious sphere of profane Greek denotes what the Christian πίστις is to supplant, we must claim for it the significance which indeed it also has elsewhere, though just in the religious sphere this is not spoken of, viz. its meaning *trust*, or the designation of a personal relation between the subject of it and its object. For though not wholly unknown, it was nevertheless unusual among the Greeks to take πίστις θεῶν to denote *trust* (cf. Soph. *Oed. R.* 1445, νῦν γ' ἂν τῷ θεῷ πίστιν φέροις), for such a bearing was not in keeping with their views of the nature of the Godhead; see ἱλεως, ἰλάσκεσθαι. Here the N. T. conception of faith follows the precedent of the O. T., without, however, exactly receiving from thence its peculiar fulness and determinateness; this does not appear until the N. T. revelation of grace, inasmuch as this conditions faith as the perfectly new and gradually formed bearing of the man to his God; hence Gal. iii. 23, πρὸ τοῦ δὲ ἐλθεῖν τὴν πίστιν. This especially in St. Paul's writings; in St. John, who uses πίστις only in 1 John v. 4, πιστεύειν denotes man's relation to Christ. (For further on this, see πιστεύω.)

Comparatively little is said of faith in the O. T.; man's whole bearing to God and

His revealed will is usually expressed otherwise; according to the economy of the law, it is called a *doing His will, walking in the way of His commandments, remembering the Lord* (Ex. iii. 15), etc.; and only as special graces do *trust, hope, waiting upon the Lord* (חַסַּד, נֶחֱמָה, נִצְחָה, ἐλπίζειν, πεποιθέναι, ὑπομένειν, etc.), appear. In the N. T., on the other hand, *πίστις* appears as the generic name for this whole bearing, comp. Acts xvii. 31, Rom. i. 5, and elsewhere. Indeed, Paul distinguishes the N. T. from the O. T. time precisely as the time of *faith*, Gal. iii. 23, comp. Acts vi. 7, xvii. 31; still comp. Rom. iv. When the moral claims of the law were in consideration, the question was not concerning doubt, but concerning obedience or disobedience. Still the O. T., as the testament of promise, does not lack the element of faith. Faith is spoken of, and this just in the most important passages; and it tallies with this, that, *e.g.*, Heb. xi. treats especially of faith in O. T. times, and also that in John faith appears as the logical consequence of previous conduct with reference to the O. T. revelation, John v. 24, xii. 44, v. 46, xii. 38, 39. The full conception of faith presupposes present salvation, and, above all, the atonement; see below. In the O. T. mention is made of faith, first at the outset of the history of God's saving plan; in the case of Abraham, Gen. xv. 6; of Israel, Ex. iv. 31, *καὶ ἐπίστευσε ὁ λαός*, the testimony of Moses concerning the divine revelation made to him; see vv. 1, 5, 8, 9; Ex. iv. 31; after the exodus and the destruction of the Egyptians, *ἐφοβήθη δὲ ὁ λαὸς τὸν κύριον, καὶ ἐπίστευσεν τῷ θεῷ καὶ Μωϋσῇ τῷ θεράποντι αὐτοῦ*. Cf. Ps. cvi. 12.—Deut. ix. 23, concerning the commanded taking possession of Canaan, *ἠπειθήσατε τῷ ῥήματι κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ ὑμῶν, καὶ οὐκ ἐπιστεύσατε αὐτῷ*; cf. Deut. i. 32; Ps. lxxviii. 22, 32, cvi. 24.—Ex. xix. 9, where, referring to the impending giving of the law, and ratifying of the covenant, it is said, *ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ παραγίνομαι πρὸς σὲ ἐν στύλῳ νεφέλης, ἵνα ἀκούσῃ ὁ λαὸς λαλοῦντός μου πρὸς σὲ καὶ σοὶ πιστεύσωσιν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*. We may thus say that mention is made of *faith* in the foundation laid in the O. T. for the New. Again, in 2 Chron. xx. 20, where the question is decided whether Jehoshaphat should lead the people out against the Ammonites and Moabites, *ἐμπιστεύσατε ἐν κυρίῳ θεῷ ἡμῶν καὶ ἐμπιστευθήσεσθε ἐμπιστεύσατε ἐν προφῆτῃ αὐτοῦ καὶ εὐδοθήσεσθε*, cf. Isa. liii. 1, vii. 9, xxviii. 16; and after Jonah's preaching at Nineveh, Jonah iii. 5, *ἐπίστευσαν οἱ ἄνδρες Νινευὴ τῷ θεῷ*. But especially the opposite behaviour, Israel's wandering and apostasy from the God of grace, is designated *unbelief*; and, almost more frequently than the positive expression, we find the negative one *לֹא־נֶחֱמָה*, Ps. xxvii. 13; 2 Kings xvii. 14; Ps. lxxviii. 22, 32, cvi. 24; Num. xx. 12; Deut. ix. 23; Isa. vii. 9, liii. 1; Num. xiv. 11. We find the verb *believe* used to describe the conduct of an individual only in Ps. cvi. 10, cxix. 66. In all these cases the verb used is *נֶחֱמָה*, and, indeed, *נֶחֱמָה*, not *חָזַק*. Hiphil of *נָחַם*, "to make firm," "to build," "to strengthen," signifies *to be firm* (Job xxxix. 24), *to hold firmly to, to rely upon*, and hence *to trust* (Job xxxix. 12, iv. 18, xv. 15), or *to take for certain, or reliable* (1 Kings x. 7; 2 Chron. ix. 6; Lam. iv. 12; Jer. xl. 14), *to be sure and certain of*, Deut. xxviii. 66; Job xxiv. 22. With reference to God, it denotes *holding fast to Him, reliance upon Him, a firm trust which*

surrenders itself to *Him*, feels sure of God as "my God," and thus gives strength and steadfastness to the subject of it; 2 Chron. xx. 20, הָאֱמִינוּ בַיהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם וְהִתְאֲמִנוּ; Isa. vii. 9, אִם לֹא תֵאֱמִינוּ בִּי לֹא תִהְיֶה הָאֱמִנָה. The word already so expressively denotes a *bearing towards God*, that by itself, and without any further qualifying word, it signifies this *self-surrendering confidence* and *trustful expectation towards the God of salvation*, e.g. Isa. vii. 9, xxviii. 16; Ps. xxvii. 13, cxvi. 10. It is not merely the same as the profane πίστις religiously used, but is akin to the verb πιστεύειν, *to trust, believe*, which was not used (as already observed) in the profane sphere to designate religious conduct, either generally or as answering to the religious πίστις.

Now this verb האמין seems to have no corresponding substantive. For אמונה answers to the participle of Kal or Niph., נֶאֱמַן, נֶאֱמָנָה, and signifies *firmness, steadfastness, certainty*, i.e. not a bearing or behaviour, but simply a quality or state, Ex. xvii. 2; Isa. xxxiii. 6, cf. Jer. xv. 18. Except in these places, it denotes an attribute of persons, their *reliableness*, the trustiness they show in their actions, but not the trust they exercise. So of men, LXX. = πίστις, 1 Chron. ix. 22; 2 Chron. xxxi. 18; Jer. vii. 28. Cf. 2 Kings xii. 7, xxii. 7 (where Luther translates the Hebrew בְּאִמּוֹנָה הֵם עָשִׂים, ἐν πίστει ἐποιοῦν, — not, indeed, against the context, but against the literal meaning of the words, — *they dealt on trust*); 2 Chron. ix. 26, 31, xxxi. 15, xxxiv. 12. Of God, in the LXX. = ἀλήθεια, it means the faithfulness and stability which characterize His economy of grace, Ps. xl. 11, xxxiii. 4, xxxvi. 6. — Ps. lxxxviii. 12, side by side with הַסֵּד (see ὁσιος), as in lxxxix. 2, 3, 25, 34, xcii. 3, xcvi. 3, c. 5; cf. lxxxix. vi. 9, 25; Hos. ii. 22. — Lam. ii. 23 = πίστις, cf. Ps. xxxiii. 4. — Ps. xvi. 13, significantly as against and parallel with צָדִיק. — It may just here be observed that the reference made by Paul to this אמונה of God (Rom. iii. 2 sqq.; see πιστός, ἀπιστεῖν) determines the Pauline conception of faith as *trust*. Now אמונה, πίστις, is used of men only seldom as a characteristic of their religious bearing; first, only in 1 Sam. xxvi. 23, κύριος ἐπιστρέφει ἐκάστῳ κατὰ τὰς δικαιοσύνας αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν πίστιν αὐτοῦ; Jer. v. 3, κύριε οἱ ὀφθαλμοί σου εἰς πίστιν; Hos. ii. 22, if compared with i. 2, is, to say the least, very doubtful. It is clear, especially from Jer. v. 3 (cf. vv. 1, 5; Matt. xxiii. 23), that in these texts the word means more than *honesty* or *candour*, far rather *fidelity* or *faithfulness to the covenant*; but still it does not denote a bearing or behaviour, or what we denominate faith, nor what האמין signifies. There remains only to be noticed, Hab. ii. 4, the text which is so decisive for the Pauline πίστις, וְצִדִּיק בְּאִמּוֹנָתוֹ יִהְיֶה, LXX., ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως μου ζήσεται (Lachm., ὁ δὲ δίκ. μου ἐκ π. ζ.). The LXX. manifestly misunderstood this passage, for they changed the suffix of the third person into the first, and referred the statement to God's covenant faithfulness and reliableness. אמונה here clearly denotes the bearing which the just man assumes towards God's promises in the face of the pride of the Chaldaeans; it means, not indeed the bearing or behaviour itself, but a *quality of the behaviour*, faithfulness in waiting for the fulfilment of the promises, ver. 3. The transition from this to the designation of the behaviour itself is easy, and was made by the syna-

gogue, for the talmudic *הִיָּמְנָהּ, הִיָּמְנָהּ* signifies directly *confiding faith* (see Levy, *chald. Wörterb.*), and this passage is thus interpreted. This meaning can never have been very far removed from O. T. phraseology, for Abraham, of whom we read, Gen. xv. 6, *הֵאֱמַן בַּיהוָה*, is called in Neh. ix. 8 *נֶאֱמַן*, cf. Ps. lxxviii. 8. When, therefore, Paul, quoting Hab. ii. 4, correcting the LXX., renders it, *ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται*, Rom. i. 17, referring to the gospel as the fulfilled promise, he not only gives the true meaning, but is, moreover, "strikingly confirmed in his rendering by the synagogue tradition" (see Delitzsch, *On Habakkuk*, pp. 50–53; Keil, *On the Minor Prophets*, in *loc.*).

Thus already by the O. T. view a hint was given whereby to discover the fundamental conception of N. T. faith, viz. a **firmly relying trust**; and with this is blended the element peculiar or analogous to the profane conception, viz. that of **acknowledgment and conviction** with reference to the truths of the gospel, or (comp. Hab. ii. 3) the relation to invisible objects, which is expressly named in Heb. xi. 1. Which of these two elements is the predominating one is indicated by the context, and is mainly to be decided on psychological grounds. We may describe *πίστις* generally to be **trust or confidence cherished by firm conviction**, a confidence that bids defiance to opposing contradictions, a confidence contrasted with *διακρίνεσθαι*, *to doubt*, a word which is used of those whose faith is wavering, see Matt. xxi. 21; Jas. i. 6; Heb. x. 39; Mark iv. 40; Heb. vi. 12, *διὰ πίστεως καὶ μακροθυμίας*; Rev. xiii. 10, *ὧδέ ἐστιν ἡ ὑπομονὴ καὶ ἡ πίστις τῶν ἁγίων*; xiv. 12, *ἡ ὑπομονὴ τῶν ἁγίων, οἱ τηροῦντες . . . τὴν πίστιν Ἰησοῦ*. (See further under *πιστεύειν*.)

We first find *πίστις* in the N. T. used apparently to denote trust shown in any particular case. Thus in the synoptical Gospels, of persons who came in contact with our Lord, Matt. viii. 10, *οὐδὲ ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ τοσαύτην πίστιν εὑρον*; Luke vii. 9; Matt. ix. 2, *ἰδὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὴν πίστιν αὐτῶν*; Mark ii. 5; Luke v. 20; Matt. ix. 29, *κατὰ τὴν πίστιν γεννηθήτω ὑμῖν*, and in the more frequent *ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε*, Matt. ix. 22; Mark v. 34, x. 52; Luke vii. 50, viii. 48, xvii. 19, xviii. 42; cf. Matt. xv. 28, *μεγάλη σου ἡ πίστις· γεννηθήτω σοι ὡς θέλεις*. That in these places, however, it does not denote an isolated trust merely, but is to be taken as the expression and testimony of a certain *relationship to Christ*, is clear from other expressions, *e.g.* Luke xviii. 8, *πλὴν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐλθὼν ἄρα εὕρησει τὴν πίστιν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*, cf. with Matt. viii. 10; Luke viii. 25, *ποῦ ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν*; Mark iv. 40, *τί δειλοὶ ἐστε οὕτως; πῶς οὐκ ἔχετε πίστιν*; Luke xxii. 32, *ἵνα μὴ ἐκλείπῃ ἡ πίστις σου*. It is faith as a trustful bearing, sure of its case, towards the revelation of God in Christ, see Luke xvii. 5, *πρόσθες ἡμῖν πίστιν*; ver. 6, *εἰ ἔχετε πίστιν ὡς κόκκον σινάπεως κ.τ.λ.*; Matt. xvii. 20, xxi. 21, cf. with Mark xi. 22, *ἔχετε πίστιν θεοῦ*. The element of convinced **acknowledgment** also is not foreign to the Synoptists, at least in their use of *πιστεύειν*. In general, *πίστις*, answering to the O. T. word *אָמַן*, is a bearing towards God and His revelation which recognises and confides in Him and in it, which not only acknowledges and holds to His word as true, but practically applies and appropriates it; Heb. iv. 2, *οὐκ ὠφέλησεν ὁ λόγος τῆς ἀκοῆς ἐκεί-*

νους μὴ συγκεκραμένους τῇ πίστει τοῖς ἀκούσασιν; vi. 12, μιμηταὶ τῶν διὰ πίστεως καὶ μακροθυμίας κληρονομοῦντων τὰς ἐπαγγελίας. πίστις does not primarily signify a laying hold or reliance on the object, but a firmly self-uniting and reacting reference of the subject to the object; and this corresponds with πίστις subjectively used. In the N. T. sphere this bearing becomes confident and self-surrendering acknowledgment and acceptance of Christ's gracious revelation; here, indeed, only can it first appear and be realized, inasmuch as here first comes clearly out what the whole divine revelation aimed at, and therefore now also for the first time man's conduct could fully shape itself thereto. In contrast with the New, the character of the O. T. revelation was that of a tuition towards faith, and this St. Paul insists upon in Gal. iii. 23, πρὸ τοῦ δὲ ἔλθειν πίστιν ὑπὸ νόμον ἐφρουρούμεθα συγκεκλεισμένοι εἰς τὴν μέλλουσαν πίστιν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι; ver. 24, ὁ νόμος παιδαγωγὸς ἡμῶν γέγονεν. Cf. Rom. xi. 32, συνέκλεισεν γὰρ ὁ θεὸς τοὺς πάντας εἰς ἀπειθειαν, ἵνα τοὺς πάντας ἐλεήσῃ; ix. 30; Acts xvii. 31, πίστιν παρασχὼν πᾶσιν. Still (and this aspect of the case may be justly maintained) the Epistle to the Hebrews represents faith as the true and distinguishing bearing of man to the God who promises and reveals His saving plan, during the entire course of the economy of grace in the O. T. as well as in the N. T., see Heb. xi.; while in the book of the Acts (which Delitzsch would attribute to the same author) faith is emphasized as the special characteristic of N. T. revelation, Acts vi. 7, ὑπήκουον τῇ πίστει (cf. Rom. i. 5, xvi. 25); xiii. 8, διαστρέφαι ἀπὸ τῆς πίστεως; xvii. 31, cf. Gal. i. 23. In St. Paul's writings, indeed, the necessity of faith and its presence under the O. T. dispensation is not denied, as the reference to Abraham and the quotation of Hab. ii. 4 show; but still, on the one hand, stress is specially laid upon the unbelief everywhere appearing in the past (Rom. xi. 32); and, on the other, answering thereto, the main feature of O. T. conduct is regarded as conditioned by the relation between law and promise or law and gospel (Gal. iii. 12-18). The case is so stated as to correspond with the antithesis of χάρις and ὀφείλημα, and thus unconditional trust is insisted on as the main element of faith, though, as has already been remarked, the element of acknowledgment is not ignored. The promise, which is the correlative of the Gospel, is the N. T. element of the O. T. economy, and demands faith, Gal. iii. 22, cf. iv. 21 sqq.; but the absence of a σπέρμα ᾧ ἐπὶ ἡγγελται, Gal. iii. 19 (*vid. μεσίτης*), conditioned the intervention of the law; and this is not a νόμος πίστεως, but a νόμος ἔργων (see νόμος), which, by convincing of sin, served as a tuition towards faith, Rom. iii. 19, Gal. iii. 22, 23; it left no other resource but a trust in the God of promise and of grace, which now appears face to face with the accomplishment of the promise. Thus is explained the antithesis of πίστις and ἔργα, χάρις and ὀφείλημα . . . πίστις and νόμος, Gal. iii. 23, where πίστις denotes the subjective bearing demanded by God, and νόμος the objective O. T. summary of the demands of God,—a contrast which with πίστις transfers to the subjectivity what is expressed purely objectively by John in the contrast χάρις and ἀλήθεια with νόμος (John i. 17); cf. the contrast similarly made between εἶδος and πίστις in 2 Cor. v. 7. Perhaps the Pauline form of the contrast is designed at

the same time to give prominence to the non-fulfilment of the law, which as such can never become, as grace does in faith, the element of spiritual life in man. For *πίστις* as contrasted with *ἔργα*, see Rom. iii. 27, 28, cf. iv. 2, 5, ix. 32; Gal. ii. 16, iii. 2, 5, cf. iii. 12; Eph. ii. 8. As contrasted with *νόμος*, Rom. iv. 13, 14, 16, ix. 30; Gal. iii. 11, 12, 23-25. That this contrast should occur only where the contrast of the O. and N. T. economies and the conduct answering to each are spoken of,—in Romans and Galatians,—is so self-evident, that the absence of it will be felt by those alone who persist in regarding the apostle as influenced and ruled solely by this one thought.

In reviewing the uses of this pre-eminently Pauline word, which is employed by John only in 1 John v. 4, Rev. ii. 19, xiii. 10, xiv. 12, we shall best arrange them under the following heads:—(I.) With particularizing additions, Heb. vi. 1, *πίστις ἐπὶ θεόν*; 1 Thess. i. 8, *ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν ἡ πρὸς τὸν θεόν*; Mark xi. 22, *πίστις θεοῦ*; 2 Thess. ii. 13, *πίστις ἀληθείας*; Col. ii. 12, *συνηγέρθητε διὰ τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἐγείραντος τὸν Χριστὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν*; Phil. i. 27, *ἡ πίστις τοῦ εὐαγγελίου*. Further, *πίστις εἰς Χριστόν*, Acts xxiv. 24, xxvi. 18; Col. ii. 5; Acts xx. 21, *πίστις ἡ εἰς τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν*; cf. Philem, 5, *ἣν ἔχεις πρὸς τὸν κύριον*; 1 Tim. iii. 13, *ἐν πίστει τῇ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*; Gal. iii. 26; Eph. i. 15; 2 Tim. iii. 15; Rom. iii. 25, *π. ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι*. With the gen. of the object, *πίστις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, *πίστις Χριστοῦ*, Rom. iii. 22; Gal. ii. 16, iii. 22; Eph. iii. 12; Phil. iii. 9; Gal. ii. 20, *ἐν πίστει ζῶ τῇ τοῦ υἱοῦ θεοῦ κ.τ.λ.*; Acts iii. 16, *ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ*; Jas. ii. 1; Rev. ii. 13, xiv. 12. Everywhere, when the genitive is not that of the subject in whom the faith is (as in Rom. iv. 16, etc.), it is that of the object, in accordance with which the above-cited Col. ii. 12 is to be understood. With *κατὰ πίστιν ἐκλεκτῶν*, Tit. i. 1, cf. Rev. xvii. 14, *κλητοὶ καὶ ἐκλεκτοὶ καὶ πιστοί*.—(II.) Without further qualification, *faith*, which regards the N. T. revelation of grace with decided *acknowledgment* and unwavering *trust*, and appropriates it as its stay. Especially weighty is the expression in Acts iii. 16, *ἡ πίστις, ἡ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, *the faith which is brought about by Jesus Christ*, an expression which may perhaps have a reference to the faith known under the O. T., which here has been originated by Christ's mediation; not, indeed, by the operation of Christ (Rom. vii. 5), but because it is our looking to Christ which effects it (Heb. xii. 2). Besides the texts already quoted from the synoptical Gospels, etc., we may mention Acts xiv. 22, *ἐμμένειν τῇ π.*; xvi. 5, *ἐστερεοῦντο τῇ π.*; Col. i. 23; 1 Pet. v. 9; Rom. xiv. 1, *ἀσθενεῖν τῇ π.*; iv. 19, 20; 1 Cor. xvi. 13, *στήκετε ἐν τῇ π.*; Rom. xi. 20; 2 Cor. i. 24, xiii. 5, *εἶναι ἐν τῇ π.*; 1 Tim. ii. 15, *μένειν ἐν π.*; 2 Tim. iv. 7, *τηρεῖν τὴν π.*; 2 Cor. viii. 7, *περισσεύειν τῇ π.*; x. 15, *αὐξανομένης τῆς π. ὑμῶν*; 2 Thess. i. 3; Col. ii. 7, *βεβαιουῖσθαι ἐν τῇ π.*; 1 Tim. i. 19, *ἔχων π.*; Jas. ii. 1, xiv. 18; Tit. i. 13, *ὑγιαίνειν ἐν τῇ π.*; ii. 2; 2 Cor. v. 7, *διὰ πίστεως περιπατεῖν*; Rom. i. 17, *ἐκ π. ζῆν*; Gal. iii. 11; Heb. x. 38; cf. *ἐν π. ζῆν*, Gal. ii. 20. Again, *διαστρέψαι ἀπὸ τῆς π.*, Acts xiii. 8; 2 Tim. ii. 18, *ἀνατρέπουσιν τὴν τινῶν π.*; 1 Tim. i. 19, *περὶ τὴν π. ἐνανάγησαν*; iv. 1, *ἀποστήσουται τινες τῆς π.*; v. 8, *τὴν π. ἤρνηται*; ver. 42, *τὴν πρῶτην π. ἠθέτησαν*; vi. 10, *ἀπεπλανήθησαν ἀπὸ τῆς π.*; ver. 21, *περὶ τὴν π. ἡστούχησαν*; 2 Tim.

iii. 8, ἀδόκιμοι περὶ τὴν π. (These frequent expressions regarding apostasy are characteristic of the pastoral Epistles.) Further, the Pauline phrase, ἐκ πίστεως εἶναι, οἱ ἐκ π., Gal. iii. 7, 9, 12, 22; Rom. iv. 16, iii. 26. Cf. Heb. x. 39, ἐσμὲν πίστεως—, to be characteristically marked by faith, cf. Rom. xiv. 22, 23, ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοῦν, δικαιοῦσθαι, to denote the connection between justification and faith;—Rom. iii. 30, δικαιοῦσιν περιτομὴν ἐκ πίστεως καὶ ἀκροβυστίαν διὰ τῆς π., cf. Gal. iii. 14; Rom. v. 1; Gal. ii. 16, iii. 8, δικαιοσύνη πίστεως, Rom. iv. 13, 11; ἐκ π., ix. 30, x. 6; Phil. iii. 9, μὴ ἔχων ἐμὴν δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐκ νόμου, ἀλλὰ τὴν διὰ πίστεως Χριστοῦ, τὴν ἐκ θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει, cf. Rom. i. 17, ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν; iv. 5, λογίζεται ἡ π. αὐτοῦ εἰς δικαιοσύνην; ver. 9. Πίστις is joined with ἀγάπη, Eph. vi. 23; 1 Thess. iii. 6, v. 8; 1 Tim. i. 14, iv. 12, vi. 11; 2 Tim. i. 5, 13, ii. 22; Gal. v. 6; 1 Cor. xiii. 13; Rev. ii. 19; with ἐλπίς, ἵπομονή, 1 Cor. xiii. 13; 2 Thess. i. 4; Rev. xiii. 10. The word also occurs Acts vi. 5, 8, xi. 24, xiv. 27, xv. 9; Rom. i. 8, 12, iii. 31, iv. 12, v. 2, x. 8, 17, xii. 6; 1 Cor. ii. 5, xv. 14, 17; 2 Cor. i. 24, iv. 13; Gal. v. 5, 22, vi. 10; Eph. iii. 17, iv. 5, 13, vi. 16; Phil. i. 25, ii. 17; Col. i. 4; 1 Thess. i. 3, iii. 2, 5, 7, 10; 2 Thess. iii. 2; 1 Tim. i. 2, 4, ii. 7, iii. 9, iv. 6, vi. 12; 2 Tim. i. 5, iii. 10; Tit. i. 1, 4, iii. 15; Philem. 6, ὅπως ἡ κοινωνία τῆς πίστεως σου ἐνεργῆς γένηται ἐν ἐπιγνώσει παντὸς ἀγαθοῦ τοῦ ἐν ἡμῖν εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν; Heb. x. 22, xiii. 7; Jas. i. 3, 6, ii. 5, 14, 17, 18, 20, 22, 24, 26, v. 15. That trust, and not mere *acknowledgment*, constitutes the chief element of faith for James, is clear precisely from the latter passage, ἡ εὐχὴ τῆς πίστεως σώσει τὸν κάμνοντα, and also from chap. ii. 1. The works of faith are, according to him, the witnesses as to what faith really is, without which faith dwindles into mere acknowledgment (Jas. ii. 19), and as *faith* is νεκρά.—1 Pet. i. 5, 7, 9, 21; 2 Pet. i. 1, 5; Jude 3, 20.—There remain a few passages in which πίστις seemingly cannot mean this confidence of salvation in Christ; e.g. first, Rom. xii. 3, ὡς ὁ θεὸς ἐμέρισεν τὸ μέτρον τῆς πίστεως, cf. Acts xvii. 31, πίστιν παρασχὼν πᾶσιν. The charismata (ver. 6) are evidently the various “*measures* of faith,” i.e. faith is, and is said to be, common to all believers (cf. ver. 6, κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς π.), and forms the common basis of the charismata. But each charisma is called μέτρον τῆς π., not because it indicates the greatness of faith, but as denoting the sphere and range specially assigned by God for the exercise of faith, and appropriate thereto. It is not the faith itself, but the μέτρον τῆς π., which varies in different believers,—the measure or range assigned for the exercise of faith.—Again, 1 Cor. xiii. 2 is easily explained by a comparison with Matt. xxi. 21; Luke xvii. 5, 6; and 1 Cor. xii. 9 should also be viewed in the light of these passages.

(III.) With the signification *faithfulness*, π. is used, like the O. T. נֶאֱמָר, of God, Rom. iii. 3; of men, Matt. xxiii. 23; Tit. ii. 10. With the former, cf. Isa. v. 1 sqq.; Gal. v. 22. To assume a meaning *doctrina fidei* is everywhere superfluous.

Πιστεύω, (I.) to rely upon, to trust, τινί, e.g. ταῖς σπονδαῖς, θεῶν θεσφάτοις, et al.; Polyb. v. 62. 6, πόλεις πιστεύουσai ταῖς παρασκευαῖς καὶ ταῖς ὀχυρότησι τῶν τόπων;

Aeschin., ἐγὼ δὲ πεπιστευκῶς ἤκω πρῶτον μὲν τοῖς θεοῖς, δευτερόν δὲ τοῖς νόμοις; Soph. *Philoct.* 1360, θεοῖς τε πιστεύσαντα τοῖς τ' ἐμοῖς λόγοις; Dem. *Phil.* ii. 67. 9, οἱ θαρρόντες καὶ πεπιστευκότες αὐτῷ. With the dative of the person and the accusative of the thing, π. τινί τι = to entrust anything to any one, Luke xvi. 11, John ii. 24; in the passive πιστεύομαι τι, something is entrusted to me; without an object, confidence is vouchsafed me, Rom. iii. 2; 1 Cor. ix. 17; Gal. ii. 7; 1 Thess. ii. 4; 2 Thess. i. 10; 1 Tim. i. 11; Tit. i. 3.—(II.) Very frequently πιστεύειν τινί means, to trust or put faith in any one, to believe, to esteem as true, to recognise or be persuaded of what one says; Soph. *El.* 886, τῷ λόγῳ. In a wider sense, πιστεύειν τινί τι, to believe any one, e.g. Eur. *Hec.* 710, λόγοις ἐμοῖσι πίστευσον τάδε; Xen. *Apol.* 15, μηδὲ ταῦτα εἰκῇ πιστεύσητε τῷ θεῷ. Then simply πιστεύειν τί, to believe something, to acknowledge, e.g. Plat. *Gorg.* 524 A, ἀ ἐγὼ ἀκηκῶς πιστεύω ἀληθῆ εἶναι; Aristot. *Analyt. pr.* ii. 23, πιστεύομεν ἅπαντα ἢ διὰ συλλογισμοῦ ἢ δι' ἐπαγωγῆς; *Id. Eth.* x. 2, πιστεύονται οἱ λόγοι. Also πιστεύειν περὶ, ὑπὲρ τινος, Plut. *Lyc.* 19, where πιστεύειν stands by itself, to believe or acknowledge concerning anything; whereas in John ix. 18 a further qualification is added, οὐκ ἐπίστευσαν οὖν περὶ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ἦν τυφλὸς καὶ ἀνέβλεψεν; Dem. *pro cor.* 10, τινὲ π. ὑπὲρ τινος.

Now in N. T. Greek, where πιστεύειν signifies (as is known), in general, the bearing required of us towards God and His revelation of grace, all these constructions occur, as well as the combinations, unused in profane Greek, π. εἰς, ἐπὶ τινα, ἐπὶ τινι, and πιστεύειν by itself. It is questionable whether the element of *trust* or that of *acknowledgment* be the primary one. It is primarily to be remembered that in the profane sphere πιστεύειν is not used religiously, but instead of it νομίζειν, to believe. When πιστεύειν, however, sometimes is used, as in Plut. *de superst.* 11, it is accounted for by the context, which, as e.g. in this case, would not admit of νομίζειν; see the passage as referred to under δεισιδαιμῶν.

As πιστεύειν, followed by the accusative or a clause answering thereto, can only signify to believe, to hold or recognise as true, only the phrases π. τινί, εἰς, ἐπὶ τινα, ἐπὶ τινι can be of doubtful meaning; for in profane Greek only πιστεύειν τινι has two meanings, to trust any one, and to give credence to him; πιστεύειν τινί τι = to entrust anything to one, is too far removed from the N. T. conception of faith to be taken in the sense, to believe any one.

Proceeding now from the combinations that are free from doubt, we find πιστεύειν with the meaning to believe, to take or be persuaded of as true, to acknowledge; (a.) followed by the accusative, John xi. 26, πιστεύεις τοῦτο; cf. vv. 25, 26; 1 John iv. 16, ἡμεῖς ἐγνώκαμεν καὶ πεπιστεύκαμεν τὴν ἀγάπην; Acts xiii. 41, ἔργον δ' οὐ μὴ πιστεύσητε ἐὰν τις ἐκδιηγῇται ὑμῖν (Received text, ᾧ); 1 Cor. xi. 18, μέρος τι πιστεύω; 1 Tim. iii. 16, ἐπιστεύθη ἐν κόσμῳ, cf. Matt. xxiv. 23, 26; Luke xxii. 67, ἐὰν ὑμῖν εἴπω, οὐ μὴ πιστεύσητε· ἐὰν δὲ ἐρωτήσω, οὐ μὴ ἀποκριθῇτε; John x. 25, εἶπον ὑμῖν καὶ οὐ πιστεύετε; (b.) followed by the infinitive, Acts xv. 11, διὰ τῆς χάριτος τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ πιστεύομεν σωθῆναι καθ' ὃν τρόπον καλέεινοι; (c.) followed by ὅτι, Matt. ix. 28, πιστεύετε

ὅτι δύναμαι τοῦτο ποιῆσαι; Mark xi. 23, ὃς ἂν . . . μὴ διακριθῇ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ, ἀλλὰ πιστεύῃ ὅτι ὃ λαλεῖ γίνεται; ver. 24, πιστεύετε ὅτι ἐλάβετε; Acts ix. 26, μὴ πιστεύοντες ὅτι ἔστιν μαθητής; Jas. ii. 19, σὺ πιστεύεις ὅτι εἰς ὁ θεὸς ἐστιν, cf. Acts xxvii. 25, πιστεύω γὰρ τῷ θεῷ ὅτι οὕτως ἔσται καθ' ὃν τρόπον λελάληταί μοι; John iv. 21, πίστευέ μοι, ὅτι ἔρχεται ὥρα.—Just this combination πιστεύειν ὅτι is specially frequent in John's writings, where (apart from 2 and 3 John and the Revelation) the word, next to the Pauline usage, most frequently occurs. The phrase does occur, however, in St. Paul's writings, see Rom. vi. 8, εἰ δὲ ἀπεθάνομεν σὺν Χριστῷ, πιστεύομεν ὅτι καὶ συζήσομεν αὐτῷ; 1 Thess. iv. 14, εἰ γὰρ πιστεύομεν ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἀπέθανεν καὶ ἀνέστη; but still we find it only rarely, and it must be acknowledged that at least in the remaining passage, Rom. x. 9, ἐὰν πιστεύσης ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου ὅτι ὁ θεὸς αὐτὸν ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν, σωθήσῃ, the influence of Pauline phraseology adds the other element of *trust* (comp. ver. 10), though the element of *acknowledgment*, according to vv. 6–8, decidedly predominates. So also Heb. xi. 6, πιστεῦσαι δεῖ τὸν προσερχόμενον τῷ θεῷ ὅτι ἔστιν κ.τ.λ.; cf. ver. 1, iv. 3.

In St. John's writings we find this combination in John iv. 21 (see above), viii. 24, ἐὰν γὰρ μὴ πιστεύσητε ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι, ἀποθανείσθε ἐν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ὑμῶν; x. 38, ἵνα γνῶτε καὶ πιστεύσητε (*al.* γινώσκητε) ὅτι ἐν ἐμοὶ ὁ πατὴρ καὶ ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ; xi. 27, ἐγὼ πεπίστευκα ὅτι σὺ εἰ ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ εἰς τὸν κόσμον εἰσερχόμενος, cf. vi. 69, xi. 42, ἵνα πιστεύσωσιν ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας, cf. xvii. 3, xiii. 19, ἵνα πιστεύσητε ὅταν γένηται ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι; xiv. 10, οὐ πιστεύεις ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐστιν; ver. 11, πιστεύετε μοι ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ π. κ.τ.λ., εἰ δὲ μὴ, διὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτὰ πιστεύετε; xvi. 27, *the Father Himself loveth you, because ye have loved me*, καὶ πεπιστεύκατε ὅτι ἐγὼ παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐξῆλθον; ver. 30, ἐν τούτῳ πιστεύομεν ὅτι ἀπὸ θεοῦ ἐξῆλθες; xvii. 8, ἔγνωσαν ἀληθῶς ὅτι παρὰ σοῦ ἐξῆλθον, καὶ ἐπίστευσαν ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας; ver. 21, ἵνα ὁ κόσμος πιστεύῃ ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας; xx. 31, γέγραπται ἵνα πιστεύσητε ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἐστὶν ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ; 1 John v. 1, ὁ πιστεύων ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἐστὶν ὁ Χριστός; ver. 5, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, cf. ver. 10.

These passages indicate that with St. John the element of *acknowledgment* or *recognition as true* is the prominent one, and this is confirmed by other quotations. Thus comp. iii. 12, εἰ τὰ ἐπίγεια εἶπον ὑμῖν, καὶ οὐ πιστεύετε, πῶς ἐὰν εἶπω ὑμῖν τὰ ἐπουράνια πιστεύετε, with ver. 11, μαρτυροῦμεν καὶ τὴν μαρτυρίαν ἡμῶν οὐ λαμβάνετε. We may also notice the connection of π. with γινώσκειν, vi. 69, x. 37, 38; see under γινώσκω, and especially also xvii. 8, 21, and elsewhere, and the relation of Christ's works, and especially of seeing to faith; John iv. 48, ἐὰν μὴ σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα ἴδῃτε, οὐ μὴ πιστεύσητε; x. 37, 38, xiv. 11, vi. 36, ἐωράκετέ με καὶ οὐ πιστεύετε; xx. 8, εἶδεν καὶ ἐπίστευσεν; xx. 29, ὅτι εἰδὼκάς με, πεπίστευκας; μακάριοι οἱ μὴ ἰδόντες καὶ πιστεύσαντες. Cf. ver. 25, i. 51, iv. 39–42, οὐκέτι διὰ τὴν σὴν λαλίαν πιστεύομεν· αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἀκηκόαμεν καὶ οἶδαμεν ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ἀληθῶς ὁ σωτὴρ τοῦ κόσμου.

Still it is a question whether this conception of *acknowledgment* is the main element

implied in the phrases πιστεύειν τινί, εἰς τινα, and not rather the conception of *trust in a person*. Πιστεύειν τινί cannot of itself mean *to acknowledge any one*, but simply *to acknowledge what he says, to trust his words*, when it is the dative of the person and not of the thing, as in John ii. 22, ἐπίστευσαν τῇ γραφῇ καὶ τῷ λόγῳ ᾧ εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς; v. 47, xii. 38 (see Luke i. 20, xxiv. 25; Acts xxiv. 14, xxvi. 27; 1 John iv. 1). Primarily also in this sense only we explain John v. 46, εἰ γὰρ ἐπιστεύετε Μωϋσεί, ἐπιστεύετε ἂν ἐμοί· περὶ γὰρ ἐμοῦ ἐκεῖνος ἔγραψεν; viii. 31, ἔλεγεν . . . πρὸς τοὺς πεπιστευκότας αὐτῷ Ἰουδαίους· Ἐὰν ὑμεῖς μένητε ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῷ ἐμῷ (cf. ver. 30, ταῦτα οὖν λαλοῦντος πολλοὶ ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτόν, and with this again ver. 24, ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι); viii. 45, ὅτι τὴν ἀλήθειαν λέγω, οὐ πιστεύετε μοι; ver. 46. Comp. x. 37 with ver. 36, xiv. 11. But it is everywhere the self-witnessing of Jesus which is thus spoken of, and hence it is the acknowledgment of Christ Himself which clearly is referred to in John v. 46 compared with vv. 37-39. (We may also bear in mind the expression in the Synoptists, πιστεύειν τινί, Matt. xxi. 26, 32; Mark xi. 31; Luke xx. 5, cf. vii. 29, οἱ τελῶναι ἐδικαίωσαν τὸν θεὸν βαπτισθέντες κ.τ.λ.) Akin to these is the peculiar expression in 1 John iii. 23, αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἐντολὴ αὐτοῦ ἵνα πιστεύσωμεν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (elsewhere εἰς τὸ ὄν, John i. 12, ii. 23, iii. 18; 1 John v. 13). — The name of Jesus denotes that which is true of Him, the recognition of which is the Father's command (see John vi. 29, xvi. 9). See also 1 John v. 10, ὁ πιστεύων εἰς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ ἔχει τὴν μαρτυρίαν ἐν ἑαυτῷ· ὁ μὴ πιστεύων τῷ θεῷ ψεύστην πεποίηκεν αὐτόν, ὅτι οὐ πεπίστευκεν εἰς τὴν μαρτυρίαν ἣν μεμαρτύρηκεν ὁ θεὸς περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ. The πιστεύειν τῷ θεῷ, *to believe in God*, is proved by the acknowledgment of His testimony, π. εἰς τὴν μαρτυρίαν, and the consequent acknowledgment of Him whom the testimony concerns. See also John v. 38, ὃν ἀπέστειλεν ἐκεῖνος, τούτῳ ὑμεῖς οὐ πιστεύετε, compared with ver. 39, (αἱ γραφαὶ) μαρτυροῦσαι περὶ ἐμοῦ, and ver. 37, ὁ πέμψας με πατήρ, ἐκεῖνος μεμαρτύρηκεν περὶ ἐμοῦ; ver. 24, ὁ τὸν λόγον μου ἀκούων καὶ πιστεύων τῷ πέμψαντί με. That this πιστεύειν τῷ Χριστῷ and τοῖς ῥήμασιν αὐτοῦ, ver. 47, implies the very essence of faith, is evident from the πιστεύσαι standing alone in ver. 44. The acknowledgment of God's witness, of Christ's testimony concerning Himself, and therefore the acknowledgment of Christ Himself, is the main element in St. John's conception of faith. As with the πιστεύειν τῷ θεῷ the πίστ. εἰς τὴν μαρτυρίαν αὐτοῦ or εἰς τὸν υἱόν corresponds, so with the πιστεύειν τῷ Χριστῷ the πιστεύειν εἰς τὸν Χριστόν corresponds, which in many places answers to a preceding or following π. ὅτι, cf. viii. 24, ἐὰν γὰρ μὴ πιστεύσητε ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι ἀποθανείσθε κ.τ.λ., with ver. 30, ταῦτα αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος πολλοὶ ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτόν; xi. 42, ἵνα πιστεύσωσιν ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας, comp. ver. 45, πολλοὶ οὖν . . . θεασάμενοι . . . ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτόν. That the main element also in this combination, πιστεύειν εἰς, is *acknowledgment*, is evident from John vii. 5, οὐδὲ γὰρ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ ἐπίστευον εἰς αὐτόν, cf. vv. 3, 4, 48, 31. Cf. also John xii. 46, ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ, with ver. 48, ὁ ἀθετῶν ἐμέ καὶ μὴ λαμβάνων τὰ ῥήματά μου. (We cannot, perhaps, maintain that the εἰς αὐτόν is simply a substitute for

the dative; we must rather regard πιστεύειν here as originally a verb by itself = to be believing with reference to, etc.; as, e.g., Plut. *Lyk.* 20, περὶ μὲν οὖν τούτων καὶ τῶν τοιούτων ἐπιστολῶν οὔτε ἀπιστῆσαι ῥάδιον οὔτε πιστεῦσαι. The German phrase *woran glauben* (to believe in) probably originated in the N. T. πιστεύειν εἰς. See, however, John vi. 29, 30, and the alternation there between τινί and εἰς τινά.) Πιστεύειν εἰς Χριστόν occurs in John ii. 11, iii. 16, 18, 36, iv. 39, vi. 29, 40 (47), vii. 5, 31, 38, 39, 48, viii. 30, ix. 35, 36, x. 42, xi. 25, 26, 45, xi. 48, xii. 11, 37, 42, 44, 46, xiv. 1, 12, xvi. 9, xvii. 20; 1 John v. 13. For the meaning to acknowledge, to behave as one acknowledging, comp. especially xi. 25–27, xii. 44, with 1 John v. 10. The only text in John's writings where another preposition occurs, is John iii. 15, where Lachm. reads ἐπ' αὐτόν, and Tisch. ἐν αὐτῷ, instead of the Received εἰς αὐτόν; and here internal reasons determine the use of the ἐν or ἐπὶ. See below.

Yet it cannot be denied that this element of *acknowledgment* (which is primarily formal merely) does not fully come up to or exhaust St. John's conception of faith. There is, with the acknowledgment, in most cases, an acting upon it (cf. ix. 38, πιστεύω κυριε' καὶ προσεκύνησεν αὐτῷ, with ver. 35, σὺ πιστεύεις εἰς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, vv. 36, 30, 31), and this is *adhesion* (becoming His disciples, ix. 27, v. 46, viii. 31, *vid.* μαθητής), cf. xi. 48, ἐὰν ἀφῶμεν αὐτὸν οὕτως, πάντες πιστεύουσιν εἰς αὐτὸν καὶ ἐλεύσονται οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι κ.τ.λ.; xvi. 31, ἄρτι πιστεύετε, cf. ver. 32, καὶ μὲν μόνον ἀφήτε; x. 26, ὑμεῖς οὐ πιστεύετε, οὐ γάρ ἐστε ἐκ τῶν προβάτων τῶν ἐμῶν, see ver. 27, τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἐμὰ τῆς φωνῆς μου ἀκούει . . . καὶ ἀκολουθοῦσί μοι; vi. 69, i. 12. Both these elements are manifestly contained in the πιστεύειν τινί, John vi. 30, as compared with ver. 29, τί οὖν ποιεῖς σὺ σημεῖον, ἵνα ἴδωμεν καὶ πιστεύσωμέν σοι; ver. 29, ἵνα πιστεύσῃτε εἰς ὃν ἀπέστειλεν ὁ θεός. See particularly also Matt. xxvii. 42; Mark xv. 32, ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ βασιλεὺς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ καταβάτω νῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ, ἵνα ἴδωμεν καὶ πιστεύσωμεν. Only by the combination of both these elements, to acknowledge Christ and to cleave to Him, is the Johannine πιστεύειν adequately interpreted; and this explains the transition to the conception of confidence and reliance implied in John iii. 15, ἵνα πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων ἐν αὐτῷ, where now also another preposition still is used, conditioned by the reference to the brazen serpent, ver. 14 (Tisch. ἐν, Lachm. ἐπ' αὐτόν). But as to John xiv. 1, πιστεύετε εἰς τὸν θεὸν καὶ εἰς ἐμὲ πιστεύετε, I do not see why the word must mean to trust, and not rather to cleave to, to hold fast to, which easily harmonizes with the prevailing signification elsewhere. We may further compare what Weiss, *Joh. Lehrbegr.* p. 23, observes, namely, that this πιστεύειν immediately connects itself with the unerring certainty of Christ's word in ver. 2.

We may therefore now say that, with St. John, πιστεύειν denotes the acknowledgment of Christ as the Saviour of the world (iv. 39 sqq.), of His relation to the Father, and of His relation conditioned thereby to the world (see πιστεύειν ὅτι), and the adhesion to Him and fellowship with Him resulting therefrom. In this sense πιστεύειν stands absolutely in John i. 7, 51, iii. 18, iv. 41, 42, 48, 53, v. 44, vi. 47, 64, ix. 38, x. 25 26, xi. 15,

40, xii. 39, 47, xiv. 29, xvi. 31, xix. 35, xx. 31 (cf. iii. 12, vi. 36, xx. 8, 25, 29). The result of this cleaving to Christ is the receiving and possession of the blessings of salvation, vi. 68, x. 26, 27, ὑμεῖς οὐ πιστεύετε, οὐ γάρ ἐστε ἐκ τῶν προβάτων τῶν ἐμῶν· τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἐμὰ τῆς φωνῆς μου ἀκούει καὶ ἀκολουθοῦσίν μοι καὶ γὰρ ζωὴν αἰώνιον δίδωμι αὐτοῖς. So iii. 12, 16, 18, 36, vi. 35, 40, 47, vii. 38, xi. 25, 26, xx. 31, cf. v. 39, viii. 24, i. 12, xii. 36, ἕως τὸ φῶς ἔχετε, πιστεύετε εἰς τὸ φῶς, ἵνα υἱοὶ φωτὸς γένησθε; ver. 46, ἐγὼ φῶς εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἐλήλυθα, ἵνα πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ μὴ μείνη; and compare this again with viii. 12, ὁ ἀκολουθῶν ἐμοὶ οὐ μὴ περιπατήσει ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ ἀλλ' ἔξει τὸ φῶς τῆς ζωῆς; xi. 40, ἐὰν πιστεύσῃς ὅψῃ τὴν δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ.

It will be seen that St. John's πιστεύειν is akin to the profane use of πίστις in the religious sphere, except that it does not, like that πίστις, mean simply *an opinion held in good faith*, but a full, firm, and clear conviction. This is the import also of πίστις in the only Johannine passage where it occurs, 1 John v. 4.

Now in the Pauline use of the word the element of conviction and acknowledgment is certainly included, see the passages cited above, and Rom. iv. 20, ἐνεδυναμώθη τῇ πίστει δοὺς δόξαν τῷ θεῷ, likewise the ὑπακοὴ πίστεως, Rom. i. 5, xvi. 26, and the relation of πιστεύειν to κηρύσσειν, Rom. x. 14, 16; 1 Cor. xv. 2, 11; Eph. i. 13. But the second element in the Johannine conception, *adhesion*, becomes very definite with St. Paul as a fully convinced and assured trust in the God of salvation and in the revelation of grace in Christ, so that the Pauline conception of faith very closely approaches the O. T. *אמנה*, see πίστις. A further difference between the Pauline and the Johannine doctrinal exposition consists in this, that the direct reference of faith to God, so frequent in Paul, is comparatively rare in John's writings, only in John v. 24, xiv. 1, xii. 44, 1 John v. 10, and this corresponds with John's apprehension of πιστεύειν. With Paul, there lies in πίστις a reference to the new moulding, we might almost say the new formation of man's relationship to God; whereas John v. 24, xii. 44, v. 46, xii. 38, 39, show that with St. John faith in Christ is the consequence of a *previously existing* relationship to the God of salvation and to His testimony.

First, we find πιστεύειν τινί = to trust, to rely upon; 2 Tim. i. 12, οἶδα ὃ πεπίστευκα, καὶ πέπεισμαι ὅτι δυνατὸς ἐστὶν τὴν παραθήκην μου φυλάξαι; Tit. iii. 8, ἵνα φροντίζωσιν καλῶν ἔργων προϊστασθαι οἱ πεπιστευκότες θεῷ; Rom. iv. 3, ἐπίστευσε Ἀβραὰμ τῷ θεῷ; Gal. iii. 6; Rom. iv. 17, κατέναντι οὐ ἐπίστευσε θεοῦ τοῦ ζωοποιούντος τοὺς νεκροὺς καὶ καλοῦντος τὰ μὴ ὄντα ὡς ὄντα, cf. ver. 18, παρ' ἐλπίδα ἐπ' ἐλπίδι ἐπίστευσεν. For the fundamental conception of *trust*, see also the union of π. with θαρρῆν, 2 Cor. v. 7, 8, and the passage above quoted from Dem. ii. 67. 9, and also Eccles. ii. 12-14, οὐαὶ καρδίαις δειλαῖς καὶ χερσὶ παρειμέναις, καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶ ἐπιβαίνουντι ἐπὶ δύο τρίβους. Οὐαὶ καρδίᾳ παρειμένῃ, ὅτι οὐ πιστεύει διὰ τοῦτο οὐ σκεπασθήσεται· οὐαὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς ἀπολλεκόσι τὴν ὑπομονήν. Instead of the dative, we have the phrase πιστεύειν ἐπὶ τινι, and, indeed, Rom. iv. 5, ἐπὶ τὸν δικαιούντα τὸν ἄσεβῃ; ver. 24, ἐπὶ τὸν ἐγείραντα Ἰησοῦν. The πιστεύειν εἰς always denotes the direct reference of faith to Christ, Rom. x. 14; Gal.

ii. 16; Phil. i. 29; and so also does ἐπί with the dative, 1 Tim. i. 16; Rom. ix. 33. Πιστεύειν, moreover, is used without any addition to denote the fully persuaded confiding behaviour towards the God of grace and promise, Rom. i. 16, iii. 22, iv. 11, 18, x. 4, 10, xiii. 11, xv. 13; 1 Cor. i. 21, iii. 5, xiv. 22; 2 Cor. iv. 13; Gal. iii. 22; Eph. i. 13, 19; 1 Thess. i. 7, ii. 10, 13; 2 Thess. i. 10.

In James, *acknowledgment* appears as the chief element in ii. 19; *trust*, on the contrary, in ver. 23; and if we compare what he says of πίστις elsewhere, it seems he takes it for granted that, under the circumstances which he combats in ii. 18, faith must dwindle into mere *acknowledgment*.

In Peter, both elements of faith, *acknowledgment* and *adhesion* or *trust*, are in like manner blended, cf. 1 Pet. i. 8 with ii. 6, 7, i. 21.—In the Epistle of Jude only in ver. 5, τὸ δεύτερον τοὺς μὴ πιστεύσαντας ἀπώλεσεν, like the Hebrew רַמְּהָם כֵּף.

If we now compare the use of the word in the book of the Acts and the synoptical Gospels, we find that the context must decide in each case whether *acknowledgment* or *trust* is prominent. *Acknowledgment* is the foremost in Acts xi. 21, πολὺς τε ἄριθμος ὁ πιστεύσας ἐπέστρεψεν ἐπὶ τὸν κύριον; xviii. 8, ἐπίστευον καὶ ἐβαπτίζοντο; and so also πιστεύειν alone, Acts ii. 44, iv. 4, 32, viii. 13, xiii. 1, xv. 7. *Trust* is prominent in x. 43, xiii. 39, and elsewhere. It occurs with the dative, v. 14, xvi. 34, xviii. 8, εἰς x. 43, xiv. 23, xix. 4; ἐπί with the accusative, ix. 42, xi. 17, xvi. 31, xxii. 19. By itself again, xiii. 48, xiv. 1, xv. 5, xvii. 12, 34, xviii. 27, xix. 2, 18, xxi. 20, 25. In the synoptical Gospels = *to acknowledge* and *cleave to*, Mark ix. 42; Matt. xviii. 6, π. εἰς ἐμέ; xxvii. 42, ἐπ' αὐτόν (another reading, ἐπ' αὐτῷ, or the simple π., cf. Mark xv. 32). The verb by itself, Mark xv. 32, xvi. 16, 17; Luke viii. 12, 13, 50, cf. i. 45 = *to trust*, Mark i. 15, π. ἐν τῷ εὐαγγ. The verb by itself, Matt. viii. 13, xxi. 22; Mark v. 36, ix. 23, 24; Luke viii. 50.

Thus the N. T. conception of faith includes **three main elements**, mutually connected and requisite, though according to circumstances sometimes one and sometimes another may be more prominent, viz., (1) a fully convinced *acknowledgment* of the revelation of grace; (2) a self-surrendering *fellowship* (*adhesion*); and (3) a fully assured and unswerving *trust* (and with this at the same time *hope*) in the God of salvation or in Christ. None of these elements is wholly ignored by any of the N. T. writers.

Ἀπίστος, ον, (I.) **not worthy of confidence, untrustworthy**, Od. xiv. 150; Hdt. ix. 98 (Isa. xvii. 10, the explanatory translation of the LXX.). Of things = **unworthy of belief, incredible**, Acts xxvi. 8. — (II.) **Not confident, distrustful**; in N. T. Gk. = **unbelieving**, of one who declines to receive God's revelation of grace, Luke xii. 46, διχοτομήσει αὐτὸν καὶ τὸ μέρος αὐτοῦ μετὰ τῶν ἀπίστων θήσει, cf. Matt. xxiv. 51, *synon.* with ὑποκριτής, 1 Cor. vi. 6, vii. 12–15, x. 27, xiv. 22–24; 2 Cor. iv. 4, vi. 14, 15; 1 Tim. v. 8, τὴν πίστιν ἡρνηται καὶ ἔστιν ἀπίστου χείρων; Tit. i. 15, τοῖς δὲ μεμιασμένοις καὶ ἀπίστοις; Rev. xxi. 8. One who does not *acknowledge* the truth of what is told him

concerning Christ, John xx. 27. One who has no corresponding and confident *trust*, Matt. xvii. 17; Mark ix. 19; Luke ix. 41.

Ἀπιστία, ἡ, (I.) faithlessness, uncertainty, Wisd. xiv. 25; (II.) distrust, Xen. *Anab.* ii. 5. 4, ἔδοξέ μοι εἰς λόγους σοι ἔλθειν, ὅπως, εἰ δυνάμεθα, ἐξέλκοιμεν ἀλλήλων τὴν ἀπιστίαν. Often in Plato with the signification *doubt*; so Mark xvi. 14. In a religious sense, in Plut. *de superst.* 2, cf. under *δεισιδαιμονία*. Unbelief, in the N. T. sense, the *lack of acknowledgment* or the non acknowledgment of Christ, Matt. xiii. 58, οὐκ ἐποίησεν ἐκεῖ δυνάμεις πολλὰς διὰ τὴν ἀπιστίαν αὐτῶν; Mark vi. 6, cf. Luke iv. 23, 24. *Want of confidence in Christ's power*, Matt. xvii. 20; Mark ix. 24; in general, *want of trust in the God of promise*, Rom. iv. 20, εἰς δὲ τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ θεοῦ οὐ διεκρίθη τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ κ.τ.λ.; and of the revelation of grace, Heb. iii. 12, 19, καρδία πονηρὰ ἀπιστίας ἐν τῷ ἀποστήναι ἀπὸ θεοῦ ζῶντος, inasmuch as this trust is said to answer to the self-evidencing *πίστις* of God, Rom. iii. 3, xi. 23, ἀπιστία, in antithesis with ἐπιμένειν τῇ χρηστότητι, ver. 22; see also ver. 20; 1 Tim. i. 13, ἀγνοῶν ἐποίησα ἐν ἀπιστίᾳ = want of acknowledgment. Comp. Rom. x. 16.

Ἀπιστέω, to put no confidence in, *fidem alicujus suspectam habere* (Sturz), Xen. *Cyrop.* vi. 4. 15, τοὺς μὲν πιστεύοντας ἀλλήλοις, τοὺς δὲ ἀπιστοῦντας. See Rom. iii. 2, ἐπιστεύθησαν τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ; ver. 3, εἰ ἠπίστησάν τινες, μὴ ἡ ἀπιστία αὐτῶν τὴν πίστιν τοῦ θεοῦ καταργήσει, hence denoting the want of *trust*, answering to the faithfulness of God; *πίστις* θεοῦ = *πίστις*, *vid.* *πίστις*; 2 Tim. ii. 13, εἰ ἀπιστοῦμεν, ἐκείνος πιστὸς μένει. Then = to doubt, e.g. τοῖς λόγοις, Plat. *Phaed.* 77 A. Cf. Mark xvi. 11, 16; Luke xxiv. 11, 41; Acts xxviii. 24, οἱ μὲν ἐπείθοντο τοῖς λεγομένοις, οἱ δὲ ἠπίστουν = not to acknowledge. Cf. 2 Macc. viii. 13; Wisd. i. 2, εὐρίσκεται ὁ κύριος τοῖς μὴ πειράζουσιν αὐτὸν, ἐμφανίζεται δὲ τοῖς μὴ ἀπιστοῦσιν αὐτῷ; x. 7, ἀπιστούσης ψυχῆς μνημεῖον ἐστηκυῖα στήλη ἄλός; xviii. 13. The passive occurs in Wisd. xii. 17, ἰσχυρὸν ἐνδείκνυσθαι ἀπιστούμενος ἐπὶ δυνάμει τελειότητι = to be suspected.

Ὀλιγόπιστος, only in the N. T. and patristic Greek = of little faith, Matt. vi. 30, viii. 26, xiv. 31, xvi. 8; Luke xii. 28. This is a significant term, helping us to determine the conception of faith.

Πείρα, ἡ, connected with *περάω*, to penetrate, *peritus, experiri, periculum*, etc. = trial, test. Also passively, the experience obtained by the trial, e.g. εἰς πείραν τινος ἔρχεσθαι, to learn to know; ἐν πείρᾳ τινὸς γίνεσθαι, to become acquainted with any one; πείραν ἔχειν, to know, Xen. *Mem.* iv. 1. 5. In the N. T. only πείραν λαμβάνειν, Heb. xi. 29, πίστει διέβησαν τὴν ἐρυθρὰν θάλασσαν ὡς διὰ ξηρᾶς γῆς, ἧς πείραν λαβόντες οἱ Αἰγυπτῖοι κατεπόθησαν; ver. 26, ἐμπαγμῶν καὶ μαστίγων πείραν ἔλαβον. The phrase is applied in a twofold sense, actively = to make an attempt,—so Heb. xi. 29; Deut. xxviii. 56; passively = to make the knowledge, to experience, Heb. xi. 36. This apparently strange double rendering is possible, not only because *πείρα* can be shown to have both meanings, but especially because the meaning of *λαμβάνειν* is twofold, namely,

purely active, *to take, to lay hold of*; *πείραν λαμβάνειν, to undertake an attempt*, like *ἔργον λαμβάνειν*, Xen. Mem. i. 7. 2; Herod. iii. 71. 2, *τὴν ἐπιχείρησιν ταύτην . . . μὴ οὕτω συντάχυνε ἀβούλως, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὸ σωφρονέστερον αὐτὴν λαμβάνει*. Then also a more passive sense, *to receive, to get*. For this very reason it is possible that the signification of *λαμβάνειν* should vary according to its object; and it is not at all strange in any language that a word or phrase should occur in two senses side by side, when it is simply a matter of passing over from the active to the passive in a verbal substantive, such as *πείρα* is. While it may be doubtful in many of the usually cited cases whether the passive may not be preferable to the active meaning, *πείραν λαμβάνειν* is undoubtedly active in Xen. Cyrop. vi. 1. 54, *ἐλάμβανε τοῦ ἀγωγίου πείραν καὶ πολὺ ῥᾶον ἤγε τὰ ὀκτω ζεύγη τὸν πυργὸν κ.τ.λ., ἡ κ.τ.λ.*; Mem. i. 4. 18, *τῶν θεῶν πείραν λαμβάνης θεραπεύων, εἴ τι σοὶ θελήσουσι κ.τ.λ.* For the *passive* meaning, which is certainly more frequent, compare Diod. Sic. xii. 24, *τὴν θυγατέρα ἀπέκτεινεν, ἵνα μὴ τῆς ὕβρεως λάβῃ πείραν, et al.*—The word occurs further in biblical Greek in Deut. xxxiii. 8, *ἐπείρασαν αὐτὸν ἐν πείρᾳ*, instead of the word usual in biblical Greek, *πειρασμός, temptation*; and we may compare this with the use of *πείρα* in a bad sense, *attempt against any one*; Thuc. vii. 21. 5, *ἵεναι οὖν ἐκέλευεν ἐς τὴν πείραν τοῦ ναυτικοῦ καὶ μὴ ἀποκνεῖν*.

Πειράω, Attic, for which in later Greek, and already in Homer, *πειράζω* occurs. Perfect passive *πεπείραμαι* = *to try, to test, to trouble oneself*. With the accusative of the person = *to tempt any one, i.e. to seek to lead him astray, to put him to the test with a hostile purpose*. Plut. Brut. 10, *τοὺς φίλους ἐπὶ Καίσαρα πειρᾶν, to endeavour to excite*. (Especially elsewhere of *misleading to unchastity, seduction*.) Akin to this is Heb. iv. 15, *πεπειραμένον κατὰ πάντα καθ' ὁμοιότητα χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας*. Here, however, more probably the biblical use of *πειράζω* is transferred to the word, because it does not occur in profane Greek in so special a sense, and when it stands of seduction to unchastity it always has a corresponding object, such as *γυναῖκα*; the perfect passive also is specially used in another sense akin to the middle, see below.—Usually middle, *to try, to take pains*, Acts ix. 26, xxvi. 31. In profane Greek, often with the genitive of the person, *to try any one, to put him to the test*, and, indeed, usually in a *hostile* sense, both *physically* of combat, *to try, to measure oneself with any one, to make trial upon him*; so also *τείχους πειρᾶσθαι, to make an attempt upon a fortress*, Thuc. ii. 81, cf. Herod. viii. 100, and *morally, to try any one, to put him to the test*, “mostly as expressive of distrust when one suspects him, and therefore endeavours to lead him into slippery places, and thus to test his reliableness, truthfulness, or integrity,” Passow. The moral conception of temptation, as it belongs to the biblical *πειράζειν*, does not, however, lie in the word, but is simply rendered possible, and prepared for by this usage. It has to do mainly with the knowledge to be obtained concerning any one. Cf. Plato, Ep. vi. 323 A, *πεπειραμένος Ἐράστου πλέονα ἢ σύ = to be acquainted with*. The perfect passive is also used in the sense (*to have tested, to have tried*, strictly passively

understood), *to know from experience, to be experienced*, synonymously with ἐπίσταμαι. Cf. Xen. Hier. ii. 6, πεπειραμένος οἶδα; so 1 Sam. xvii. 39, οὐ πεπείραμαι (= ἦρα, elsewhere = πειράζειν; ἦρα ἔχ, *I have not tried it*). The word does not occur anywhere else in biblical Greek.

Πειράζω, in Homer and in later Greek, still upon the whole, but seldom = πειράω *to try, to test*, to be distinguished from δοκιμάζειν, first of all, in that πειρ. requires great effort; δοκιμ., on the contrary, = *to inquire, to prove, to estimate, to approve*, denotes an intellectual act. Comp. δοκιμάζειν τὰ διαφέροντα, Rom. ii. 18. Now it is just in the fact that πειρᾶν, πειράζειν cannot be understood save as implying effort, that the usage may be accounted for which employs these words for all attempts that require certain pains and energy (e.g. σθένεος πειρᾶν, Il. xv. 359, *to try his strength*, whereas an ἀνὴρ δοκιμασθεὶς is *a man acknowledged as such, as of age*), but specially of those attempts which are directed towards some person or thing. Schol. on Aristoph. Pl. 575, ἂ πειράζουσι μὲν τὰς πτέρυγας, ἵπτασθαι δὲ οὐ δύνανται. Πειράζω, in the sense, *to search out, to question*, Od. ix. 281, ὥς φάτο πειράζων, ἐμὲ δ' οὐ λάθην εἰδότες πολλὰ, ἀλλὰ μιν ἄψορρον προσέφην δολίοις ἐπέεσσιν, cannot be urged against this, for here it is an attempt directed against some one. Now this element of hostility is wanting in δοκιμάζειν, which leans so much, on the other hand, towards the positive side as to pass into the meaning, *to approve*, whereas πειράζειν leaves the issue at least uncertain, though it aims at a definitely negative result, *to overthrow the opponent*. Cf. Plut. Mor. 230 A, εἰ δοκίμιον ἔχει τινὲ τρόπῳ, πειράζεται ὁ πολύφιλος, with Isocr. i. 25, δοκίμαζε τοὺς φίλους ἐκ τῆς περὶ τὸν βίον ἀτυχίας; Jas. i. 12, μακάριος ἀνὴρ ὃς ὑπομένει πειρασμόν, ὅτι δόκιμος γενόμενος κ.τ.λ., comp. ver. 13! 2 Cor. viii. 22, ὃν ἐδοκιμάσαμεν ἐν πολλοῖς πολλαῖς σπουδαῖον ὄντα, cf. Rev. ii. 2, ἐπείρασας τοὺς λέγοντας ἑαυτοὺς ἀποστόλους εἶναι καὶ οὐκ εἰσὶν, καὶ εὗρες αὐτοὺς ψευδεῖς. Thus it is said, δοκιμάζεσθαι, *to stand proof, to be found approved*, 1 Pet. i. 7; 1 Tim. iii. 10; 1 Thess. ii. 4, καθὼς δεδοκιμάσμεθα ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ πιστευθῆναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον. With this comp. Heb. iv. 15, πεπειραμένον κατὰ πάντα καθ' ὁμοιότητα χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας. As, however, πειράζειν, πειρᾶν, when the hostile aim is absent or comes less into view, may be used more indifferently than δοκιμάζειν, and in quite a general sense, as, for instance, the perfect participle passive, 1 Sam. xvii. 39 and elsewhere (see πειράω), as = *to experience, to be exercised, to know*, πειράζειν and δοκιμάζειν may stand as almost perfect synonyms, though a certain difference always remains; comp. 2 Cor. xiii. 5, ἑαυτοὺς πειράζετε εἰ ἐστὲ ἐν τῇ πίστει, ἑαυτοὺς δοκιμάζετε· ἢ οὐκ ἐπιγινώσκετε ἑαυτοὺς, ὅτι Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς ἐν ὑμῖν; εἰ μή τι ἀδόκιμοί ἐστε; Ps. xxvi. 2, δοκίμασόν με, κύριε, καὶ πείρασόν με; Ecclus. xxvii. 5. And as also in δοκιμάζειν an unexpected result may ensue, both words may stand synonymously even in a bad sense, as in Heb. iii. 9, Received text, ἐπείρασάν με οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν, ἐδοκίμασάν με, where, however, the more correct reading tallies better with the representations combined in these words, ἐπείρασαν οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν ἐν δοκιμασίᾳ. At any rate, however, when a decidedly hostile testing,

or what amounts to temptation, is meant, only *πειράζειν* can be used, not *δοκιμάζειν*. Hence we see how, if occasion required, *πειράζειν* may pass from the more general sense, *to attack*, to the more definite, *to tempt to sin* (comp. Jas. i. 2, 12 with vv. 13, 14), and that at one time mention can be made of Abraham's temptation (Heb. xi. 17), and at another it can be said, *μηδεὶς πειραζόμενος λεγέτω, ὅτι ἀπὸ θεοῦ πειράζομαι*. Consequently there is a difference between *δοκιμάζειν* and *πειράζειν τινά*, as between *to prove or try* and *to tempt*, except that *πειράζειν* does not always appear with this concrete meaning. In the N. T., however, it occurs in the sense *to try* only in John vi. 6.

The LXX. always employ *πειράζειν* for the Hebrew *נִסָּה*, *to try, to put to the test*, either in a good or a bad sense. In the N. T. in a good sense only in Acts xvi. 7 (xxiv. 6); John vi. 6; 2 Cor. xiii. 5; Rev. ii. 2. We find (I.) *πειράζειν τι*, *to try anything, to prove*; Acts xvi. 7, *ἐπείραζον πορευθῆναι*; xxiv. 6, *τὸ ἱερὸν ἐπείρασε βεβηλωῶσαι*. Comp. Deut. iv. 34, *εἰ ἐπείρασεν ὁ θεὸς εἰσελθὼν λαβεῖν ἐαυτῷ ἔθνος ἐκ μέσου ἔθνους ἐν πειρασμῷ καὶ ἐν σημείοις κ.τ.λ.*; comp. Deut. vii. 19, xxix. 3, under *πειρασμός*. Without object, Judg. vi. 39, (II.) *π. τινά*, *to put one to the test*; Dan. i. 12, 14; 1 Kings x. 1, *ἦλθε πειράσαι αὐτὸν ἐν αἰνίγμασι*. In a moral sense, always according to the subject, (a.) = *to prove, to put to the test*. So of God, Gen. xxii. 1, *ὁ θεὸς ἐπείρασε τὸν Ἀβρ.*; Deut. xiii. 4, *πειράζει κύριος ὁ θεὸς σου ὑμᾶς εἰδέναι εἰ ἀγαπᾶτε τὸν θεὸν ὑμῶν*; Judg. ii. 22, *τοῦ πειράσαι ἐν αὐτοῖς τὸν Ἰσραὴλ, εἰ φυλάσσονται τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου*; iii. 1; Ps. xxvi. 2, *δοκίμασόν με, κύριε, καὶ πείρασόν με*. With these comp. in the N. T. Heb. xi. 17; John vi. 6.—2 Cor. xiii. 5; (b.) = *to put to the test, either from distrust or with a hostile bad intent, to tempt, to endeavour to seduce*. In the sense of distrust, *τὸν θεὸν πειράζειν*, Ex. xvii. 2, 7; Num. xiv. 22; Isa. vii. 12; Ps. lxxviii. 56; Deut. vi. 16, ix. 22, xxxiii. 8; Ps. xcv. 8. Comp. Acts v. 9, xv. 10; 1 Cor. x. 9.—Rev. ii. 2. Then decidedly, *in order to get one into one's power, and to ruin*, Matt. xvi. 1, xix. 3, 22, xviii. 35; Mark viii. 11, x. 2, xii. 15; Luke xi. 16, xx. 23 (John viii. 6, Received text), of the attempts made to entangle Christ. Akin to this, we have *πειράζειν* first of the attacks and sufferings, which render difficult the faith of believers, and thus threaten their salvation, 1 Cor. x. 13, *οὐκ ἔάσει ὑμᾶς πειρασθῆναι ὑπὲρ ὃ δύνασθε*; Rev. ii. 10, comp. *πειρασμός*,—and specially = *to tempt to sin*, Matt. iv. 1, *πειρασθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου*; iv. 3, *ὁ πειράζων*, of the devil, as also 1 Thess. iii. 5; Mark i. 13; Luke iv. 2; 1 Cor. vii. 5, *μὴ πειράξη ὑμᾶς ὁ σατανᾶς*; Rev. iii. 10.—Comp. Trench, *Synonyms*, etc., part 2, p. 110, "We may say, then, that while *πειράζειν* may be used, but exceptionally (?), of God, *δοκιμάζειν* could not be used of Satan, seeing that he never proves that he may approve, or tests that he may know and accept." With a defined subject, the passive *πειρασθῆναι*, *to be tempted*, Gal. vi. 1, *μὴ καὶ σὺ πειρασθῇς*; Heb. ii. 18, iv. 15 (xi. 37, Received text); Jas. i. 13, *μηδεὶς πειραζόμενος λεγέτω ὅτι ἀπὸ θεοῦ πειράζομαι ὁ γὰρ θεὸς ἀπείραστός ἐστιν κακῶν, πειράζει δὲ αὐτὸς οὐδένα*; ver. 14, *ἐκαστος δὲ πειράζεται ὑπὸ τῆς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας ἐξελκόμενος καὶ δελεαζόμενος*. The usage in profane Greek is analogous, only not so comprehensive; see under *πειράω*.

Πειρασμός, ὁ, Attic *πειράσις*, trial; also of temptation to unchastity, Thuc. vi. 56; the conception of *πειρασμός* is, however, more comprehensive. In profane Greek, pointed out only in one place,—Diosc. *praef.* 1, τοὺς ἐπὶ παθῶν πειρασμούς, of medical experiments; while in Aristotle *πειραστικός* occurs; ἡ διαλεκτικὴ πειραστικὴ περὶ ὧν ἡ φιλοσοφία γνωριστικὴ, ἡ δὲ σοφιστικὴ φαινομένη, οὐσα δ' οὐ, *Metaph.* iii. 2; *De sophist. elench.* 2, λόγοι πειραστικοὶ (in distinction from διδασκαλικοί, διαλεκτικοί, and ἐριστικοί) οἱ ἐκ τῶν δοκούντων τῷ ἀποκρινόμενῳ καὶ ἀναγκαίῳ εἶδέναι τῷ προσποιούμενῳ ἔχειν τὴν ἐπιστήμην. It occurs more frequently in biblical Greek, and there denotes, (I.) (a.) testing, proving; Ecclus. xxvii. 5, σκεύη κεραμέως δοκιμάζει πῦρ, καὶ πειρασμὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐν διαλογισμῷ αὐτοῦ; 1 Macc. ii. 52, Ἀβραὰμ ἐν πειρασμῷ εὐρέθη πιστός, to be referred to *πειράζειν* τινά. On the contrary, (b.) akin to *πειρᾶσθαι* or *πειράζεσθαι*, to endeavour, to trouble oneself (see *πειράω*), trouble, pains; with σημείον, τέρας, Deut. iv. 34, ἐπείρασεν ὁ θεὸς εἰσελθὼν λαβεῖν ἐαυτῷ ἔθνος . . . ἐν πειρασμῷ καὶ ἐν σημείοις; vii. 19, τοὺς πειρασμούς τοὺς μεγάλους οὓς ἴδωσαν οἱ ὀφθαλμοί σου, τὰ σημεία καὶ τὰ τέρατα μεγάλα; xxix. 3 (= *ἡθρ*), perhaps synonymous with the N. T. δυνάμεις, like the German "Kraftproben" (trials of strength). Then (II.) in the hostile sense of *πειράζειν* τινά, and indeed, (a.) *physically, treating with enmity, attacking*, so that one is put to the proof, yet always concerning his moral state, comp. Matt. xxvi. 41, προσεύχεσθε ἵνα μὴ εἰσέλθῃτε εἰς πειρασμόν· τὸ μὲν πνεῦμα πρόθυμον, ἡ δὲ σὰρξ ἀσθενής; Mark xiv. 38; Luke xxii. 28, 40, 46, viii. 13, ἐν καιρῷ πειρασμοῦ ἀφίστανται, cf. Matt. xiii. 21, γενομένης δὲ θλίψεως ἡ διωγμοῦ . . . σκανδαλίζεται. There are attacks of a physical kind (Acts xx. 19, δουλεύων τῷ κυρίῳ μετὰ . . . πειρασμῶν τῶν συμβάντων μοι ἐν ταῖς ἐπιβουλαῖς τῶν Ἰουδαίων), with a moral tendency, cf. 1 Pet. iv. 12, μὴ ξενίζεσθε τῇ ἐν ὑμῖν πυρώσει πρὸς πειρασμόν ὑμῖν γινομένη; 2 Pet. ii. 9, οἶδεν κύριος εὐσεβεῖς ἐκ πειρασμοῦ ῥύεσθαι, comp. ver. 8, βασανίζειν (Isocr. i. 12, synonymous with *δοκιμάζειν*, denoting the investigation of truth, only that the word passes into the meaning, *to torture*, then = *to torment*; therefore still coincident in its representation with *πειράζειν*). 1 Cor. x. 13; Jas. i. 2, 12; 1 Pet. i. 6; Rev. iii. 10, comp. Ecclus. vi. 7. — Now, from this the transition is very easy to (b.) the purely moral import, *temptation*; see *πειράζειν*, *πειράζεσθαι*, (II.) (b.). So in 1 Tim. vi. 9, ἐμπίπτουσιν εἰς πειρασμόν καὶ παγίδα καὶ ἐπιθυμίας πολλὰς ἀνόητους καὶ βλαβερὰς, αἵτινες βυθίζουσιν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους εἰς ὄλεθρον καὶ ἀπώλειαν. But this is the only passage in which it is so used like *πειράζεσθαι* in Jas. i. 13, 14. — Heb. iii. 8, ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ πειρασμοῦ = *ἡθρ*, Ex. xvii. 7; Deut. vi. 16, ix. 22; Ps. xcvi. 8 (Deut. xxxiii. 8 = *πειρά*), the word corresponds with the *πειράζεσθαι* τὸν θεόν, of distrust directed towards God. On the contrary, Matt. vi. 13, μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς εἰς τὸν πειρασμόν, ἀλλὰ ῥύσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ, both significations are combined in the words *attack* (through suffering) and *temptation* (by incitation and lust). There is at least no reason for wholly excluding the latter element, though the first certainly stands in the foreground; see under *πονηρός*. Ecclus. ii. 1, xxxvi. 1. — Gal. iv. 14, τὸν πειρασμόν ὑμῶν (so Lachm. and the Cod. Sin., instead of *μοῦ*) τὸν ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ μου οὐκ ἐξουθενήσατε κ.τ.λ., is to be

classed, not under (I.) (a.), but under (II.) (a.), inasmuch as the outward appearance of the apostle and his sufferings were manifestly in some way a hindrance in his calling and his purposes, and herein his readers had something to get over and subdue; 1 Pet. i. 6, 7.

Ἀπειράστος, *ον*, a verbal adjective, often in Josephus; in profane Greek, ἀπείρατος, in the significations, untried (πειράζειν τι), *e.g.* οὐδὲν ἀπείρατον ἦν, *nothing was left untried*, Dem. xviii. 249; further, inexperienced (πειράομαι, πεπειράμαι; see πειράω), ignorant. Ἀπειράστος occurs in Heliodorus, of a virgin; elsewhere in Josephus also = inexperienced. On the other hand, in Maxim. Conf. 18b, "παντελῶς ὁδύνης ἀπείραστος, *qui tentari non potest*;" cf. Cic., *animi valentes morbo tentari non possunt, corpora possunt*. In a facultative sense, also, in Jas. i. 13, ὁ γὰρ θεὸς ἀπείραστός ἐστιν κακῶν, πειράζει δὲ αὐτὸς οὐδένα, in antithesis with ver. 12, μακάριος ἀνὴρ ὃς ὑπομένει πειρασμόν; see under πειράζειν = incapable of being tempted. Cf. Ignat. ad Philipp. 11, πῶς πειράξεις τὸν ἀπείραστον, ἐπιλαθόμενος τοῦ νομοθέτου παρακελευομένου· ὅτι οὐκ ἐκπειράσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου; Phot. c. Manich. iv. 225, πειράζειν ἐπιχειρήσας τὸν ἀπείραστον.

Ἐκπειράζω, to prove or test thoroughly, to find by testing; not in profane Greek, rare in the LXX. = פָּרָא; Deut. vi. 16 = to tempt, πειράζειν, (II.) (b.) So always in the N. T., Matt. iv. 7, κύριον; Luke iv. 12. — 1 Cor. x. 9, τὸν Χριστόν. Comp. Luke x. 25.

Πίπτω, πεσοῦμαι, ἔπεσον (ἔπεσα), πέπτωκα, to fall, to fall headlong, Matt. vii. 27, etc.; to prostrate oneself, Matt. ii. 11, etc.; to fall down, to fall to pieces, Acts xv. 16, σκῆνη Δαβὶδ ἢ πεπτωκυῖα; Heb. iii. 17. Frequently = to come to ruin, to fall to destruction; cf. Soph. Trach. 84, ἢ σεσώσμεθα ἢ πίπτομεν; Dem. 510. 15, εἰς Θηβαίους σωθῶσι καὶ μὴ πέσωσι. So Rev. xvii. 10, οἱ πάντες ἔπεσαν, ὁ εἰς ἐστίν; xviii. 2, ἔπεσεν, ἔπεσεν Βαβυλὼν ἢ μεγάλη; Luke xvi. 17, τοῦ νόμου μίαν κεφαλὴν πεσεῖν (cf. Matt. v. 18, παρέρχεσθαι); Ruth iii. 18. In a soteriological sense, Rom. xi. 11, μὴ ἔπταισαν ἵνα πέσωσιν, cf. ver. 22, ἐπὶ μὲν τοὺς πεσόντας ἀποτομία, ἐπὶ δὲ σὲ χρηστότης θεοῦ, εἰς ἐπιμένους τῇ χρηστότητι; 1 Cor. x. 12, ὁ δοκῶν ἐστάναι βλεπέτω μὴ πέσῃ, cf. ver. 8, ἔπεσαν ἐν μία ἡμέρᾳ κ.τ.λ.; Rom. xiv. 4, κυρίῳ στήκει ἢ πίπτει. See Ps. cxli. 10; Prov. xi. 28, xxiv. 16, 17; Eccles. iv. 10; Eccles. i. 30, ii. 7, πτώσις; Luke ii. 34, Heb. ἔβη. In an ethical sense, as = to fail or err, it stands alone without addition very rarely, as in Plat. Phaed. 100 E, τούτου ἐχόμενος ἡγοῦμαι οὐκ ἂν πότε πεσεῖν. Usually with some more specific limitation, *e.g.* εἰς κακότητα; Heb. iv. 11, ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ ὑποδείγματι τῆς ἀπειθείας. The πόθεν may be regarded as such a limitation in Rev. ii. 5; cf. with ver. 4, μνημόνευε οὖν πόθεν πέπτωκας καὶ μετανόησον. ἔβη, also, does not occur in an ethical sense, not even in Ps. xxxvii. 24, comp. Prov. xxiv. 16; Ps. xx. 9. See Hupfeld *in loc.*

Παραπίπτω, to fall beside, to fall down. Esth. vi. 10, μὴ παραπεσάτω σου λόγος; see Ruth iii. 18, Luke xvi. 18, under πίπτω. It sometimes occurs in an ethical sense = to fall by the side of, to miss the mark, especially in Polyb., *e.g.* with ἀγνοεῖν, xviii. 19. 6, τοῖς δ' ὅλοις πράγμασιν ἀγνοεῖν ἔφη καὶ παραπίπτειν αὐτόν, where, therefore, at the same

time excuse is implied. The genitive is added to complete the sense, xii. 7. 2, τῆς ἀληθείας; viii. 13. 8, τοῦ καθήκοντος, cf. iii. 54. 5, τῆς ὁδοῦ, *to hurry past on the way and miss it*. Cf. Polyb. xvi. 20. 5, περὶ τῆς τῶν τόπων ἀγνοίας . . . διὰ τὸ μεγάλην εἶναι τὴν παράπτωσιν, οὐκ ὤκησα γράψαι; xv. 23. 5, εἰς τοιαύτην ἀγνοίαν ἢ καὶ παράπτωσιν τοῦ καθήκοντος ἦκεν. In biblical Greek, on the contrary, the word denotes the *heinousness of sin*, together with its *guilt*; for it is = עָוֶן, Ezek. xxii. 4, ἐν τοῖς αἵμασιν αὐτῶν οἷς ἐξέχεας παραπέπτωκας καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐνθυμήμασιν σου οἷς ἐποίησες ἐμιαίνου. But it is especially = חַטָּא, which denotes conscious (hidden) deceitful and faithless action. This word is rendered by παραπτ. in Ezek. xiv. 13, xv. 8, xviii. 24, xx. 27; in 2 Chron. xxvi. 18, xxix. 6, 19 = ἀποστήναι; 1 Chron. v. 25 = ἀθετεῖν; x. 13, ἀνομεῖν τῷ θεῷ. See 2 Chron. xii. 2; Deut. xxxii. 51; Num. v. 27; Lev. v. 21; Josh. vii. 1, xxii. 20. — Ezek. xiv. 13, γῇ ἢ ἐὰν ἀμύρῃ μοι τοῦ παραπεσεῖν παράπτωμα; xv. 8, ἀνθ' ὧν παρέπεσον παραπτώματι; xviii. 24, ἐν τῷ παραπτώματι αὐτοῦ ᾧ παρέπεσεν, καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις αὐτοῦ αἷς ἥμαρτεν, ἐν αὐταῖς ἀποθανεῖται; xx. 27, ἕως τούτου παρώργισάν με οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν ἐν τοῖς παραπτώμασιν αὐτῶν ἐν οἷς παρέπεσον εἰς ἐμέ; cf. παραπτ. εἰς in Polyb., of hostile assault. It thus denotes the *blameworthy and wilful carelessness* of him who falls into sin, and, more rarely, inadvertency or thoughtlessness. The word must be referred to πίπτειν, *to throw oneself headlong*, rather than to πίπτειν, as = *to fall*. See πίπτω in the Lexicons. Thus Heb. vi. 6, ἀδύνατον γὰρ τοὺς ἅπαξ φωτισθέντας . . . καὶ παραπεσόντας, πάλιν ἀνακαινίζει εἰς μετάνοιαν κ.τ.λ. — In the Book of Wisdom it occurs in the laxer sense of profane usage, vi. 10, ἵνα μάθητε σοφίαν καὶ μὴ παραπέσητε; xii. 2, τοὺς παραπίπτοντας κατ' ὀλίγον ἐλέγχεις.

Παράπτωμα, τό, only in later Greek, and but seldom there. — (I.) = **Fault, mistake**, e.g. of a writer (Longin. *de subl.* xxxvi. 2); in an ethical sense, in Polyb. ix. 10. 6, = **offence, neglect, error**. More frequently in the LXX. and N. T., and here not in this lax sense. Comp. Wisd. iii. 13, μακαρία στείρα ἢ ἀμίαντος, ἥτις οὐκ ἔγνω κοίτην ἐν παραπτώματι; x. 1, of Adam's sin, ἡ σοφία . . . ἐξέλατο αὐτὸν ἐκ παραπτώματος ἰδίου. — Ezek. xiv. 13, xv. 8, xviii. 24 = חַטָּא (see above). Again = חַטָּא, perverseness, Ezek. iii. 20, ἐν τῇ ἀποστρέφειν δίκαιον ἀπὸ τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ καὶ ποιήσῃ παράπτωμα; xviii. 26. — = עֲוֹן, Ezek. xiv. 11, ἵνα μὴ μιαίνωνται ἔτι ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς παραπτώμασιν αὐτῶν; xviii. 22; Job xxxvi. 9, ἀναγγελεῖ αὐτοῖς τὰ παραπτ. αὐτῶν ὅτι ἰσχύουσιν. — = חֲבִיבָה, injury; Dan. vi. 22, ἐνώπιον δὲ σοῦ παράπτωμα οὐκ ἐποίησα. Hence occasionally in a weaker sense, viz. = נִסְיָאָה, *neglect or error*, Ps. xix. 13, and = חֲבִיבָה, Dan. vi. 5. Excepting, perhaps, in Ps. xix. 13, it everywhere denotes sin as involving guilt, and as thus apprehended, or might be, by the sinner himself. Παράπτωμα does not in Scripture, as in profane Greek, imply palliation or excuse (see παραπίπτειν with ἀγνοεῖν); it denotes sin as a **missing and violation of right**; see Wisd. iii. 13. It may therefore be regarded as synonymous with παράβασις, which designates sin as the **transgression of a known rule of life**, and as involving guilt; comp. Rom. v. 14, ἐπὶ τοὺς μὴ ἀμαρτήσαντας ἐπὶ τῷ ὁμοίω-

ματι τῆς παραβάσεως Ἀδάμ, with ver. 15, οὐχ ὡς τὸ παράπτωμα, οὕτως καὶ τὸ χάρισμα, and ver. 19, διὰ τῆς παρακοῆς τοῦ ἐνὸς Ἀ. In accordance with this is the use of παράπτ. when mention is made either of imputation or forgiveness, Matt. vi. 14, 15, ἀφιέναι τὰ παραπτ.; Mark xi. 25; Rom. iv. 25, παρεδόθη διὰ τὰ παραπτ. ἡμῶν; v. 16, τὸ χάρισμα ἐκ πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων εἰς δικαίωμα; ver. 20, νόμος παρεισῆλθεν ἵνα πλεονάσῃ τὸ παράπτ.; see Gal. iii. 19; 2 Cor. v. 19, μὴ λογιζόμενος αὐτοῖς τὰ παραπτ. αὐτῶν; Col. ii. 13, χαρισάμενος ἡμῖν πάντα τὰ παραπτ.; Eph. i. 7, ἡ ἄφεσις τῶν παραπτ. Cf. also νεκροὶ τοῖς παραπτ. καὶ ταῖς ἁμ., Eph. ii. 1, 5; Col. ii. 13. Still the word is not quite so strong as παράβασις, which is used only once (Heb. ix. 15) in connection with salvation, and elsewhere only where imputation and punishment are spoken of (see Heb. ii. 2); whereas παράπτ. in St. Paul's writings (where alone it occurs, save in Matt. vi. 14, 15; Mark xi. 25; Jas. v. 16) is often used where pardon is spoken of. See, for instance, Gal. vi. 1, ἐὰν καὶ προλημφθῇ ἄνθρωπος ἐν τινι παραπτώματι, where, though a sin involving guilt is clearly meant, a missing of the mark, rather than a transgression of the law, is the form of sin referred to. We must accordingly affirm that παράβασις denotes *sin objectively viewed*, as a violation of a known rule of life, but that in παράπτ. reference is specially made to the *subjective passivity and suffering* of him who misses or falls short of the enjoined command; and the word has come to be used both of great and serious guilt (LXX.; in Philo, to designate *total relapse*, see Delitzsch, *Hebräerbr.* p. 219), and generally of all sin, even though unknown and unintentional (Ps. xix. 13; Gal. vi. 1), so far as this is simply a missing of the right, or involves but little guilt, therefore a *missing* or *failure* including the activity and passivity of the acting subject, and hence in Rom. v. in antithesis with δικαίωμα. Comp. παράπτωμα = *defeat*. Like its verb, παράπτωμα is used synonymously with ἁμαρτία as the generic word, see Rom. v. 20, ἵνα πλεονάσῃ τὸ παράπτωμα· οὐ δὲ ἐπλεόνασεν ἡ ἁμ., and is thus *a missing of the mark*, and includes both ἁμαρτία and παράβασις. — It occurs also in Rom. v. 15, 17, 18. — (II.) Defeat, discomfiture, Diod. xix. 100; Rom. xi. 11, τῷ αὐτῶν παραπτώματι ἡ σωτηρία τοῖς ἔθνεσιν; ver. 12, cf. πίπτειν, ver. 11.

Πληρῆς, es (πλέος), (I.) relatively, full, filled, Mark viii. 19; John i. 14, and elsewhere. — (II.) Absolutely, complete, whole, 2 John 8.

Πληρῶω, to make full; relatively, to fill; absolutely, to fulfil or complete. Primarily, with reference to space, and then of other relations. — (I.) Relatively, to make anything full, to fill, either τί τινος, or so that the subject forms the contents of the object; (a.) τί τινος, local, Matt. xiii. 48; John xii. 3. Figuratively, Acts ii. 28, εὐφροσύνης; Rom. xv. 13, χαρᾶς, as in 2 Tim. i. 4; Acts xiii. 52, χαρᾶς καὶ πνεύματος ἁγίου; Rom. xv. 14, γνώσεως; Luke ii. 40, σοφίας; Acts v. 28, πεπληρώκατε τὴν Ἱερουσαλὴμ τῆς διδαχῆς ὑμῶν. Rarely, but sometimes in profane Greek, with the dative (e.g. Eur. *Herc. fur.* 372; Plut. *de plac. phil.* i. 7, συμπεπληρωμένον πᾶσι τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς), as in Rom. i. 29, ἀδικία; 2 Cor. vii. 4, παρακλήσει. In place of this ἐν is used, Eph. v. 18, πλη-

ροῦσθε ἐν πνεύματι, as against μὴ μεθύσκεσθε οἴνῳ; Col. ii. 10, ἐστὲ ἐν αὐτῷ πεπληρωμένοι, where the rendering, *to be filled by Christ*, most simply and in a most unforced manner suits the connection, and carries it on, cf. Eph. i. 23; whereas an absolute πληροῦσθαι, πεπληρωμένος, in an ethical sense, as = τέλειος, after the analogy of Phil. iv. 18, is untenable. See Huther on Col. iv. 12, where we must either join πεπληρωμένοι with ἐν παντὶ θελήματι, or, according to the best mss., read πεπληροφορημένοι. There is no reason for taking the verb independently (as Harless does, through dislike of the combination πληροῦσθαι ἐν), and preferring the rendering, *to be satisfied, to have enough*, which in all these passages would hardly be in keeping with the context. Analogous to this is πληροῦσθαι εἰς πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ θεοῦ, Eph. iii. 19, instead of the simple accusative, Phil. i. 11, καρπὸν δικαιοσύνης (καρπῶν, Rec. text); Col. i. 9, τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ. This construction also is unknown in profane Greek (cf. the intransitive ὁ θεὸς . . . πεπληρώκει μακαριότητα, Plut. *de placit. phil.* i. 7); still it must be retained, because an absolute πληροῦσθαι in any appropriate sense is untenable, or indeed inadmissible. (b.) The subject forms the contents of the object, Acts ii. 2, ἡχος ἐπλήρωσεν ὄλον τὸν οἶκον; John xvi. 6, ἡ λύπη πεπλήρωκεν ὑμῶν τὴν καρδίαν; Acts v. 3, ἐπλήρωσεν ὁ σατανᾶς τὴν καρδίαν σου, ψεύσασθαί σε κ.τ.λ.; Eph. iv. 10, τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν πληρουμένου. For the middle in this last passage, comp. Xen. *Hell.* vi. 2. 14, τὰς ναῦς ἐπληροῦτο καὶ τοὺς τριηράρχους ἠνάγκαζε; vi. 2. 35, αὐτὸς πληρωσάμενος τὴν ναῦν ἐξέπλει. So also in Dem., Plut., Polyb.

(II.) Absolutely, *to complete or fulfil*, e.g. Luke iii. 5, φάραγξ πληρωθήσεται; Matt. xxiii. 32, πληρώσατε τὸ μέτρον τῶν πατέρων ὑμῶν, cf. Dan. viii. 23; 2 Macc. vi. 14; 1 Thess. ii. 16, εἰς τὸ ἀναπληρῶσαι αὐτῶν τὰς ἀμαρτίας. So in profane Greek with many applications, e.g. *to complete a number, to fulfil a definite time, a wish, a promise; πληρωθῆναι, to be fully satisfied or supplied*, cf. Phil. iv. 18. Still more variously in N. T. Greek as synon. with τελεῖν, τελειοῦν = *to finish, to conclude*; e.g. τὰ ῥήματα, Luke vii. 1, cf. Matt. vii. 28; 1 Kings i. 14; ἔργον, Acts xiv. 26; Rev. iii. 2, see Acts xix. 21, xii. 25; ἔξοδον, Luke ix. 31, cf. δρόμον, Acts xiii. 25; *completely to establish*, e.g. ὑπακοή, 2 Cor. x. 6; χαρά, John iii. 29, xv. 11, xvi. 24, xvii. 13; 1 John i. 4; 2 John 12. In particular of prophecies, ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθέν, Matt. i. 22, ii. 15, 17, 23, iv. 14, viii. 17, xiii. 35, xxi. 4, xxvii. 9; ἡ γραφή, αἱ γραφαί, Matt. xxvi. 54, 56; Mark xiv. 49, xv. 28; Luke iv. 21; John xiii. 18, xvii. 12, xix. 24, 36; Acts i. 16; Jas. ii. 23; ὁ λόγος, John xii. 38, xv. 25, xviii. 9, 32, cf. Acts xiii. 27. In connection therewith, Luke xxiv. 44, δεῖ πληρωθῆναι πάντα; Acts iii. 18, θεὸς . . . ἐπλήρωσεν οὕτως; Luke xxii. 16, ἕως οὗτο πληρωθῇ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τ. θ. = *to realize* (cf. Luke xxii. 16, under βασιλεία). Also τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, Rom. xv. 19, and Col. i. 25, τὸν λόγον τ. θ. ? Cf. ἀναπληροῦν, Matt. xiii. 14. This is akin to the profane πληροῦν τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν, Arr. Epict. iii. 23; τὰς ὑποσχέσεις, Herodian, ii. 7. 9. Πληροῦν καιρὸν, moreover, is not, as some say, peculiar to Hellenistic or biblical Greek, but occurs sometimes (though, perhaps, more rarely) in profane Greek, e.g. Plat. *Legg.* ix. 866 A, εἰς δὲ . . . τοὺς χρόνους μὴ

ἐθέλη πληροῦν ἀποξενούμενος τοὺς εἰρημένους, *si tempora non vult complere peregrinationis praescripta* = to complete, of the termination of a certain period, whether retrospectively or prospectively. So in the O. T. = כָּמַל, Kal and Piel; Gen. xxix. 21; Jer. xxv. 12; Ecclus. xxvi. 2; Gen. xxv. 24; Lev. xii. 4, xxv. 30, cf. ver. 29 = מָלַא. See Acts vii. 23, 30, ix. 23, xxiv. 27; John vii. 8. Especially of the times of the economy of grace, Mark i. 15, *πεπλήρωται ὁ καιρὸς*, cf. Gen. xxix. 21, of a term of years now expired, and a definite period having now arrived. — Luke xxi. 24, ἄχρι οὗ πληρωθῶσιν καιροὶ ἐθνῶν. — We also meet with the expression *πληροῦν τὸν νόμον*, to fulfil or accomplish the law, cf. Herod. i. 199, ἐκπλήσαι τὸν νόμον. So in Rom. xiii. 8; Gal. v. 14. See Matt. v. 17, iii. 15, *πληρῶσαι πᾶσαν δικαιοσύνην*; Rom. viii. 4, ἵνα τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ νόμου πληρωθῇ ἐν ἡμῖν; 2 Thess. i. 11, *πλ. πᾶσαν εὐδοκίαν ἀγαθωσύνης*.

Πλήρωμα, τὸ, always in a passive sense, but variously, according as it is referred to the relative or the absolute *πληροῦν*. — (I.) Relatively, (a.) *that of which anything is full, or with which it is filled, the filling or fulness*, e.g. the manning of a ship, the inhabitants of a town, e.g. Aristid. ii. 282, *παῖδας δὲ καὶ γυναῖκας καὶ πάντα τὰ τῆς πόλεως πληρώματα*. So τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς γῆς, 1 Cor. x. 26; Ps. xxiv. 1; Jer. viii. 16; Ezek. xii. 19, xix. 7, xxx. 12; τῆς οἰκουμένης, Ps. l. 12, lxxxviii. 12; τῆς θαλάσσης, Ps. xcvi. 11, xcvii. 7; 1 Chron. xvi. 32; Eccles. iv. 6, *πλήρωμα δρακός*, a handful. So also John i. 16, ἐκ τοῦ πληρώματος αὐτοῦ ἡμεῖς πάντες ἐλάβομεν, cf. ver. 15, *πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας*; Mark viii. 20, πόσων σφυρίδων πληρώματα κλασμάτων; vi. 43. Also (b.) = *that wherewith anything is filled or completed, complementum*, e.g. Plat. Rep. ii. 371 E, *πλήρωμα δὲ πόλεως εἰσιν καὶ μισθωτοί*, perhaps = *to a real city belong also merchants*. So Matt. ix. 16, Mark ii. 21, of the patch put upon a rent in a garment, cf. ἀναπληροῦν τὸ ὑστέρημα, 1 Cor. xvi. 17; Phil. ii. 30; ἀνταναπληροῦν, Col. i. 24. — (II.) Absolutely, *that which is made full, which is complete*, e.g. totality or completeness, Rom. xi. 12, τὸ ἥττημα αὐτῶν . . . τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτῶν; ver. 25, τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν; xv. 29, *πλ. εὐλογίας Χριστοῦ*; Col. ii. 9, *πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος*, the fulness or sum-total of all that God is, see θεότης. So, perhaps, i. 19, ἐν αὐτῷ εὐδόκησεν πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα κατοικῆσαι, though Hofmann refers the πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα to τὰ πάντα, ver. 16, “the totality of all that exists,” comparing Eph. i. 10. As in any case a genitive has to be supplied, it does not tell against this that *πλήρωμα* does not occur in this sense, Eph. iii. 19, ἵνα πληρωθῇτε εἰς πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ θεοῦ, see 2 Cor. vi. 16. — *Of the close of a certain time* (see *πληρώω*), Gal. iv. 4, ἦλθε τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου; Eph. i. 10, τῶν καιρῶν. *Of the realization or fulfilling of the law*, Rom. xiii. 10, *πλήρωμα οὖν νόμου ἢ ἀγάπης*. — *Τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, the fulness of Christ, τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν πληρούμενος, Eph. i. 23, is a name given to the church, because the church embodies and shows forth all that Christ, ὁ τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν πληρούμενος, is, the contents of His nature giving the standard, iv. 13, that is aimed at in the οἰκοδομὴ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ in ver. 12. The explanation espoused by Calvin, Hofmann,

Kolbe, *the church completes Christ*, or without her Christ is empty and destitute of that which makes Him Christ (Hofmann),—**πλήρωμα**, in the sense of (I.) (a.), affords, indeed, an ingenious thought, but not so true.

Πληροφόρεω, for the most part only in biblical and patristic Greek = **πληροῦν**, see Luke i. 1, *περὶ τῶν πεπληροφορημένων ἐν ὑμῖν πραγμάτων*; 2 Tim. iv. 5, *τὴν διακονίαν σου πληροφορήσου*; iv. 17, *ἵνα δι' ἐμοῦ τὸ κήρυγμα πληροφορηθῇ*; see **πληρόω**, (II.). Thus = **πληροῦν**, Eccles. viii. 6, *ἐπληροφορήθη ἡ καρδία τοῦ ποιῆσαι, חִשְׁבֹּן לֵב עָשָׂה*, for which, in Esth. vii. 5, *τολμᾶν* is used. Thus, too, we may best explain Rom. iv. 21, *πληροφορηθεὶς ὅτι ὁ ἐπήγγελται δυνατός ἐστιν κ.τ.λ.*, corresponding with the preceding *ἐνεδυναμώθη τῇ πίστει*, like the German, *wonon voll sein*; Test. XII. patr. 667, *ἐπληροφορήθην τῆς ἀναιρέσεως αὐτοῦ, I was quite possessed with the idea of killing him*. In Rom. iv. 21 it means *to be fully persuaded*, and in this sense it often occurs in patristic Greek; Rom. xiv. 5, *ἕκαστος ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ νοῦ πληροφορεῖσθω*. So also Hesych. explains it, *ἐπιστώθη· ἐπείσθη, ἐπληροφορήθη*; Ignat. *ad Magn.* 8, *εἰς τὸ πληροφορηθῆναι τοὺς ἀπειθοῦντας, ὅτι εἰς θεός ἐστιν*; *ibid.* 11, *πεπληροφορήσθαι ἐν τῇ γεννήσει καὶ τῷ πάθει καὶ τῇ ἀναστάσει τῇ γενομένη ἐν καιρῷ τῆς ἡγεμονίας Ποντίου Πιλάτου*; *id. ad Smyrn.* 1, *πεπληροφορημένους εἰς τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν, ἀληθῶς ὄντα κ.τ.λ.*; here, perhaps, it signifies *in full or perfect faith*, as is indisputable in the text of the longer recension of the Ignatian Epistles. We also find the passive with the signification, *to be fully persuaded, to be fixed and firm*, in Col. iv. 12, *ἵνα στήτε τέλειοι καὶ πεπληροφορημένοι ἐν παντὶ θελήματι τοῦ θεοῦ*; see Huther *in loc.* We find it afterwards used in the sense *to convince or satisfy*, in Phot. *bibl.* xli. 29, *πολλοῖς ὅρκοις καὶ λόγοις πληροφορήσαντες Μεγάβυζον*.—The earliest trace we can find of the word is in the text already cited in Eccles. viii. 6, and hence some have inferred that it was of Alexandrine origin.

Πληροφορία, ἡ, only with the meaning *perfect certitude, full conviction*, in N. T. and patristic Greek alone; Ignat. *ad Magn.* 11, *ταῦτα ὁ γνούς ἐν πληροφορίᾳ καὶ πιστεύσας*; Hesych., *κατοιόμενος· ὁ μετὰ πληροφορίας πιστεύων*. In the N. T., *πλ. πίστεως*, Heb. x. 22; *τῆς ἐλπίδος*, vi. 11, cf. iii. 6; Col. ii. 2, *πάν τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς πληροφορίας τῆς συνέσεως*; Luther, *all riches of full understanding*; 1 Thess. i. 5, *τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἡμῶν ἐγενήθη . . . ἐν πληροφορίᾳ πολλῇ*.—In John Damasc. conjoined with *ἐντελής γνώσις*. Hesych., *πληροφορία· βεβαιότης*, as Theophylact on 1 Thess. i. 5 explains, who, on Heb. x. 22, says, *πίστις ἡ ἀπηρτισμένη καὶ τελειοτάτη*.

Πλησίον, adverbial neuter of **πλησίος**, α, ον (from **πέλας**), *near, near to*, John iv. 5; ὁ **πλησίος**, *the neighbour*, often in Homer, less frequently in the Attic writers, who use the adverbial **πλησίον** as a substantive, ὁ **πλησίον**, *neighbour, i.e. fellow-man*. LXX. = **עַם**, Ex. ii. 13, xx. 17, xxi. 14, Deut. v. 18, Lev. xix. 13, whereby are meant *fellow-countrymen, fellow-tribesmen*, general connection or affinity, cf. 1 Sam. xv. 28, xxviii. 17, where David is called Saul's *neighbour*. Cf. also **אֶחָד** — **עַם**, *the one, the other*, Gen. xi. 3,

Judg. vi. 29, and elsewhere. Further = $\pi\lambda\sigma$, Lev. v. 21, xix. 15 (*fellowship, companionship*). = $\pi\lambda$, Gen. xxvi. 31; Lev. xxv. 14; Joel ii. 8. This O. T. limitation of the expression to national fellowship (cf. Matt. v. 43) already deepens the profane view, according to which \acute{o} $\pi\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$ meant *quavis alius*, even one's enemy were he living near, as Dem. *Conon.* 15 designates an opponent as \acute{o} $\pi\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$ (cf. Acts vii. 27; Jas. iv. 12). Plat. *Rep.* ii. 373 D, η $\tau\acute{\omega}\nu$ $\pi\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$ $\chi\acute{\omega}\rho\alpha$ = neighbour; *Theaet.* 174 B, \acute{o} $\pi\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ \acute{o} $\gamma\epsilon\acute{\iota}\tau\omega\nu$. It denotes primarily a merely outward nearness, proximity = fellow-creature; Polyb. *de Virtut.* p. 1369, $\pi\iota\kappa\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ $\gamma\epsilon\gamma\omicron\nu\acute{o}\varsigma$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\acute{\iota}\tau\eta\tau\omicron\varsigma$ $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\tau\iota\mu\eta\tau\acute{\eta}\varsigma$ $\tau\acute{\omega}\nu$ $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\alpha\varsigma$, $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\kappa\acute{o}\tau\omega\varsigma$ $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\omicron$ $\tau\acute{\omega}\nu$ $\pi\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$ $\alpha\acute{\upsilon}\tau\omicron\varsigma$ $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\rho\alpha\iota\tau\acute{\eta}\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\tau\upsilon\gamma\chi\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\iota$ $\kappa\alpha\tau\eta\gamma\omicron\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$. Connected with this O. T. deepening and intensifying of the meaning is its widening in the N. T., where they also are included in the bond of brotherhood who are not within the ties of kindred or nation, Luke x. 29 sqq. As the man, whoever he be, with whom I have to do is my neighbour, I must hold fast and cherish that bond of fellowship which brings him so near to me that I cannot separate myself from him; $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\pi\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\tau\omicron\nu$ $\pi\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$ $\sigma\omicron\upsilon$ $\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ $\sigma\epsilon\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu$, Lev. xix. 18; Matt. v. 43, xix. 19, xxii. 39; Mark xii. 31, 33; Luke x. 27; Rom. xiii. 9; Jas. ii. 8, cf. Heb. viii. 11; Eph. iv. 25; Rom. xiii. 10, xv. 2. "While in the word *neighbour* there lies the intimation of a position implying blood-relationship, \acute{o} $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\alpha\varsigma$ simply denotes one who is locally external to me, or removed from me, even though he be my enemy, Dem. *Conon.* 15." Accordingly, already Gataker, *Opp. Crit.* p. 526, and after him Brunck on Soph. *Ant.* 479, $\omicron\upsilon$ $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa$ $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\iota$ $\phi\rho\omicron\nu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\gamma'$ $\acute{\omicron}\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\delta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\acute{o}\varsigma$ $\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\iota$ $\tau\acute{\omega}\nu$ $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\alpha\varsigma$, indicate the merely seemingly Christian force of the expression, the latter in the words, "*Insubide vertit Johnsonus, qui servus est proximi. Oí πέλας sunt quivis alii, ó πέλας alius quivis.*" Nägelsbach, *nachhomer. Theol.* 239 (v. 2. 29). "Through the Christian view of universal love many expressions of citizen life receive a religious import, which they could never have had apart from Christianity. *Thie nahiston* (superlative of *nah*) are in Old High German *neighbour citizens*. In this sense the word belongs to the Old High German apart from Christianity. But when, on the contrary, the Old High German *der nahisto*, the nearest, or *neighbour*, is equivalent to *man*, *fellow-man* generally, this could have been brought about only by a faith which regards all men as brothers and neighbours. It is only by the Christian view, as Christ declared it in the parable of the Good Samaritan, that the O. T. expression really received its world-embracing significance," R. von Raumer, *Die Einwirkung des Christenthums auf die althochd. Sprache*, p. 401.

$\Pi\nu\acute{\epsilon}\omega$, to blow, to breathe, Matt. vii. 25, 27; Luke xii. 55; John iii. 8, vi. 18; Acts xxvii. 40; Rev. vii. 1.

$\Pi\nu\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\mu\alpha$, $\tau\acute{o}$, the wind, John iii. 8; Heb. i. 7; the breath breathed forth, 2 Thess. ii. 8, $\delta\nu$ \acute{o} $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\lambda\acute{\omega}\sigma\epsilon\iota$ $\tau\hat{\omega}$ $\pi\acute{\nu}\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\iota$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\sigma\acute{\tau}\acute{o}\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ $\alpha\acute{\upsilon}\tau\omicron\upsilon$. *Breathing* as the sign and condition of life; *breath*, e.g. $\tau\acute{o}$ $\pi\acute{\nu}\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\iota$ $\delta\iota\acute{\alpha}$ $\tau\iota\upsilon\alpha$, Polyb. xxxi. 18, 4 = *to owe one's life*

to any one; τὸ πν. ἀφιέναι, Eur. *Hec.* 751; Aesch. *Pers.* 507, τάχιστα πνεῦμ' ἀπέρρηξεν βίου, of violent death. Then = the element of life, life, Aristot. *de Mund.* 4, οὐδὲν γάρ ἐστιν ἄνεμος πλὴν ἀὴρ πολλὸς ῥέων καὶ ἄθροος· ὅστις ἅμα καὶ πνεῦμα λέγεται. λέγεται δὲ ἑτέρως πνεῦμα ἢ τε ἐν φυτοῖς καὶ ζώοις καὶ διὰ πάντων διήκουσα ἐμφυχός τε καὶ γόνιμος οὐσία; cf. Eurip. *Suppl.* 533, ἀπῆλθε πνεῦμα μὲν πρὸς αἰθέρα, τὸ σῶμα δ' ἐς γῆν. Thus, in a physiological sense, we often find it in profane Greek, especially in the poets and in later Greek; in a psychological sense, as the element of human existence and personal life, never.

To this the Scripture use of the word attaches itself. (I.) (a.) Most akin are such expressions as Luke viii. 55, ἐπέστρεψε τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτῆς; Jas. ii. 26, τὸ σῶμα χωρὶς πνεύματος νεκρὸν ἐστίν; Ezek. xxxvii. 8, of the dead, וְהָיָה הָאֵשׁ; Hab. ii. 19, of idols, יִבְרָרָה רִגְלֵי הַלֹּבֵן, cf. Rev. xiii. 15, ἐδόθη αὐτῷ δοῦναι πνεῦμα τῇ εἰκόνι τοῦ θηρίου ἵνα καὶ λαλήσῃ ἡ εἰκὼν; xi. 11, πν. ζωῆς ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσῆλθεν ἐν αὐτοῖς. But this affinity does not extend far. In Scripture, πνεῦμα denotes the distinctive, self-conscious, inner life of man; 1 Cor. ii. 11, τίς γὰρ οἶδεν τὰ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου εἰ μὴ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τὸ ἐν αὐτῷ; 1 Cor. v. 3, ἀπὼν τῷ σώματι, παρὼν δὲ τῷ πνεύματι, ἥδη κέκρικα ὡς παρών; Col. ii. 5; Matt. v. 3, πτωχοὶ τῷ πν.; Luke i. 17, ἐν πνεύματι καὶ δυνάμει Ἡλίου; i. 80, ἐκραταιοῦτο τῷ πν.; ii. 40; 1 Cor. v. 5, εἰς ὄλεθρον σαρκός, ἵνα τὸ πνεῦμα σωθῇ. To it the utterances of the will are referred, Acts xix. 21, ἔθετο ὁ Παῦλος ἐν τῷ πν.; cf. Matt. xxvi. 41, τὸ μὲν πνεῦμα πρόθυμον. Upon it all the affections of personal life operate, Acts xvii. 16, παρωξύνετο τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ; John xi. 33, ἐνεβριμήσατο τῷ πνεύματι; xiii. 21, ἐταράχθη τῷ πν., and it often appears as parallel with soul or heart, cf. 1 Cor. v. 3 with 1 Thess. ii. 17; Acts xix. 21 with xxiii. 11; John xiii. 21 with xii. 27, νῦν ἡ ψυχὴ μου τετράρακται; Matt. xxvi. 38; John xiv. 1, 27, μὴ ταρασσέσθω ὑμῶν ἡ καρδιά; Luke i. 47, μεγαλύνει ἡ ψυχὴ μου τὸν κύριον καὶ ἡγαλλίασεν τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπὶ κ.τ.λ.; Col. ii. 5; 1 Cor. xvi. 18, ἀνέπαυσεν γὰρ τὸ ἐμὸν πνεῦμα καὶ τὸ ὑμῶν, cf. Ps. xxiii. 3, וְהָיָה הָאֵשׁ. Further, cf. Gen. xlv. 27; Josh. ii. 11; 1 Kings ii. 11; Jer. li. 11; Ps. lxxvi. 13; Ex. vi. 9; Ps. li. 19, xxxiv. 19; Isa. lxvi. 2, xxv. 4; Prov. xvi. 32, xxv. 28; Matt. xxvi. 38; Mark xiv. 34; John xii. 27; 3 John 2; Matt. xi. 29; Acts xiv. 22, xv. 24. (*Vid.* Roos, *Fundamenta Psychol. scr.* ii. 21–32; Auberlen, article “Geist” in Herzog’s *Realencykl.*) But between spirit and soul there is this important distinction, that the soul is represented as the subject of life (see ψυχὴ), but the spirit never; cf. 1 Cor. xv. 45; Gen. ii. 7; Ezek. xviii. 4, 20. Roos, *Psychol. scr.* ii. 9, “*primus Adam anima viva . . . vocatus est, spiritus nunquam, secundus Adam Christus dicitur spiritus, quamvis ipse ante plenam sui glorificationem etiam animae suae mentionem faceret;*” cf. Ath. xii. 530 f., ἐγὼ Νίκος πάλαι ποτ' ἐγενόμην πνεῦμα, νῦν δ' οὐκέτ' οὐδέν, ἀλλὰ γῇ πεποιήμαι. Considering the above-cited passages, Luke viii. 55, Jas. ii. 26, etc., Gen. vi. 17, vii. 15, we are led to regard the spirit as the principle of life, which has an independent activity of its own in all the circumstances of perceptive and emotional life. Death is described both as a giving up of the πνεῦμα and as a laying down or

departure of the *ψυχή*; the former, of Christ, Matt. xxvii. 50; Luke xxiii. 46; John xix. 30; of Stephen, Acts vii. 59, cf. Luke viii. 55; 1 Kings xvii. 21; the latter, of Christ, John x. 15, 17; Mark x. 45; and elsewhere, John xii. 25, xiii. 37, 38; Matt. x. 39; Gen. xxxv. 18; yet there is a limit beyond which these expressions cannot be used interchangeably (see under *ψυχή*), but are clearly distinguished from each other, showing plainly that *πνεῦμα* is the principle of life. We see at once that we cannot similarly denote death by the use of the word *heart*, though of the heart it is said, *ἐκ ταύτης ἔξοδοι ζωῆς*, Prov. iv. 23, so that there is a marked distinction between *spirit* and *heart*. We thus discover the following successive stages of thought and expression: the spirit principle, the soul subject, and the heart organ of the life. From this inter-penetrating relationship may be explained the varied parallelism between these expressions.

Now *πνεῦμα*, *רוח*, is predicated both of men and of brutes, Eccles. iii. 19, 20, Isa. xlii. 5, Ps. civ. 29, 30, from which texts it is at the same time clear that it signifies not simply a *life-principle*, but a *life-principle springing from God*, a *divine life-principle*,—and with this it agrees that *ψυχή*, also *ψυχὴ ζωσα*, is used of men as well as brutes, Gen. i. 24, ii. 7, ix. 10, 16; Lev. xvii. 10, 11, 14, 15. But, nevertheless, man is distinct, Gen. ii. 20 (Hebrew and LXX.), i. 26, 27, for he has life not by virtue of that life-giving power of God which determines creation at large, as the brutes have, Gen. i. 24, cf. ver. 2, but by virtue of a *special immediate communication*; and thus the *πνεῦμα* in him, as the *divine life-principle*, is at the same time the principle of that God-related and therefore morally determined life which is peculiar to him (cf. Gen. i. 26, 27 with Eph. iv. 24, Col. iii. 10). Hence his *πνεῦμα* is *distinctively* active or acted upon in all the relations of the *religious, God-related life*; Ps. xxxiv. 19, li. 19; Isa. lxi. 3, lxvi. 2; Ps. xxxi. 6; Isa. xxvi. 9, xxxviii. 15–17; Ps. lxxviii. 8, xxxii. 2; Prov. xvi. 2; Ps. li. 12; Ezek. xiii. 3; Isa. xxix. 24. In the N. T. cf. Rom. i. 9, *τῷ θεῷ λατρεύω ἐν τῷ πνεύματί μου*, for which in 2 Tim. i. 3 we have *ὃ λατρεύω ἐν καθαρᾷ συνειδήσει*, since *συνειδήσις* is the result of the activity of the spirit in the heart, the determinateness of self-consciousness by the divine life-principle, the spirit; see *συνειδήσις, καρδιά*. If even in this sense *spirit* and *heart* are used interchangeably, this may be explained by the meaning of *heart*, and its relation to *πνεῦμα*, see *καρδιά*. The *spirit*, as the divine life-principle, and the principle of the divine or God-related life, is spoken of in Rom. viii. 10, *εἰ δὲ Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν, τὸ μὲν σῶμα νεκρὸν δι' ἁμαρτίαν, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ζῶν διὰ δικαιοσύνην*. In like manner, ver. 16, *αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα (π. νόθεσις) συμμαρτυρεῖ τῷ πνεύματι ἡμῶν ὅτι ἐσμὲν τέκνα θεοῦ*. (Cf. 1 Cor. ii. 11.) According to this passage, the self-consciousness of the children of God depends upon the contact of the Spirit newly given them of God with the spirit in them which is theirs conformably with nature,—cf. ver. 10 with ver. 9, —and the vitality and power of the divine life-principle (cf. *πτωχοὶ τῷ πν.*, Matt. v. 3; *ἐκραταιούτο πνεύματι*, Luke i. 80) depends upon the communication or indwelling of the Spirit of Christ, ver. 9, *ὑμεῖς δὲ οὐκ ἔστε ἐν σαρκὶ ἀλλὰ ἐν πνεύματι, εἴπερ πνεῦμα θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν· εἰ δέ τις πν. Χριστοῦ οὐκ ἔχει κ.τ.λ.* Cf. ver. 14, *ὅσοι πνεύματι θεοῦ*

ἄγονται, with ver. 15, ἐλάβετε πν. υἰοθεσίας, ver. 16, συμμαρτυρεῖ τῷ πν. ἡμῶν, and ver. 10, τὸ μὲν σῶμα νεκρὸν . . . τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ζωὴ διὰ δικαιοσύνην. Accordingly, we may say that by the communication of the Spirit (Gal. iii. 5, ὁ οὖν ἐπιχορηγῶν ὑμῖν τὸ πν.) there is brought about a *renewal or revivification of the divine life-principle* by and in order to the slaying of the σάρξ, which is filled with sin, and which hinders the action and dominion of the spirit (comp. the relation between νοῦς and σάρξ, νοῦς and πνεῦμα, under νοῦς, and that between σάρξ and πνεῦμα, under σάρξ); Rom. vii. 18, 20, viii. 3, 5-7. Hence ἡ χάρις μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ὑμῶν, Gal. vi. 10; Phil. iv. 23; Philem. 25, cf. 2 Cor. vii. 1, μολυσμὸς σαρκὸς καὶ πνεύματος, see σάρξ; Gal. vi. 8, ὁ σπείρων εἰς τὴν σάρκα . . . εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα. Always according to the context, we must understand by πνεῦμα the divine life-principle by nature peculiar to man, either in its natural position within his organism, or as renewed by the communication of the Spirit, see especially Rom. viii. 10, τὸ μὲν σῶμα νεκρὸν δι' ἁμαρτίαν, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ζωὴ διὰ δικαιοσύνην; 1 Thess. v. 23, ὑμῶν τὸ πν. καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ καὶ τὸ σῶμα; Phil. iii. 3, οἱ πνεύματι θεῷ (αἱ θεοῦ) λατρεύοντες . . . καὶ οὐκ ἐν σαρκὶ πεποιθότες; Eph. vi. 18, προσευχόμενοι ἐν πνεύματι; Phil. i. 27, στήκετε ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύμῃ; Gal. v. 25, εἰ ζῶμεν πνεύματι, πνεύματι καὶ στοιχῶμεν; 2 Cor. xii. 18, οὐ τῷ αὐτῷ πνεύματι περιπατήσαμεν. In this renewal the πνεῦμα is ever foremost as the active life-principle, cf. Gal. v. 25, εἰ ζῶμεν πνεύματι κ.τ.λ.; Eph. v. 18; 2 Cor. xii. 18; Rom. viii. 9, οὐκ ἐστὲ ἐν σαρκὶ, ἀλλ' ἐν πνεύματι; ver. 4, κατὰ σάρκα, κατὰ πνεῦμα περιπατεῖν; ver. 5, οἱ κατὰ σάρκα ὄντες . . . οἱ κατὰ πν.; ver. 6, τὸ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς . . . τοῦ πν.; ver. 9, οὐκ ἐστὲ ἐν σαρκὶ, ἀλλ' ἐν πν., εἴπερ πνεῦμα θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν; ver. 2, ὁ νόμος τοῦ πνεύματος τῆς ζωῆς . . . ἠλευθέρωσέ με ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου τῆς ἁμαρτίας καὶ τοῦ θανάτου. But we must keep fast hold of the truth, that this newly given life-principle does not become identical with the spirit belonging to man by nature, nor does it supplant it. It cannot be said of it, τὸ ἐμὸν, ὑμῶν πνεῦμα, though we must distinguish between the texts where it is spoken of as now belonging to man, and those where it appears as existing independently as πν. ἁγίου, πν. τοῦ θεοῦ, πν. τ. Χριστοῦ. It is spoken of in the former way in most of the texts here cited, wherein it denotes (b.) the divine life-principle newly communicated to man; comp. 2 Pet. i. 3, ὡς πάντα ἡμῖν τῆς θείας δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ τὰ πρὸς ζωὴν καὶ εὐσεβείαν δεδωρημένης, ver. 4, ἵνα γένησθε θείας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως, with Rom. viii. 2, ὁ νόμος τοῦ πν. τῆς ζωῆς κ.τ.λ., ver. 13, εἰ γὰρ κατὰ σάρκα ζῆτε, μέλλετε ἀποθνήσκειν· εἰ δὲ πνεύματι τὰς πράξεις τοῦ σώματος θανατοῦτε, ζήσεσθε. In this sense we must take it in most of the places where it stands contrasted with σάρξ, cf. Gal. iii. 3, ἐναρξάμενοι πνεύματι νῦν σαρκὶ ἐπιτελείσθε, with ver. 5, ὁ οὖν ἐπιχορηγῶν τὸ πν., v. 16, πνεύματι περιπατεῖσθε καὶ ἐπιθυμίαν σαρκὸς οὐ μὴ τελέσητε, ver. 17, ἡ γὰρ σάρξ ἐπιθυμεῖ κατὰ τοῦ πν., τὸ δὲ πν. κατὰ τῆς σαρκὸς, ver. 18, εἰ δὲ πνεύματι ἄγεσθε (cf. Rom. viii. 14, πνεύματι θεοῦ ἄγεσθαι), ver. 22, ὁ καρπὸς τοῦ πνεύματος, ver. 19, τὰ ἔργα τῆς σαρκὸς, vi. 8.—Eph. v. 18, πληροῦσθε ἐν πν.; Gal. v. 5, ἡμεῖς γὰρ πνεύματι ἐκ πίστεως ἐλπίδα δικαιοσύνης ἀπεκδεχόμεθα; Eph. ii. 18, ἔχομεν τὴν προσαγωγὴν οἱ ἀμφότεροι ἐν ἐνὶ πν. πρὸς τὸν πατέρα. This life-

principle newly communicated to the man—the principle of a new life in him (cf. Jude 19, *ψυχικοί, πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες*)—is described as *πν. νιοθεσίας*, Rom. viii. 15 (in contrast with *δουλείας*); *πν. τῆς πίστεως*, 2 Cor. iv. 13; 2 Tim. i. 7, *οὐ γὰρ ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν ὁ θεὸς πνεῦμα δειλίας, ἀλλὰ δυνάμεως καὶ ἀγάπης καὶ σωφρονισμοῦ*, cf. Gal. vi. 1, *ὕμεις οἱ πνευματικοὶ καταρτίζετε τὸν τοιοῦτον ἐν πν. πραύτητος*; 2 Thess. ii. 13, *ἀγιασμός πνεύματος*; 1 Pet. i. 2. As the *σάρξ* forms the basis of the natural oneness of humanity, so the *πνεῦμα* forms the basis of the communion of the *καινὴ κτίσις* (cf. 2 Cor. v. 17 with 1 Cor. vi. 17); Phil. i. 27, *στήκετε ἐν ἐνὶ πν.*; Eph. ii. 18; Phil. ii. 1, *εἴ τις κοινωνία πνεύματος*; Eph. iv. 3, *τηρεῖν τὴν ἐνότητα τοῦ πν.*; ver. 4, *ἐν σῶμα καὶ ἐν πν.* (cf. *μία σάρξ*, 1 Cor. vi. 16).

In keeping with the fact that this Spirit is spoken of as not the man's own, though it has become part of him, we find it described (*c.*) as the *πν. ἅγιον*, the *πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ, τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, independently and as distinct from the man, whether He be described as communicated to man or operating independently in him. Thus in the Pauline writings, Rom. viii. 9, *πν. θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν*. — *εἴ τις πν. Χριστοῦ οὐκ ἔχει*; ver. 11, *εἰ τὸ πν. τοῦ ἐγγείραντος Ἰησοῦν οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν*. — *διὰ τοῦ ἐνοικούντος ἐν ὑμῖν πν.*, viii. 14; 2 Tim. i. 14; Rom. ix. 1, *συμμαρτυρούσης μοι τῆς συνειδήσεώς μου ἐν πν. ἁγ.*; with this comp. Rom. i. 9; 2 Tim. i. 3; Rom. viii. 16. — 1 Cor. ii. 12, *οὐ τὸ πν. τοῦ κόσμου ἐλάβομεν, ἀλλὰ τὸ πν. τὸ ἐκ θεοῦ, ἵνα εἰδῶμεν τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ χαρισθέντα ἡμῖν*, cf. ver. 11; 1 Cor. iii. 16, *ναὸς θεοῦ ἐστὶ καὶ τὸ πν. τ. θ. οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν*; vi. 19, *τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν ναὸς τοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν ἁγίου πν.*; Eph. ii. 22, *συνοικοδομεῖσθε εἰς κατοικητήριον τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν πν.* The seat of His presence and operations is the heart, 2 Cor. i. 22, *ὁ δὸς τὸν ἀρραβῶνα τοῦ πν. ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν*; v. 5; Gal. iv. 6, *ἐξαπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸ πν. τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν*. The purpose and end of His working is the strengthening of the inner man, Eph. iii. 16, *ἵνα δώῃ ἡμῖν . . . δυνάμει κραταιωθῆναι διὰ τοῦ πν. αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν ἔσω ἄνθρωπον*. See also 2 Cor. vi. 6, *συνιστῶντες ἑαυτοὺς ὡς θεοῦ διάκονοι . . . ἐν πν. ἁγίῳ*; xiii. 13, *ἡ κοινωνία τοῦ ἁγίου πν. μετὰ πάντων*; Gal. iii. 2, 5, 14, *ἵνα τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πνεύματος λάβωμεν*; Eph. i. 13, *ἐσφραγίσθητε τῷ πν. τῆς ἐπαγγελίας τῷ ἁγίῳ*; i. 17, iv. 30, *μὴ λυπεῖτε τὸ πν. τὸ ἅγιον ἐν ᾧ ἐσφραγίσθητε*; comp. 2 Cor. i. 22, v. 5; Rom. v. 5, viii. 15, 16; Gal. iv. 6; 1 Thess. iv. 8, *ἀθετεῖ . . . τὸν θεὸν τὸν δόντα τὸ πν. αὐτοῦ τὸ ἅγιον εἰς ὑμᾶς*. So also in the Heb. ii. 4, *μερισμοὶ πνεύματος*; vi. 4, *μέτοχοι γεννηθέντες πνεύματος ἁγίου*; 1 Pet. iv. 14, *τὸ τῆς δόξης καὶ δυνάμεως καὶ τοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ πν. ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἀναπαύεται*; 1 John iii. 24. Akin to these are the modes of expression in 1 John iv. 13, *ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος αὐτοῦ δέδωκεν ἡμῖν*, cf. Acts ii. 17, 18, *ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου*; Rom. viii. 23, *ἀπαρχὴ τοῦ πν.*

It must ever be maintained (II.) that the principle which gives life to the creature is of God, and originally belongs to God, so that where God's *πνεῦμα* is spoken of it is primarily in such a manner that we must understand by it the life-principle in the creature, which is part of God, and manifests itself creatively. Thus obviously in Gen. i. 2, *וְהָיָה רցּחַ הָאֵלִים מְרַחֵף עַל-פְּנֵי הַמַּיִם*. As God's Spirit, it is called *πνεῦμα ἅγιον* (as to the

import of this, see ἅγιος). Matt. i. 18, εὐρέθη ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσα ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου; ver. 20, τὸ γὰρ ἐν αὐτῇ γενηθὲν ἐκ πν. ἐστὶν ἁγίου. Hence joined with δύναμις, Luke i. 35, πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σὲ καὶ δύναμις ὑψίστου ἐπισκιάσει σοι (cf. Luke iv. 14; Rom. i. 4; 1 Cor. ii. 4; Gal. iii. 5; Eph. iii. 16; 1 Thess. i. 5; 2 Tim. i. 7; Heb. ii. 4, cf. 1 Cor. v. 4, συναχθέντων ὑμῶν καὶ τοῦ ἐμοῦ πνεύματος σὺν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ; Luke xxiv. 49, ἕως οὗ ἐνδύσησθε ἐξ ὕψους δύναμιν, with Acts i. 5). Absolutely, τὸ πνεῦμα, the Holy Spirit, 1 Cor. ii. 10. It is through this creatively working Holy Spirit of God that Christ possesses His divine equipment, Matt. xii. 28, ἐν πν. θεοῦ ἐγὼ ἱκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια; iii. 16, xii. 18; Mark i. 10, iii. 29; Luke iii. 22, iv. 18; John i. 32, 33, iii. 34; Acts x. 38. God's saving work to be accomplished in man is brought about through Him, Matt. iii. 11, βαπτίσει ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ; Mark i. 8; Luke iii. 16; John i. 33; Luke xi. 13, δώσει πν. ἅγιον τοῖς αἰτοῦσιν αὐτόν; and every divine work upon or by man is referred to the Spirit, Matt. x. 20, τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν τὸ λαλοῦν ἐν ὑμῖν; Mark xiii. 11; Luke i. 15, πνεύματος ἁγίου πλησθήσεται; i. 41, 67, ii. 25, 26, 27, xii. 12, ἅγ. πν. διδάξει ὑμᾶς; Gal. iv. 29, ὁ κατὰ σάρκα γενηθεὶς ἐδίδωκε τὸν κατὰ πνεῦμα. Hence Matt. xxii. 43, Δαβὶδ ἐν πνεύματι καλεῖ αὐτὸν κύριον; Mark xii. 36; Acts xi. 28, ἐσήμανε διὰ τοῦ πν.; 2 Pet. i. 21, ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι ἐλάλησαν ἀπὸ θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι; Acts i. 16, προεῖπεν τὸ πν. τὸ ἅγ.; Heb. iii. 7, ix. 8, x. 15. To this class belong also the passages, Matt. iv. 1, Ἰησοῦς ἀνήχθη εἰς τὴν ἔρημον ὑπὸ τοῦ πν.; Mark i. 12; Luke iv. 1, 14, ὑπέστρεψεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ πνεύματος εἰς τὴν Γαλ. We must only distinguish how, on the one hand, the πν. is said to be God's, through whom all God's operations are carried on, and on the other, how He is spoken of as belonging to the man,—the πν. ἅγιον for man. Of the latter we read, John vii. 39, τοῦτο δὲ εἶπεν περὶ τοῦ πνεύματος, οὗ ἔμελλον λαμβάνειν οἱ πιστεύοντες εἰς αὐτόν· οὕτω γὰρ ἦν πνεῦμα (αἱ πν. ἅγιον), ὅτι Ἰησοῦς οὐδέπω ἐδοξάσθη; comp. John i. 32, 33, vi. 63. Still this is not a difference of subjects, but simply a difference of relationship to man. — Personality belongs to this Spirit in the same manner as to the Son (Matt. xxviii. 19), and this is shown in the saving operations of the Spirit, as described in John xiv. 17, 26, xv. 26, xvi. 13, so that where mention is thus made of the Spirit the reference is to the Holy Spirit, as the agent who accomplishes in and for man the divine work of redemption; 1 Cor. xii. 11, πάντα δὲ ταῦτα ἐνεργεῖ τὸ ἐν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα διαιροῦν ἰδίᾳ ἐκάστῳ καθὼς βούλεται. Where this Spirit is given, there is variously a φανέρωσις τοῦ πνεύματος, 1 Cor. xii. 7, showing itself in διαιρέσεις χαρισμάτων, ver. 4; enumerated, vv. 8–10, cf. xiv. 2, 12, 14–16. As to τὰ ἑπτὰ πν. τοῦ θεοῦ, Rev. iv. 5, v. 6, i. 4, cf. Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* i. 200, according to whom “is to be understood the Spirit, not as He is in God, but as He carries out God's will in the world. He thus appears in His divine manifoldness, just as the church is represented in the seven churches. But when the church is represented as the bride, the Spirit also is represented in His unity,” Rev. xxii. 17.

When, in Rom. xi. 8 (after Isa. xxix. 10), mention is made of a πνεῦμα κατανύξεως,

רוח ה' as given by God, we have the same view as already is given in Judg. ix. 23, 1 Sam. xvi. 16, 23, xviii. 10, xix. 9, where the רוח אלהים of chap. xvi. 15 is called, in ver. 23, simply רוח אלהים, cf. Ps cxliii. 10, because the power which thus determined the life in evil appears as sent by God, though not the Spirit that belongs to God, cf. Ezek. xxxvi. 27.

(III.) Every influence which determines the life from within outwards is spiritual, and is therefore designated πνεῦμα; Eph. ii. 2, τὸ πν. τὸ νῦν ἐνεργοῦν ἐν τοῖς υἱοῖς τῆς ἀπειθείας; Bengel in loc., "*Non hic ipse princeps dicitur spiritus, sed spiritus est h. l. principium illud internum, ex quo fluunt actiones infidelium, oppositum spiritui fidelium filiorum Dei.*" Cf. Luke ix. 55, οὐκ οἴδατε, οἷον πνεύματος ἐστὲ ὑμεῖς; similar is Luke iv. 33, ἄνθρωπος ἔχων πνεῦμα δαιμονίου ἀκαθάρτου, cf. ver. 36, ἐπιτάσσει τοῖς ἀκαθάρτοις πνεύμασιν καὶ ἐξέρχονται, where, as in all passages containing mention of *unclean spirits*, the spirit of infirmity, etc., two representations are combined,—πνεῦμα signifying both a power determining the life, and the manifested form of that power. The word thus comes,

(IV.) to denote an essence without, or not requiring, any corporeal garb or especially any corporeal medium for its inner reality; so that it is only as we simply utter the word which denotes this that the living essence is, so to speak, present (πν. being here perhaps akin to its derivation, *breath*). So Luke xxiv. 37, ἐδόκουν πνεῦμα θεωρεῖν; ver. 39, πνεῦμα σάρκα καὶ ὅσπερ οὐκ ἔχει. We may here include Heb. xii. 23, πνεύματα δικαίων τετελειωμένων; whereas the phrase ψυχὰι τῶν ἐσφαγμένων, Rev. vi. 9, cf. xx. 4, suggests another representation; see ψυχή. In the same sense Christ says, John iv. 24, πνεῦμα ὁ θεός, i.e. raised above any material medium of existence (cf. 1 Kings viii. 27); and accordingly what follows explains itself, viz. τοὺς προσκυνούντας αὐτὸν ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ δεῖ προσκυνεῖν, i.e. the worship of God, who is spirit, demands above all the man's inner nature, unfettered by any hindrances pertaining either to the O. T. localizing of the place of revelation, or to the carnal corporeality (σάρξ) of the man himself, and must free itself therefrom; cf. the contrast in the Hebrews between σάρξ and συνειδήσις, δικαιώματα σαρκός, etc., Heb. ix. 9, 10, 13; see σάρξ. What is required is a relation of spirit to spirit. — Thus the angels are designated πνεύματα in Heb. i. 14; and by the analogy of this verse we may, lastly, best explain Heb. i. 7, ὁ ποιῶν τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ πνεύματα καὶ τοὺς λειτουργοὺς αὐτοῦ πυρὸς φλόγα, πν. and πυρ. φλ. denoting different forms of manifestation. Elsewhere πνεῦμα, in this sense, is used only of dæmons, and, indeed, inasmuch as they are at the same time powers determining physical or psychical life; πν. ἀκάθαρτον, Matt. x. 1, xii. 43, Mark i. 23, 26, 27, iii. 11, 30, v. 2, 8, 13, vi. 7, vii. 25, ix. 25, Luke iv. 36, vi. 18, viii. 29, xi. 24, Rev. xvi. 13, 14, xviii. 2; πν. πονηρόν, Matt. xii. 45, Luke vii. 21, viii. 2, xi. 26; πν. ἀσθενείας, Luke xiii. 11; πν. ἄλλαν καὶ κωφόν, Mark ix. 17, 25; πνεῦμα by itself, Mark ix. 20, Luke ix. 39, x. 20. The unusual expression in Mark v. 2, ἄνθρωπος ἐν πν. ἀκαθάρτῳ, seems to be akin to ἐν πνεύμῃ, Matt. xxii. 43, Luke ii. 27, etc., if it be not the Hebrew פְּ of accompaniment.

After all that has been said, we must in general claim for πνεῦμα two distinct mean-

ings: spirit as the life-principle, or the life-determining power, and spirit as a form of manifestation.

Πνευματικός, belonging to the Spirit, or determined by the πνεῦμα; spiritual (in Plut., in contrast with σωματικός, *de san. tu.* 389). — (I.) In the first sense, Rom. i. 11, χάρισμα πνευματικόν; xv. 27; 1 Cor. ix. 11, xii. 1, περὶ τῶν πνευματικῶν; xiv. 1, ζηλοῦτε τὰ πνευματικά = φανερώσεις τοῦ πνεύματος, xii. 7; Eph. i. 3, εὐλογία πνευματική; 1 Cor. ii. 13, πνευματικοῖς πνευματικὰ συγκρίνοντες, πνευματικά = τὰ ὑπὸ θεοῦ χαρισθέντα ἡμῖν, ver. 12; πνευματικοῖς = ἐν διδ. πν., ver. 13, or = *becoming* or *suitable to the Spirit*, cf. ἀνδρικός, φιλικός? — (II.) Determined by the πν., 1 Cor. xiv. 37, εἴ τις δοκεῖ προφήτης εἶναι ἡ πνευματικός (Bengel, *propheta species, spiritualis genus*); Gal. vi. 1, ὑμεῖς οἱ πνευματικοὶ καταρτίζετε τὸν τοιοῦτον ἐν πνεύματι πραΰτητος; 1 Cor. iii. 1, οὐκ ἡδυνήθην λαλῆσαι ὑμῖν ὡς πνευματικοῖς ἀλλ' ὡς σαρκίνοις. Masculine also, according to some interpreters, in 1 Cor. xii. 1; but as what is spoken of is not a spiritually effected *life*, but spiritually wrought *gifts*, the neuter rendering is to be preferred. — Eph. v. 19; Col. iii. 16, ῥῳδαὶ πνευματικαί; i. 9, σύνεσις πνευματική. The expression οἶκος πνευματικός, 1 Pet. ii. 5, cannot be = ἀχειροποίητος (De Wette), for this is obvious by the comparison itself; but in order to give the result of the preceding καὶ αὐτοὶ ὡς λίθοι ζῶντες οἰκοδομείσθε, that peculiarity of the house must be named, which arises from the character of the constituent stones, which possess a life inwrought by the Spirit, cf. Eph. ii. 22, κατοικητήριον τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν πν. In like manner ἀνεγκαι πνευματικὰς θυσίας, *offerings which are determined by the Spirit*. — 1 Cor. x. 3, τὸ αὐτὸ βρῶμα πνευματικὸν ἔφαγον; ver. 4, πόμα πνευματικὸν ἔπιον, denote *meat and drink of a kind produced by the Spirit*, by virtue of which they differed from ordinary nourishment; see Ex. xvi. 12–25, xvii. 5, 6; Deut. viii. 15. The expression πνευματικὴ πέτρα, ver. 4, has reference to the source of the water, which did not belong to the rock from which it sprang, but to the Lord (Deut. viii. 15, cf. Ex. xvii. 6), the Rock of Israel (Deut. xxxii. 4, xv. 18), who made it to spring from the rock which He pointed out. The following word, ἀκολουθούσης, shows what Rock the apostle meant, viz. *not* the rock in Horeb (Ex. xvii. 6, רֹכֶסֶת הַצִּיּוֹן). — The word occurs also in 1 Cor. ii. 15, xv. 44, 46, in contrast with ψυχικός, and, as in all places save 1 Cor. x., with the sense of πνεῦμα, as = *the divine life-principle* of the *καινὴ κτίσις*.

Πονηρός, ἀ, ὄν, connected with πόνος, *labour, pains*; πενία, *indigence* = burdensome, bad, adverse; in a moral sense = bad, evil; in both cases the antithesis of χρηστός. — (I.) Physically = bad, ill, e.g. πονηρὸν σῶμα, *a sickly body*; πονηρὰ τροφή, *of corrupt or putrid food*; πονηρῶς ἔχειν, *to be in evil case*, Thuc. vii. 83; Xen. *Anab.* vii. 4. 12, ὅτι ἐν πονηροῖς τόποις σκηνῶν καὶ πλησίον εἶεν οἱ πολέμιοι, *of a difficult and dangerous district*; Aristotle, *Eth. Nicom.* iii. 6, τὸ δὲ λέγειν ὡς οὐδεὶς ἐκὼν πονηρὸς οὐδ' ἄκων μάκαρ κ.τ.λ.; Rev. xvi. 2, ἔλκος κακὸν καὶ πονηρόν = grievous, cf. Job. ii. 7, ἔπαισε τὸν Ἰωβ ἔλκος

πονηρῶ. (In this sense the Attics accented the word thus, πόνηρος.) Matt. vii. 17, 18, καρποὶ πονηροί, *fruits which are unfit for use, worthless*, as opposed to καλός. Cf. Jer. xxiv. 8, τὰ σῦκα τὰ πονηρὰ ἃ οὐ βρωθήσονται ἀπὸ πονηρίας αὐτῶν; Matt. vi. 23, ἐὰν δὲ ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου πονηρὸς ᾖ, ὅλον τὸ σῶμα σκοτεινὸν ἔσται, *a diseased eye*, opposed to ἀπλοῦς, ver. 22; Luke xi. 34, Hebrew נָפַח, נִפְחָ, *souped*. Cf. Just. Mart. *Apol.* i. p. 34, ἐκ γενετῆς πονηροὺς ὑγιεῖς πεποιηκέναι; Gen. xli. 19; also of *unwholesome, adverse things*, e.g. πονηρὰ βουλευμάτα, *unwholesome, unfavourable counsels*, Ar. Lys. 517; πονηροὶ ἄνεμοι, *contrary winds*, Dion. Hal. *Ant.* i. 52. So ἡμέραι πονηραί, of a *bad, unfavourable time*, Eph. v. 16, vi. 13, ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ πονηρᾷ; Gal. i. 4, ὅπως ἐξέλῃται ἡμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ ἐνεστώτος αἰῶνος πονηροῦ. Cf. Gen. xlvii. 9, μικραὶ καὶ πονηραὶ γεγόνασιν αἱ ἡμέραι τῶν ἐτῶν τῆς ζωῆς μου; Ps. xli. 2, ἐν ἡμέρᾳ πονηρᾷ ῥύσεται αὐτὸν ὁ κύριος; xxxvii. 19; Eccles. ix. 12; Mic. ii. 3. — In many places, like κακός, it includes both a natural and a moral meaning, because whatever evil happens to any one is, on moral grounds, to be rejected. So Acts xxviii. 21, ἐλάλησέν τι περὶ σοῦ πονηρόν; 3 John 10, λόγοις πονηροῖς φλυαρῶν ἡμᾶς; Matt. v. 11, ὅταν . . . εἴπωσιν πᾶν πονηρόν ῥῆμα καθ' ὑμῶν ψευδόμενοι (Tisch., καθ' ὑμῶν πᾶν πονηρόν). See also ἐνθυμήματα πονηρά, *malevolent, wicked thoughts*, Matt. ix. 4, cf. Mark vii. 22, ὀφθαλμοὺς πονηρός, as a species of τὰ πονηρά, like Matt. xv. 19, διαλογισμοὶ πονηροί, Jas. ii. 4; 1 Tim. vi. 4, ὑπόνοιαι πονηραί; 2 Tim. iv. 18, ῥύσεται με ὁ κύριος ἀπὸ παντὸς ἔργου πονηροῦ καὶ σώσει εἰς τὴν βασ. αὐτοῦ, cf. ver. 17. The neuter by itself, τὸ πονηρόν, the *evil which what is wicked, or the wicked inflict*, Matt. v. 39, μὴ ἀντιστῆναι τῷ πονηρῷ. So also in the disputed texts, 2 Thess. iii. 3, ὁ κύριος φυλάξει ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ, cf. vv. 2, 5; John xvii. 15, οὐκ ἐρωτῶ ἵνα ἄρῃς αὐτοὺς ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου, ἀλλ' ἵνα τηρήσῃς αὐτοὺς ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ, cf. the connection between this prayer and the hatred of the world in ver. 14; Matt. vi. 13, ῥύσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ. As to this last passage, both the physical and moral reference of ἀπὸ τοῦ π. is demanded by the twofold character of the foregoing πειρασμός, cf. 1 Cor. x. 10–13; 2 Pet. ii. 9; Jas. i. 2, 12 sqq.; 1 Pet. i. 6, iv. 12–14. (Still we must be careful not to take τὸ πονηρόν to denote the evil which *we do*, for in all cases wherein πον. has the double sense it means the evil *we suffer*, see the above texts.) Against the rendering which would take τοῦ πον. as the genitive of the masculine, it is enough to say that there is no reason nor pretext in the context for making this possible rendering necessary. The thought which suggests this rendering is foreign to the character of the prayer, and we see the inappropriateness of it, as Stier remarks, by putting ἀπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου for ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ. We cannot see why the broad and deep meaning of the πονηρόν above given should not suffice. See also under ῥύεσθαι.

(II.) In a moral sense = *bad, evil*, answering somewhat to the German *unnütz, useless*, what is *good for nothing*. It is therefore in Greek, in the first place, the opposite of χρηστός, as applied to persons who diligently follow their calling, and thus support themselves, e.g. of a clever housewife, good parents, good citizens. Πονηρός is the concrete

embodiment of a *κακός*; and while *κακός* denotes the nature or character, *πονηρός* refers to the behaviour, cf. Eur. *Hes.* 596, *ὁ πονηρός οὐδὲν ἄλλο πλὴν κακός*. Akin to this root-meaning is that view of *πονηρός* which takes it, in a moral sense, to signify *evil*, inasmuch as evil bears a **forbidding character**, and is **repulsive or disagreeable**. (This at least may be the general point in which the moral and physical *πον.* meet.) Otherwise in Plat. *Soph.* 228 D, see *πονηρία*. As to the scope of the conception, comp. e.g. Xen. *Mem.* ii. 6. 19, 20, *οὔτε γὰρ τοὺς πονηροὺς ὁρῶ φίλους ἀλλήλοις δυναμένους εἶναι πῶς γὰρ ἂν ἡ ἀχάριστοι ἢ ἀμελεῖς ἢ πλεονέκται ἢ ἄπιστοι ἢ ἀκρατεῖς ἄνθρωποι δύναιντο φίλοι γενέσθαι; οἱ μὲν οὖν πονηροὶ πάντως ἔμοιγε δοκοῦσιν ἀλλήλοις ἐχθροὶ μᾶλλον ἢ φίλοι πεφυκέναι. Ἀλλὰ μὴν . . . οὐδ' ἂν τοῖς χρηστοῖς οἱ πονηροὶ ποτε συναρμόσειαν εἰς φιλίαν πῶς γὰρ οἱ τὰ πονηρὰ ποιοῦντες τοῖς τὰ τοιαῦτα μισοῦσι φίλοι γένοιεντ' ἂν; εἰ δὲ δὴ καὶ οἱ ἀρετὴν ἀσχοῦντες κ.τ.λ.*

In the LXX. it most frequently translates the Hebrew *נר*; indeed, it may be taken as the literal rendering of that word, so sporadic or rare is the use of *κακός*, *ἄδικος*, and others; see *κακός*. But the Hebrew *נר* signifies (likewise, in the first instance, physically or outwardly) what is *unpleasant, disagreeable, or offensive* (Fuerst, *Hebr. Wörterb.*), or *hostile* (Gesenius), and we find it oftener than *נר*, which, according to its root-meaning, may answer to *ἄδικος*.

In the N. T. we find it joined with *ἄνθρωπος*, Matt. xii. 35, 2 Thess. iii. 2, 2 Tim. iii. 13, cf. the characteristic description, Mark vii. 21–23; *ἔργα*, 1 John iii. 12, as against *δίκαιος*; 2 John 11; John iii. 19, vii. 7; Col. i. 21, cf. Luke iii. 19; *ῥαδιούργημα*, Acts xviii. 14; *ἀνὴρ*, xvii. 5; *γενεά*, Matt. xii. 39, 45, xvi. 4, Luke xi. 29; *εἶδος*, 1 Thess. v. 22; *καύχησις*, Jas. iv. 16; *καρδία πον. ἀπιστίας*, Heb. iii. 12; *συνείδησις*, x. 22; *δοῦλος*, Matt. xviii. 32, xxv. 26, Luke xix. 22. *Πονηροί, οἱ πονηροί*, Matt. v. 45, *ἐπὶ πονηροὺς καὶ ἀγαθοὺς*; xxii. 10, xiii. 49, vii. 11; Luke vi. 35, xi. 13. *ὁ πον.* = *he who is wicked*, 1 Cor. v. 13, from Deut. xvii. 7. On the other hand, *ὁ πονηρός* is a name for the devil, Matt. xiii. 19, Eph. vi. 16, *τὰ βέλη τοῦ πον.*; 1 John ii. 13, 14, *νεκικήκατε τὸν πον.*; v. 18, *ὁ πον. οὐχ ἄπτεται αὐτοῦ*; iii. 12, *Καὶν ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ ἦν*, cf. ver. 10, *τὰ τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ . . . τοῦ διαβόλου*. It is doubtful whether, in Matt. xiii. 38, *τὰ τέκνα τοῦ πονηροῦ* is = *τοῦ διαβόλου*, or is to be taken as the gen. neuter, corresponding with *τὰ τ. τῆς βασιλείας*. Cf. *τὸ πονηρόν, moral evil, wrong*, Matt. v. 37, Rom. xii. 9, and 1 John v. 19, *ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐσμὲν καὶ ὁ κόσμος ὅλος ἐν τῷ πονηρῷ κείται*, where, adopting the masculine rendering, we should have expected *ἐκ τοῦ πον. ἐστίν*, in keeping with St. John's diction, for in this the simplest form of antithesis prevails.—Cf. the O. T. *נר*, *τὸ πον.*, *τὰ πον.*, e.g. Deut. iv. 25, ix. 18; Ps. li. 6; Isa. lxv. 12, lxvi. 4; Num. xxxii. 13, etc.—Further, *πνεύματα πονηρὰ* denote *evil spirits*, so called on account of their *evil influence*, Matt. xii. 45, *τὸ ἀκάθαρτον πνεῦμα . . . παραλαμβάνει μεθ' ἑαυτοῦ ἑπτὰ ἕτερα πνεύματα πονηρότερα ἑαυτοῦ*; Luke vii. 21, viii. 2, xi. 26; Acts xix. 12, 13, 15, 16. Elsewhere mostly *ἀκάθαρτον*, which see.

Πονηρία, ἡ, (I.) physically, badness of nature; e.g. καρπῶν, ὀφθαλμῶν, cf. Jer. xxiv. 8.—(II.) Morally, worthlessness, wickedness, joined with κακία, 1 Cor. v. 8, to complete the antithesis, as against εὐκρινεία καὶ ἀλήθεια. Cf. Rom. i. 29, πεπληρωμένους πάσῃ ἀδικίᾳ, πονηρίᾳ, πλεονεξίᾳ, κακίᾳ. First, it means, as in 1 Cor. v. 8, Acts iii. 26, ἐν τῷ ἀποστρέφειν ἕκαστον ἀπὸ τῶν πονηριῶν ὑμῶν, Eph. vi. 12, τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας, badness, moral wickedness in general, as shown in conduct, in contrast with ἀρετή, Plat. Theaet. 176 B, Soph. 228 D, τὸ κακὸν πονηρία καλούμενον ὑπὸ τῶν πολλῶν νόσος τῆς ψυχῆς σαφέστατα ὄν.—On the contrary, in Mark vii. 22, μοιχείαι, πλεονεξίαι, πονηρίαι, δόλος . . . ὀφθαλμὸς πονηρός, Rom. i. 29 (see above), it seems that it must be specially rendered like the German *boshaft* (malicious), maliciousness, cf. Matt. xxii. 18, γνοὺς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὴν πονηρίαν αὐτῶν, εἶπεν· Τί με πειράζετε (in the story of the tribute money); Luke xi. 39, γέμει ἀρπαγῆς καὶ πονηρίας. Compare Ex. xxxii. 12, μετὰ πονηρίας ἐξήγαγεν αὐτοὺς ἀποκτεῖναι κ.τ.λ.; Ps. xxviii. 4, κατὰ τὴν πονηρίαν τῶν ἐπιτηδευμάτων αὐτῶν.

Πρέσβυς, vos, ὁ, old; in the singular used in this meaning only in the nom., acc., and vocat. (otherwise = ambassador). More commonly the comparative **Πρεσβύτερος**, (I.) elder, Luke xv. 25, ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ὁ πρεσβύτερος (John viii. 9); 1 Pet. v. 5, νεώτεροι ὑποτάγητε πρεσβυτέροις; 1 Tim. v. 1, 2; Acts ii. 17.—(II.) οἱ πρεσβύτεροι = ancestors, predecessors, Heb. xi. 2, ἐν ταύτῃ γὰρ ἐμαρτυρήθησαν οἱ πρεσβ.; Matt. xv. 2, ἡ παράδοσις τῶν πρεσβυτέρων; Mark vii. 3, 5, synonymously with ἀρχαῖοι, Matt. v. 21, 27, 33; cf. Ecclus. xlv. 1, πατέρες; it is hardly to be found in this sense in profane Greek.—(III.) It is a name of dignity, of an official position, cf. the office of the πρέσβυς in the Spartan constitution; the γερονσία, the *senatus*, the elders of the Egyptians, Gen. l. 7, of the Moabites and Midianites, Num. xxii. 7; Heb. זְקֵנִים, primarily connected with and depending upon the natural dignity of age. We find such elders in Israel, as the representatives of the people, whose decisions held good for the whole people, Ex. iii. 16, 18, iv. 29, cf. ver. 31, xix. 7, cf. ver. 8; they were, apparently, the foremost of the tribes and families, according to the right of the first-born, cf. 1 Kings viii. 1, 3. From among them Moses, at God's command, chose a college of seventy men, who should "bear with him the burden of the people," Num. xi. 16, and who, therefore, were no longer the representatives of the people, cf. Deut. xxvii. 1 with Ex. xix. 7; Josh. viii. 10. Herewith is connected, though not perhaps in historical continuity, the institution of the Sanhedrim, side by side with which the institute of the elders revived throughout Israel, Susannah 5; Judith x. 7; 1 Macc. xii. 6, 35; Luke vii. 3, cf. Matt. xxvi. 59, οἱ δὲ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι καὶ τὸ συνέδριον ὅλον (Lachm. and Tisch. expunge κ. οἱ πρ.); Luke xxii. 66, συνήχθη τὸ πρεσβυτέριον τοῦ λαοῦ ἀρχιερεῖς τε καὶ γραμματεῖς, καὶ ἀνήγαγον αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ συνέδριον ἐαυτῶν. While there were elders in every city, they could not *eo ipso* have been regarded as members of the Sanhedrim, but were, perhaps, men chosen from among them, or, like the γραμματεῖς, occasional assistants. In the

N. T. they are mentioned together with the ἀρχιερεῖς and γραμματεῖς, Matt. xvi. 21, xxvi. 3, xxvii. 41; Mark viii. 31, xi. 27, xiv. 43, 53, xv. 1; Luke ix. 22, xx. 1; Acts vi. 12, cf. Matt. xxi. 23, xxvi. 47, 57, xxvii. 1, 3, 12, xxviii. 12; Luke xxii. 52; Acts iv. 5, 8, 23, xxiii. 14, xxiv. 1, xxv. 15. Cf. Winer, *Realwörterb.*, art. "Aelteste, Synedrium, Synagoge;" and the same articles in Herzog's *Realencycl.*; Keil, *bibl. Archäol.* § 143.

Akin to this institution, at least at first, the name πρεσβύτεροι was used to designate the προεστῶτες (1 Tim. v. 17) within the Christian churches, who were appointed (καθιστάναι, Tit. i. 5; χειροτονεῖν, Acts xiv. 23 = *to elect*) everywhere (κατ' ἐκκλησίαν, Acts xiv. 23; κατὰ πόλιν, Tit. i. 5). The first notice of them in Acts xi. 30, where the disciples at Antioch send their contributions for their brethren in Judaea to the presbyters, and, indeed, to the presbyters in Jerusalem (xii. 25), would lead us to suppose that we have the beginnings of the presbytery in Acts vi., in the appointment of the seven so-called deacons, who were to act as assistants to the apostles, see διάκονος; cf. 1 Pet. v. 1, πρεσβυτέρους τοὺς ἐν ὑμῖν παρακαλῶ ὁ συμπρεσβύτερος, and the fellowship between the apostles and elders indicated in Acts xv. 2, 6, xvi. 4, cf. xv. 4, 22, ἀπ. καὶ πρ. καὶ ἡ ἐκκλ.; ver. 26, καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί. In the absence of the apostles they entered upon their work, Acts xx. 17, 28-30; and the deacons in like manner, though with a narrower sphere of work, were appointed to their side, just as they had been to the apostles. As to the range of their work, hints of it are given in Acts xv., xx. 28 sqq.; 1 Tim. v. 17; Jas. v. 14; 1 Pet. v. 1. See ἐπίσκοπος. Besides the passages quoted, we have the word also in Acts xxi. 18.—In 2 John 1 and 3 John 1, St. John calls himself simply ὁ πρεσβύτερος, whether on account of his age (cf. Philem. 9) or his office (1 Pet. v. 1) is doubtful. Priority of office usually implies that of age also.

In the Apocalypse there appear twenty-four elders with the four ζῶα around God's throne, Rev. iv. 4, 10, v. 5, 6, 8, 11, 14, vii. 11, 13, xi. 16, xiv. 3, xix. 4, representatives of Israel and the nations, or of the O. and N. T. churches (?), cf. Isa. xxiv. 23.

Πρεσβυτέριον, τό, the college of the elders, and, indeed, of the Jewish people, Luke xxii. 66; Acts xxii. 5; also of the Christian community, 1 Tim. iv. 14; the office of a presbyter, Susannah 50.

P

ῥαντίζω, in classical Greek ῥαίνω = *to besprinkle*. The word in the LXX. is also more rare than ῥαίνω and its compounds, and answers to נָחַץ, Lev. vi. 20; נָחַץ, Lev. viii. 11, which in Ex. xix. 21, Lev. iv. 17, v. 9, viii. 30, xiv. 16, 27, xvi. 14, 15, 19, Num. xix. 4 = ῥαίνω; Lev. iv. 6, viii. 30 = προσραίνω; Lev. xiv. 7, 51, Num. xix. 18, xix. 21, viii. 7 = περιῥραίνω; Lev. vi. 20 = ἐπιῥαντίζω. Aorist, ἐράντισα instead of ἐῤῥάντισα, compare Winer, § 13, 1a. Like ῥῆνι, it denotes the ritualistic act of sprinkling blood or water; of the ashes of the red heifer, Num. xix. The latter word is used when

all the blood is sprinkled, the former when part of it was to be poured on the altar (hence the LXX. usually render רָוַי by προσχέειν, Lev. i. 5, 11, iii. 2, 8, 13, vii. 2, 14, *et al.*). But *sprinkling* was the form of transfer of the blood of the sacrifice in order to secure its atoning efficacy, the form of purifying connected with expiation, and it is therefore followed by the words καθαρίζειν, ἀφαγνίζειν, ἀγιάζειν, ἐξιλάσκεσθαι, Lev. viii. 11, 30, xiv. 7, 27, xvi. 14, 15, cf. vv. 16, 19; Num. viii. 7, xix. 19. It has not been sufficiently considered that the sprinkling of blood was performed as a rule only upon the holy place or upon the altar, and in order to its purification,—see καθαρίζειν (II.),—and only in special cases was followed by a sprinkling upon the persons or the people generally,—a fact of the greatest significance as indicating the import of the O. T. sacrifices—μὴ δυνάμεναι κατὰ συνείδησιν τελειῶσαι τὸν λατρεύοντα (Heb. ix. 9). A sprinkling of persons took place only upon the ratifying of the covenant, Ex. xxiv. 8; upon the consecration of the family of Aaron to the priesthood, Ex. xxix. 21; in cleansing from leprosy and pollution from a dead body, Lev. xiv.; Num. xix. The two latter cases are akin as leprosy and death, and the two former manifestly in like manner harmonize. In the two former, we have to do with the first establishing of a covenant between God and His people, and accordingly we have the application of the atoning blood on both sides by the mediator. In the two latter, we have the removal of fellowship with that which is of the nature of judgment against sin. But it is in keeping with the character of a provisional expiation that an operation (the sprinkling) took place only on God's side; on man's side once only at the outset, and never afterwards save when leprosy and contact with death (as anticipations of judgment) had actually annulled the covenant relation. Thus at least, in my opinion, we are to regard the matter so as to grasp the truth that the **N. T. sprinkling with the blood of Christ** (Heb. xii. 24, αἷμα ῥαντισμοῦ) can properly be connected only with Ex. xxiv. and Num. xix., and is to be understood of sprinkling on both sides, Heb. ix. 19, 21, 13, x. 22, though no mention is made of a sprinkling corresponding with that of the holy place or the altar, as was done in the regular O. T. ritual (but see Heb. ix. 12). This ritual institution certainly demands a more thorough investigation. The above hints must here suffice, though they leave many questions untouched; compare, for example, Heb. ix. 9 with ver. 13.

ῥαντισμός, ὁ, besprinkling, only in biblical and patristic Greek. LXX. Num. xix. 9, 13, 20, 21, ὕδωρ ῥαντισμοῦ = מֵי נִדָּחִים, *water for impurity*; xxxi. 23 = τὸ ὕδωρ τοῦ ἀγνισμοῦ, to which, in the N. T., the blood of Christ corresponds as αἷμα ῥαντισμοῦ, Heb. xii. 24, cf. Heb. ix. 13, 14, 1 Pet. i. 1, εἰς ῥαντισμὸν αἵματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,—denoting the application of the expiation made by Christ. With this comp. also 1 John v. 6, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἐλθὼν δι' ὕδατος καὶ αἵματος κ.τ.λ., οὐκ ἐν τῷ ὕδατι μόνον κ.τ.λ. (In the O. T. it is the form of that purification which is accomplished by expiation.)

ῥύομαι, rare in Attic prose,—not at all, *e.g.*, in Xenophon, Plato, Thucydides, nor in Aristotle. As to the aorist ἐρύσάμην, aorist passive ἐρύσθην instead of ἐῤῥῶ, see

Winer, § 13, 1a = to draw or snatch out to oneself, to rescue, to save, to preserve; synonymous with σώζειν, only that this latter word more definitely conveys the idea of preservation or restoration. Syncopated from *φέρυομαι*, *φρύομαι*, and hence originally equivalent to ἐρύω, ἐρύομαι, to draw, to tear. "The meanings should perhaps be arranged in accordance with the cognate Sanscrit root *vri*, (I.) to roll, i.e. to trail, to pull, to draw; (II.) to wrap up with anything, to encompass, to wind round, to cover (comp. volo, volumen, volva), i.e. to protect, to screen, to ward off, to save," Schenkl. Always, according to the context, it signifies both to rescue from and to preserve in presence of a danger, to save and (not or) to preserve, because the single complete representation expressed by the word necessarily includes both; saving is at the same time preserving, and preserving saving, but, according to circumstances, now one and now the other element will be prominent. We cannot even affirm that, in certain combinations, the one or the other meaning is to be preferred. Without statement of the situation, with the accusative of the person, ῥύεσθαι τινα, as when it is said ῥ. τινά τινος, ἐκ τινός, ἀπό τινος, both meanings are always expressed. Thus ῥύεσθαι τινα = to save, Herod. iv. 187, ἣν δὲ καίουσιν τὰ παῖδια σπασμός ἐπιγένηται, ἐξέρχεται σφί ἄκος· τράγου οὖρον σπείσαντες ῥύονται σφέας; again, = to shield, to defend, Herod. vi. 7, ἔδοξε πεζὸν μὲν στρατὸν μὴ συλλέγειν ἀντίξουν Πέρσῃσι, ἀλλὰ τὰ τείχεα ῥύεσθαι αὐτοὺς Μιλησίου. The difference is only whether the danger is already present or still impending—whether it is real or merely possible; it is virtually there, only in a different manner, and the subject in question is rescued from it. Kamphausen, *Gebet des Herrn*, on Matt. vi. 13, would distinguish between ῥ. ἀπό and ῥ. ἐκ,—the former as = to preserve from, the latter as = to save from or rescue out of. The import only of the prepositions seemingly tells for this: ἀπό, to rescue away from anything, ἐκ, out of; but usage tells against it. For the combinations are both found with both meanings, and the context alone must decide which representation prevails. Cf. Herod. v. 49. 2, ῥύσασθε Ἰωνας ἐκ δουλοσύνης = to save from out of servitude; Lucian, *Asin.* 33, οὗτος ἐρρύσατό με ἐκ τοῦ θανάτου δεινὰ ἐπ' ἐμοὶ βουλευσάμενος· "μηδαμῶς," ἔφη, ἀποσφάξης ὄνον καὶ ἀλεῖν καὶ ἀχθοφορεῖν δυνάμενον, to shield, to preserve from death. It is joined with ἀπό very seldom indeed in profane Greek; only Soph. *Oed. R.* 1352 is cited, ὅστις μ' ἀπό τε φόνου ἔρρυτο κἀνέσωσεν, and even in this place the combination with the synonymous ἀνασώζειν suggests the meaning to save rather than to shield. In biblical Greek, ῥύεσθαι ἀπό occurs oftener, though not quite so frequently as ῥ. ἐκ, and both combinations occur in both senses. We cannot so much as say that the meaning to shield is the more prevailing one for ῥύεσθαι ἀπό. ῥύεσθαι answers in the LXX. to the Hebrew לָצַד, צָרַח in the Hiphil, לָצַח in the Hiphil, צָרַח, צָרַח in Piel, and other words; mostly to לָצַח in Hiphil. In most cases it is combined with ἐκ, comp. Gen. xlviii. 16, ὁ ἄγγελος ὁ ῥυόμενός με ἐκ πάντων τῶν κακῶν (לָצַח); Ex. xiv. 30, ἐκ χειρὸς τῶν Αἰγ. (= צָרַח). In like manner, Judg. viii. 34 and other places = to save from. In the same sense ἀπό, even interchangeably with ἐκ, comp. 2 Sam. xix. 9, ἐρρύσατο ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐχθρῶν ἡμῶν καὶ αὐτὸς ἐξείλετο ἡμᾶς ἐκ χειρὸς ἀλλοφύλων; Ps. xviii. 49, ὁ ῥύστης μου ἐξ ἐχθρῶν

ὀργίλων . . . ἀπὸ ἀνδρὸς ἀδίκου ῥύσῃ με, where 2 Sam. xxii. 49, ἐξ ἀνδρὸς ἀδικημάτων ῥύσῃ με (= 𐤀𐤆𐤁). In Ps. xvii. 13, ῥύσῃ τὴν ψυχὴν μου ἀπὸ ἀσεβοῦς (= 𐤀𐤁𐤅𐤁), it is clearly = to save from, comp. ver. 14. In like manner Ps. xxxix. 9, ἀπὸ πασῶν τῶν ἀνομιῶν μου ῥύσαι με (𐤀𐤁); Ezek. xxxvii. 23, ῥύσομαι αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ πασῶν τῶν ἀνομιῶν ὧν ἡμάρτοσαν ἐν αὐταῖς, καὶ καθαριῶ αὐτούς (𐤀𐤁). On the other hand, comp. Wisd. x. 13, ἡ σοφία ἐξ ἁμαρτίας ἐρρύσατο αὐτόν = to preserve or shield from, with reference to Gen. xxxviii. 7–9. With Prov. xi. 4, οὐκ ὠφελήσει ὑπάρχοντα ἐν ἡμέρᾳ θυμοῦ καὶ δικαιοσύνη ῥύσεται ἀπὸ θανάτου, comp. Tob. iv. 10, ἐλεημοσύνη ἐκ θανάτου ῥύεται, xii. 9, where in both places, notwithstanding the different prepositions, the same thought is expressed. 3 Esdr. viii. 60, ἐρρύσατο ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τῆς εἰσόδου ἀπὸ παντὸς ἐχθροῦ, is quite correctly rendered in the Zürich version, *He saved us out of all hostile attacks*; 1 Macc. xii. 15, ἐρρύσθημεν ἀπὸ τῶν ἐχθρῶν ἡμῶν; 3 Macc. vi. 10, ῥυσάμενος ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ ἐχθρῶν χειρός; Ps. cxx. 2. Ps. xviii. 30, ἐν σοὶ ῥυσθήσομαι ἀπὸ πειρατηρίου, belongs also to this class. On the other hand = to shield, to preserve, in Ps. cxl. 1, ἐξελοῦ με κύριε ἐξ ἀνθρ. πονηροῦ, ἀπὸ ἀνδρὸς ἀδίκου ῥύσαι με, where the word answers to the Hebrew 𐤀𐤁. In like manner Job xxxiii. 17, τὸ δὲ σῶμα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ πτώματος ἐρρύσατο (𐤀𐤁𐤅𐤁); Prov. ii. 12, ἵνα ῥύσῃται με ἀπὸ ὁδοῦ κακῆς, καὶ ἀπὸ ἀνδρὸς λαλοῦντος μηδὲν πιστόν. The relation stands thus: ῥύεσθαι ἐκ is more frequent than ῥύεσθαι ἀπό, and signifies “to preserve from” more rarely than this; but ῥύεσθαι ἀπό nevertheless signifies “to save out of” more frequently than “to preserve from.” This is important for the exposition of Matt. vi. 13, ῥύσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ, inasmuch as it is not here *eo ipso* certain that the meaning is, *preserve us from the evil*, which would be simply the positive statement of the preceding petition. The question is, in what situation is the person praying,—is he standing face to face with threatening danger, or is he already in the midst of it? The conception embraces both; and ῥύεσθαι, answering thereto, includes both,—deliverance out of present and from still future evil, from all that this conception includes; see πονηρός,—and thus alone is it in keeping with, and adequate to, the character of the prayer.

In the N. T. we find (I.) ῥύεσθαί τινα, Matt. xxvii. 43; 2 Pet. ii. 7. — (II.) ἐκ, Rom. vii. 24; 2 Cor. i. 10; 2 Tim. iii. 11, iv. 17; 2 Pet. ii. 9, comp. Luke i. 74, aorist passive. — Col. i. 13, 1 Thess. i. 10, synonymously with λυτροῦν, ἀπολυτροῦν, σώζειν in the gospel sense, comp. Luke i. 74; Rom. xi. 26. — (III.) ἀπό, Matt. vi. 13; 2 Tim. iv. 18. — Rom. xv. 31, 1 Thess. i. 10, 2 Thess. iii. 2, according to the connection = to preserve, because the reference is to the future. — (IV.) Absolutely, Rom. xi. 26, ἥξει ἐκ Σιῶν ὁ ῥυόμενος = 𐤀𐤁; the article is used generically.

Σ

Σάρξ, κός, ἡ, (I.) flesh. Plural, σαρκὰς φαγεῖν, Jas. v. 3; Rev. xvii. 16, xix. 18, 21, Gen. xli. 2, 3, 4, xlvi. 18, 19, and often, as in Homer, who but once, *Od.* xix. 450, uses the singular to designate a piece of flesh. Σὰρξ καὶ ὄσπεα, as the substance of the

body, Luke xxiv. 39, πνεῦμα σάρκα καὶ ὅσπερ οὐκ ἔχει; Eph. v. 30, μέλη ἐσμέν τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὀστέων αὐτοῦ, cf. Gen. ii. 23. Next, (II.) corporeity according to its material side, which, as an organic whole, is called σῶμα. So 1 Cor. xv. 39, οὐ πάντα σὰρξ ἡ αὐτὴ σὰρξ, ἀλλὰ ἄλλη μὲν ἀνθρώπων, ἄλλη δὲ σὰρξ κτηνῶν κ.τ.λ., comp. vv. 38, 40, σῶμα; 1 Cor. vi. 16, ὁ κολλώμενος τῇ πόρῃ ἐν σῶμά ἐστιν, ἔσονται γὰρ οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν; Eph. v. 31, comp. ver. 28; Matt. xix. 5, 6; Mark x. 8. Generally the corporeal part of man, so called from the substance of it, Acts ii. 26, ἐτι δὲ καὶ ἡ σὰρξ μου κατασκηνώσει ἐπ' ἐλπίδι; ver. 31, οὔτε ἡ σὰρξ αὐτοῦ εἶδεν διαφθοράν; Rom. xiii. 14, τῆς σαρκὸς πρόνοιαν μὴ ποιήσθε εἰς ἐπιθυμίας; 2 Cor. iv. 11, ἐν τῇ θνητῇ σαρκὶ ἡμῶν; vii. 5, οὐδεμίαν ἔσχηκεν ἄνεσιν ἡ σὰρξ ἡμῶν, ἀλλ' ἐν παντὶ θλιβόμενοι; x. 3, ἐν σαρκὶ περιπατεῖν; Gal. ii. 20; Phil. i. 22, ζῆν ἐν σαρκί; i. 24, ἐπιμένειν ἐν τῇ σαρκί; 1 Pet. iv. 2, τὸν ἐπίλοιπον ἐν σαρκὶ βιώσαι χρόνον; Col. ii. 1, τὸν πρόσωπόν μου ἐν σαρκί; ver. 5, τῇ σαρκὶ ἄπειμι, ἀλλὰ τῷ πνεύματι σὺν ὑμῖν εἰμί (cf. 1 Cor. v. 3, σῶμα); Eph. v. 29. Compare the designation of the whole man by ψυχή and σάρξ, e.g. Ps. lxxiii. 2, lxxxiv. 3. In like manner is σάρξ to be understood in Rom. ii. 28, ἡ ἐν τῷ φανερῷ ἐν σαρκὶ περιτομή, as against ver. 29, περιτομή καρδίας ἐν πνεύματι οὐ γράμματι; Eph. ii. 11, τὰ ἔθνη ἐν σαρκὶ οἱ λεγόμενοι ἀκροβυστία ὑπὸ τῆς λεγομένης περιτομῆς ἐν σαρκὶ χειροποιήτου; Col. ii. 13, ἀκροβυστία τῆς σαρκὸς; Gal. vi. 13, ἵνα ἐν τῇ ὑμετέρᾳ σαρκὶ καυχῶνται. In these passages, however, the choice of σάρξ instead of σῶμα seems to indicate an intentional accuracy with reference to what is peculiar to the σάρξ, cf. Gal. vi. 13 with ver. 12, Rom. iv. 1–10, 11, or to its contrast with πνεῦμα. For strictly it holds true (III.) of σάρξ that it mediates and brings about man's connection with nature, cf. Gen. ii. 23, 24; 1 Cor. vi. 16. Accordingly τὰ τέκνα τῆς σαρκὸς, Rom. viii. 9, as against τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, cf. iv. 19. — Gal. iv. 23, ὁ μὲν ἐκ τῆς παιδείας κατὰ σάρκα γεγέννηται; ver. 29, ὁ κατὰ σάρκα γεννηθείς, as against ὁ κατὰ πνεῦμα, where κατὰ σάρκα is equivalent to, according to the conditions of human nature. John iii. 6, τὸ γεγεννημένον ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς (hence σάρξ as the object of lust, Jude 7; 2 Pet. ii. 10, 18, cf. Ecclus. xxiii. 16). Σάρξ is also used to denote kinship, Rom. xi. 14, εἴ πως παραζηλώσω μου τὴν σάρκα; ix. 3, ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου τῶν συγγενῶν μου κατὰ σάρκα, cf. ix. 5, ἐξ ὧν ὁ Χριστὸς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα; i. 3, ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυὶδ κατὰ σάρκα; 1 Cor. x. 18, βλέπετε τὸν Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ σάρκα. In the O. T. Isa. lviii. 7, cf. Judg. ix. 2; 2 Sam. v. 1, xix. 13; Gen. ii. 23. So also mankind as a whole are designated πάντα σάρξ, Matt. xxiv. 22; Mark xiii. 20; Luke iii. 6; John xvii. 2; Acts ii. 17; 1 Pet. i. 24; Rom. iii. 20; 1 Cor. i. 29; Gal. ii. 16. Cf. 𐤀𐤓𐤁𐤁, Isa. xl. 5, Job xxxiv. 15, Isa. lxvi. 16, Jer. xxv. 31, and other places, because the distinctive features of σάρξ are dwelt upon; on the one hand man's frailty, weakness, and need of help; on the other, the contrast which exists between humanity and God, or God's testimony; cf. Deut. v. 26 (Isa. xxxiii. 14), 2 Chron. xxxii. 8, Ps. lxxviii. 39, Isa. xl. 5–7, Ps. lvi. 5, Jer. xvii. 5; and upon its contrast with spirit, and especially the Spirit of God, Gen. vi. 3, 17. Its contrast with the human πνεῦμα, as it appears in 2 Cor. vii. 5, οὐδεμίαν

ἔσχηκεν ἄνεσιν ἡ σὰρξ ἡμῶν, comp. ii. 13, οὐκ ἔσχηκα ἄνεσιν τῷ πνεύματί μου, and other places, is not to be classed here, but under (II.). Compare there ψυχή . . . σάρξ.

As σάρξ is the outward form of human nature,—the medium of that nature,—the word further serves (IV.) to denote **human nature in and according to its corporeal manifestation**, 1 John iv. 2, Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθώς; 2 John 7, ἐρχόμενος ἐν σαρκί; 1 Tim. iii. 16, ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί; Col. i. 22, ὑμᾶς ἀποκατήλλαξεν ἐν τῷ σώματι τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ, with which cf. Heb. x. 20, ἐνεκαίνισεν ἡμῖν ὁδὸν . . . διὰ τοῦ καταπετάσματος τοῦτ' ἔστιν τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ. Comp. Heb. xii. 9, οἱ τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν πατέρες, opposed to τῷ πατρὶ τῶν πνευμάτων. — John i. 14, ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο, σάρξ is called that which the Logos became, that wherein it manifested itself (ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθώς, see under αἷμα, 1 John iv. 6). Comp. Rom. i. 3, ix. 5. In like manner σάρξ denotes human nature in its bodily manifestation in 2 Cor. xi. 18, κατὰ σάρκα καυχᾶσθαι; Gal. vi. 13, ἐν τῇ ὑμετέρᾳ σαρκὶ καυχ.; Phil. iii. 3, 4, πεποιθέναι σαρκί, ἐν σαρκί, cf. ver. 5; Rom. iv. 1, τί ἐροῦμεν Ἀβραάμ εὐρηκέναι κατὰ σάρκα, cf. vv. 10, 11; Col. ii. 13, νεκροὶ ἐν τῇ ἀκροβυστίᾳ τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν; Jude 8, σάρκα μιαίνουσιν; 1 Cor. i. 26, σοφοὶ κατὰ σάρκα, parallel with ver. 27, τοῦ κόσμου, cf. vv. 20, 21, 25. — In this application of the word we must have regard to what is further to be affirmed concerning σάρξ, and especially to what determines the Pauline use of the word, namely, (V.) that **all that is peculiar to human nature in its corporeal embodiment** is said to belong to it, cf. 1 Cor. iii. 4, ἄνθρωποι, parallel with ver. 3, σαρκικοὶ ἐστε καὶ κατ' ἄνθρωπον περιπατεῖτε; Rom. vi. 19, ἀνθρώπινον λέγω διὰ τὴν ἀσθένειαν τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν, as conversely, the peculiarities or idiosyncrasies of the σάρξ in turn affect the nature of the man. Hence its contrast with the *καينὴ κτίσις*, 2 Cor. v. 16, 17, κατὰ σάρκα, ver. 16 (comp. John viii. 15), may be taken in an objective or subjective sense, cf. John i. 13, iii. 6, so that in the one case σάρξ is parallel to ὁ ἔξω ἄνθρωπος, cf. 2 Cor. iv. 16, 11, Col. i. 24, and in the other parallel to ὁ πάλαιος ἄνθρωπος, Rom. vi. 6, viii. 3 sqq. Human nature, as every one receives it through the σάρξ, manifests itself in the σάρξ, and is determined by it and called after it, and thus it comes to stand in contrast with πνεῦμα, the divine nature (cf. 2 Pet. i. 4; Rom. viii. 3 sqq.; Eph. iii. 16), in a metaphysical and moral sense, Rom. viii. 3, οἱ μὴ κατὰ σάρκα περιπατοῦντες ἀλλὰ κατὰ πνεῦμα; Gal. iii. 3, ἐναρξάμενοι πνεύματι νῦν σαρκὶ ἐπιτελείσθε; v. 17, ἡ σὰρξ ἐπιθυμεῖ κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα κατὰ τῆς σαρκὸς; Matt. xxvi. 41, τὸ μὲν πνεῦμα πρόθυμον, ἡ δὲ σὰρξ ἀσθενής; Mark xiv. 38; 1 Cor. v. 5, εἰς ὄλεθρον τῆς σαρκὸς, ἵνα τὸ πνεῦμα σωθῇ; 1 Pet. iv. 6; Gal. vi. 8, ὁ σπείρων εἰς τὴν σάρκα ἐαυτοῦ, ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς θερίσει φθοράν· ὁ δὲ σπείρων εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα, ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος θερίσει ζωὴν αἰώνιον (cf. John xvii. 2). Cf. Rom. i. 3; 1 Tim. iii. 16; 1 Pet. iii. 18; Rom. ii. 28, viii. 4–9, 12, 13; 2 Cor. vii. 1, μολυσμός σαρκὸς καὶ πνεύματος, *pollution which comes upon human nature in its bodily manifestation*, and which at the same time injures the divine life-principle in the Christian, cf. 1 Cor. v. 5; Gal. v. 16, 17, 19, iii. 3, ἐναρξάμενοι πνεύματι νῦν

σαρκὶ ἐπιτελείσθε, cf. v. 17, vi. 12 sqq. Cf. also for this contrast the O. T. texts above cited.

Thus *σάρξ* comes at length, in distinct and presupposed antithesis to *πνεῦμα*, to signify (VI.) the sinful condition of human nature, in and according to its bodily manifestation, cf. 2 Cor. x. 2, 3, ἐν σαρκὶ γὰρ περιπατοῦντες οὐ κατὰ σάρκα στρατευόμεθα, and in such a manner that this same *σάρξ*, by means of which human nature exhibits itself, and its possession by the individual is brought about, mediates or effectuates also that sinful condition; accordingly *σάρξ ἁμαρτίας*, the *σάρξ* determined by sin, Rom. viii. 3; cf. the expressions in 1 Cor. vii. 28, θλίψιν τῇ σαρκὶ ἔξουσιν; 2 Cor. vii. 5, οὐδεμίαν ἔσχηκεν ἄνεσιν ἢ σὰρξ ἡμῶν; xii. 7, ἐδόθη μοι σκόλοψ τῇ σαρκί, with Rom. xiii. 14, τῆς σαρκὸς πρόνοιαν μὴ ποιήσθε εἰς ἐπιθυμίας; Col. ii. 23, ἐν ἀφειδίᾳ σώματος . . . πρὸς πλησμονὴν τῆς σαρκός.—Gal. v. 13, εἰς ἀφορμὴν τῇ σαρκί; 1 Pet. iv. 1, Χριστοῦ παθόντος σαρκὶ . . . ὁ παθὼν ἐν σαρκὶ πέπνυται ἁμαρτίας. The bodily organism is accordingly defined as *σῶμα τῆς σαρκός*, Col. ii. 11, cf. i. 22, and κατὰ σάρκα ζῆν stands parallel with πράξεις τοῦ σώματος, Rom. viii. 12, 13, cf. vii. 5, ὅτε γὰρ ἤμεν ἐν τῇ σαρκί, τὰ παθήματα τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἐνεργεῖτο ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν ἡμῶν, where τὰ μέλη, as in vii. 23, βλέπω νόμον ἐν τοῖς μέλεσίν μου,—ὁ νόμος τῆς ἁμαρτίας ὁ ὢν ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν,—are not to be understood merely as τὰ μέλη τοῦ σώματος, but, according to the context, as τὰ μέλη τοῦ σώματος τῆς σαρκός, because from Rom. vii. 5 compared with ver. 20 the instruments of the bodily organism are ruled by the ἁμαρτία οἰκουσα ἐν ἐμοί, ver. 20; τοῦτ' ἔστιν τῇ σαρκί μου, ver. 18, cf. Rom. vi. 13; from which it is clear that the *σάρξ* is not in itself the principle of sin, but has been taken possession of by the principle of sin; see also what follows. The expressions φρόνημα τῆς σαρκός, Rom. viii. 6, 7, cf. ver. 5, τὰ τῆς σαρκὸς φρονεῖν, and ἐπιθυμία τῆς σαρκός, Gal. v. 16, 24, cf. ver. 17, Eph. ii. 2, 3, 2 Pet. ii. 18 (cf. ver. 10), 1 John ii. 16; θελήματα τῆς σαρκός, Eph. ii. 3; νοῦς τῆς σαρκός, Col. ii. 18, may likewise be explained by the fact that *σάρξ* denotes sinfully-conditioned human nature, and that this *σάρξ*, as it is the means whereby human nature is possessed, has at the same time a power determining the person; cf. Rom. viii. 5, οἱ κατὰ σάρκα ὄντες, with ver. 8, οἱ ἐν σαρκὶ ὄντες; vii. 18, ἐν ἐμοὶ τοῦτ' ἔστιν ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου. Hofmann, *Schriftbew.* i. 559, "The nature of man is that of a corporeal essence, but of a corporeal essence which is to be personal, so that the ungodly impulse of the inborn nature shows itself in the ungodly bearing of the *ego*, receiving it as its nature." See under *σῶμα* the import of *corporeity* as the condition of human nature. For this very reason it is possible to distinguish *σάρξ* and *νοῦς*, as in Rom. vii. 25, ἄρα οὖν αὐτὸς ἐγὼ τῷ μὲν νοὶ δουλεύω νόμῳ θεοῦ, τῇ δὲ σαρκὶ νόμῳ ἁμαρτίας, and again to designate *νοῦς*, like *σῶμα*, as *νοῦς τῆς σαρκός*, according to the relation of the person to his nature; cf. Eph. ii. 3, ποιοῦντες τὰ θελήματα τῆς σαρκὸς καὶ τῶν διανοιών, in explanation of ἀναστρέφεσθαι ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις τῆς σαρκός.—As *σάρξ* is contrasted with *πνεῦμα*, so also with *συνειδήσεις* (see *πνεῦμα, συνειδήσεις*, cf. Rom. i. 9; 2 Tim. i. 3). In 1 Pet. iii. 21 and Heb. ix. 13, ix. 10, *σαρκὸς καθαρότης* and *δικαιώματα σαρκός* indicate that

the operations and ordinances of the O. T. had as their immediate object and their limit the corporeal manifestation of human nature, because they could not penetrate effectively into the inner life of man. This only was effected, that the σάρξ should not hinder the fellowship and communion in the O. T. economy with its promises and hopes; cf. Rom. viii. 3, 7, 14, and the following passage from the *Apol. C. A.* 254, which is in keeping with this meaning of σάρξ, "*Dicebantur in lege quaedam propitiatoria sacrificia propter significationem seu similitudinem, non quod mererentur remissionem peccatorum coram Deo, sed quia mererentur remissionem peccatorum secundum justitiam legis, ne illi, pro quibus fiebant, excluderentur ab ista politia.*" As to σάρξ in connection with αἷμα, Matt. xvi. 17; John vi. 51 sqq.; 1 Cor. xv. 50; Gal. i. 16; Eph. vi. 12; Heb. ii. 14,—see αἷμα.

Σαρκικός, σάρκινος,—the reading is doubtful in Rom. vii. 14; 1 Cor. iii. 1, 3; 2 Cor. i. 12; Heb. vii. 16. σαρκικός is undisputed in Rom. xv. 27; 1 Cor. ix. 11; 2 Cor. x. 4; 1 Pet. ii. 11; it is certain in 1 Cor. iii. 3; 2 Cor. i. 12. σάρκινος in 2 Cor. iii. 3.

Σαρκικός, equivalent to κατὰ σάρκα, distinctive of the flesh, what attaches to the σάρξ as corporeity; Rom. xv. 27, εἰ γὰρ τοῖς πνευματικοῖς αὐτῶν ἐκοινώνησαν τὰ ἔθνη, ὀφείλουσιν καὶ ἐν τοῖς σαρκικοῖς λειτουργῆσαι αὐτοῖς; 1 Cor. ix. 11, εἰ ἡμεῖς ὑμῖν τὰ πνευματικά ἐσπέσαμεν, μέγα εἰ ἡμεῖς ὑμῶν τὰ σαρκικά θερίσωμεν. Cf. σάρξ as determined by human nature in its bodily manifestation; see under σάρξ in Deut. v. 26, etc., 2 Cor. x. 4, τὰ ὄπλα τῆς στρατείας ἡμῶν οὐ σαρκικά ἀλλὰ δυνατὰ τῷ θεῷ, cf. Jer. xvii. 5, and elsewhere. Belonging to σάρξ as to sinful human nature, 1 Pet. ii. 11, ἀπέχεσθε τῶν σαρκικῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν, αἵτινες στρατεύονται κατὰ τῆς ψυχῆς. Cf. Polyc. *ad Phil.* 5, πᾶσα ἐπιθυμία κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος στρατεύεται, see ἐπιθυμία; concerning 1 Cor. iii. 3, 2 Cor. i. 12, see below.

Σάρκινος, of flesh, carnal, 2 Cor. iii. 3, οὐκ ἐν πλαξὶν λιθίναις, ἀλλ' ἐν πλαξὶν καρδίας σαρκίναίς. In all places, except 1 Cor. iii. 3, where Lachm. and Tisch. read σαρκικοί, Codd. D F G σάρκινοι, σάρκινος is preferred to σαρκικός in modern recensions (Griesb., Lachm., Tisch.). Σαρκικός is unknown in non-biblical Greek (excepting in Aristot. *h. a.* x. 2, ὅταν δὲ σαρκιώτερα ᾖ τὴν χροάν τὰ σημεῖα), and this may explain the insertion of σάρκινος in the text. But as σαρκικός is undisputed in the above-named places, we must suppose that the grosser σάρκινος may have been supplanted by the more abstract σαρκικός. So Rom. vii. 14, ἐγὼ δὲ σάρκινός εἰμι πεπραμένος ὑπὸ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, in antithesis with ὁ νόμος πνευματικός ἐστιν, where σάρκινος gives a very good sense; cf. ver. 18, οὐκ οἰκεῖ ἐν ἐμοὶ τοῦτ' ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου ἀγαθόν; see Ps. lxxviii. 39. The difference is like that between σὰρξ εἰμί and κατὰ σάρκα εἰμί (Rom. viii. 5). So also 1 Cor. iii. 1, οὐκ ἠδυνήθην λαλῆσαι ὑμῖν ὥς πνευματικοῖς ἀλλ' ὥς σαρκίνοις, where the grosser term is chosen, while in ver. 3 (except in Codd. D F G) σαρκικοί appears, and in ver. 4 simply ἄνθρωποι, because the fact that the Corinthians were

σαρκικοί and ἄνθρωποι justified the apostle in the use of the epithet σάρκινος, for they manifested only their sinful human nature, and not that the Spirit of God was dwelling in them, cf. ver. 16, οὐκ οἶδατε ὅτι . . . τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν. In 2 Cor. i. 12 the reading σαρκίνη is badly attested (F G), and ἐν σοφίᾳ σαρκικῇ corresponds with σοφὸς κατὰ σάρκα, 1 Cor. i. 26. On the contrary, in Heb. vii. 16 the reading δὲ οὐ κατὰ νόμον ἐντολῆς σαρκίνης γέγονεν, instead of σαρκικῆς, is adopted by Griesb., Lachm., Tisch., where the prescription of the law is called ἐντολὴ σαρκίνη, because it attaches the priesthood to natural descent.

Σέβω, from the root σεβ, cf. the Latin *severus*, Greek *σεμνός*. The idea lying at its root is that of *reverential fear*, profound respect (Curtius, Schenkl), chiefly applied to the bearing of men towards the gods; = to honour them reverentially, with holy awe. The active only in the Tragic poets, the middle in Homer and the Attics, in the present imperfect and aor. pass. ἐσέφθην. The fut. σεβήσομαι, Diog. L. vii. 120; ἐσεψάμην, Phot. xix. 7; Hesych., σέβεσθαι αἰδεῖσθαι, ἐντρέπεσθαι, προσκυνεῖν, αἰσχύνεσθαι (as to this last meaning, see below). Xen. *Mem.* iv. 4. 19, ἐγὼ μὲν θεοὺς οἶμαι τοὺς νόμους τούτους (sc. ἀγράφους) τοῖς ἀνθρώποις θεῖναι καὶ γὰρ παρὰ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις πρῶτον νομίζεται θεοὺς σέβειν; *Id. Ag.* xi. 1, τὰ ἱερὰ καὶ ἐν τοῖς πολεμίοις ἐσέβετο. Next, it is used generally of any religious or pious relationship, Xen. *Cyrop.* viii. 8. 1, οἱ ἀρχόμενοι Κῦρον ὡς πατέρα ἐσέβοντο; *Hell.* vii. 3. 12, ὡς ἄνδρα ἀγαθὸν κομισάμενοι ἔθαψάν τε ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ καὶ ὡς ἀρχηγέτην τῆς πόλεως σέβονται. — It appears transitively and intransitively; (I.) transitively, to honour, to reverence, to fear, of man's bearing to the gods, and towards whatever is ὅσιον (see ἀσεβής, etc.). Plat. *Phaedr.* 251 A, ὡς θεὸν σέβεται; *Legg.* xvii. 177 D, ὁ φύσει καὶ μὴ πλαστῶς σέβων τὴν δίκην. Thus we find it in the LXX. = שָׁבַע, Josh. iv. 14, ὅπως γινώσκιν πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς ὅτι ἡ δύναμις τοῦ κυρίου ἰσχυρά ἐστίν, καὶ ἵνα ὑμεῖς σέβησθε κύριον τὸν θεὸν ἡμῶν ἐν παντὶ ἔργῳ; xxii. 25; Job i. 9; Jonah i. 9, τὸν κύριον θεὸν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐγὼ σέβομαι. Cf. Isa. xxix. 13, as parallel with τιμᾶν; Wisd. xv. 6, 18, of the heathen *cultus*; 2 Macc. i. 3. Elsewhere שָׁבַע is generally = φοβεῖσθαι. In the N. T. Matt. xv. 9; Mark vii. 7, from Isa. xxix. 13; Acts xviii. 13, παρὰ τὸν νόμον ἀναπείθει οὗτος τοὺς ἀνθρώπους σέβεσθαι τὸν θεόν; xix. 27, of the heathen *cultus*; xvi. 14 and xviii. 7, of the *fear of God* in those who were not Jews, cf. x. 2, Κορινθίους εὐσεβῆς καὶ φοβούμενος τὸν θεόν. — (II.) Intransitively, Hesych. = αἰσχύνεσθαι, to fear or dread what is wrong. It seems to denote the religious character of moral reverence, so that it is not strictly intransitive, but only without object = God-fearing, to be God-fearing as to doing something. To this view the N. T. use of the absolute σέβεσθαι leads, σέβεσθαι being = to be God-fearing, used of proselytes, οἱ σεβόμενοι, Acts xiii. 43, 50, xvii. 4, 17, τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις καὶ τοῖς σεβομένοις, cf. the equally absolute οἱ φοβούμενοι, 2 Chron. v. 6. That it occurs in profane Greek only of *fear of wrong*, and not of the conscientious practice of right, is accounted for if we consider the nature of the fear of God entertained. Cf. also the positive εὐσεβής, which becomes

positive only in virtue of the compound; Plat. *Tim.* 69 D, σεβόμενοι μαινείν τὸ θεῖον.

Σεβάζομαι = σέβομαι, sometimes in Homer and in later Greek. In the N. T. Rom. i. 25.

Σέβασμα, τό, only in later Greek for σέβας = the object of holy respectful reverence, Acts xvii. 23; 2 Thess. ii. 4, ὁ ὑπεραιρόμενος ἐπὶ πάντα λεγόμενον θεὸν ἢ σέβασμα, with which comp. Dan. xi. 36, 37; Jude 8; 2 Pet. ii. 10. Also = σέβασις, just as σέβας signifies reverence; Clem. Alex. *Strom.* vii. 829, πατὴρ σεβάσματι καὶ συγῇ σεβαστός.

Ἄσεβής, ἐς, godless, without fear and reverence of God; not = *irreligious*, but positively, *he who practises the opposite of what the fear of God demands*; derived from the absolute (intrans.) σέβεσθαι, it is the religious name for immoral and impious behaviour. Pausan. iv. 8. 1, θεῶν ἀσεβής = *he who sins against the gods*, cf. ἀσεβεῖν; Xen. *Anab.* ii. 5. 20, τρόπος πρὸς θεῶν ἀσεβῆς πρὸς ἀνθρώπων αἰσχρός; *Cyrop.* viii. 8. 27, φημι γὰρ Πέρσας . . . καὶ ἀσεβεστέρους περὶ θεοὺς καὶ ἀνοσιωτέρους περὶ συγγενεῖς καὶ ἀδικωτέρους περὶ τοὺς ἄλλους; viii. 7. 22, μήποτε ἀσεβὲς μηδὲν μηδὲ ἀνόσιον μήτε ποιήσητε μήτε βουλεύσητε; LXX. = אַפְסִי, אַפְסִי, Job viii. 13, xv. 34, xxvii. 8; Prov. xi. 9; Isa. xxxiii. 14; יִפְסִי, Ezek. xx. 38. Most frequently = אַפְסִי, Gen. xviii. 23, 25, and often, see אֲדִיקוֹס. Cf. אַפְסִי אַפְסִי, Job xxxiv. 8, xxxvi. 12 = אַפְסִי אַפְסִי, ἀσεβεῖς. Often as a noun in the Apocrypha, *Wisd.* iii. 10, iv. 16, xix. 1, *Ecclus.* xii. 6, and often, opposed to δίκαιος, Rom. iv. 5, v. 6; Ex. xxiii. 7; synonymous with ἀμαρτωλός, Rom. v. 6, 8; joined therewith, 1 Tim. i. 9, 1 Pet. iv. 18, Jude 15. Elsewhere, 2 Pet. ii. 5, iii. 7; Jude 4, οἱ ἀσεβεῖς τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν χάριτα μετατιθέντες εἰς ἀσέλγειαν καὶ τὸν μόνον δεσπότην καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἀρνούμενοι. As to its comparative rareness in biblical Greek, see ἀσεβεῖν.

Ἀσέβεια, ἡ, godlessness, synonymous with ἀδικία. Xen. *Cyrop.* viii. 8. 7, διὰ τὴν ἐκείνων περὶ μὲν θεοὺς ἀσέβειαν, περὶ δὲ ἀνθρώπους ἀδικίαν; *Apol.* 24, πολλὴν ἑαυτοῖς συνειδέναι ἀσέβειαν καὶ ἀδικίαν. It is the religious designation and estimate of impious and immoral conduct, Rom. i. 18, ἐπὶ πᾶσαν ἀσέβειαν καὶ ἀδικίαν ἀνθρώπων τῶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐν ἀδικίᾳ κατεχόντων. In the LXX. = אַפְסִי, Ps. xxxii. 6, Ezek. xxxiii. 9; אַפְסִי, Prov. iv. 17, *Eccles.* viii. 8, Hos. x. 4; אַפְסִי, Deut. ix. 4, xxv. 3, Prov. xi. 5. It is worthy of note that, besides ἀδικία, it is the only word for אַפְסִי, see ἀμαρτάνειν. In the N. T. besides Rom. i. 18, in 2 Tim. ii. 16, ἐπὶ πλεῖον γὰρ προκόψουσιν ἀσεβείας; Tit. ii. 12, ἵνα ἀρνησάμενοι τὴν ἀσέβειαν καὶ τὰς κοσμικὰς ἐπιθυμίας σωφρόνως καὶ δικαίως καὶ εὐσεβῶς ζήσωμεν; Jude 15, τὰ ἔργα ἀσεβείας. The plural, Rom. xi. 26, Jude 18, answering to the Hebrew אַפְסִי.

Ἀσεβέω, to act impiously, to sin against anything which we should account sacred, πρὸς, περί τινα, τι; e.g. πρὸς τὰ θεῖα, περὶ ξένους, εἰς μυστήρια (Xen.) εἰς, 2 Macc. iv. 38.

Rarely with the accusative in the same sense. Oftener without object = to trespass, to commit any offence. In the LXX. it but rarely occurs — $\Psi\psi$, Isa. lix. 13; Jer. ii. 8, 29, iii. 13; Zeph. iii. 11; $\Sigma\sigma\eta$, Prov. viii. 36. Also = $\Psi\psi$. Still more rarely in the N. T. Generally the negative and strong terms $\alpha\delta\iota\kappa\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$, $\alpha\sigma\epsilon\beta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$, $\alpha\nu\acute{o}\sigma\iota\alpha \pi\omicron\iota\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$, which occur often in profane Greek, are met with in Scripture far more rarely than the positive $\alpha\mu\alpha\rho\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\iota\nu$ (to which $\alpha\sigma\epsilon\beta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ is parallel in Wisd. xiv. 9; Ecclus. xv. 20), which in profane Greek was far less morally, and still less religiously estimated. Herein is manifest, on the one hand, the far deeper religious view of Scripture, which estimates "failings," or sins of omission, so seriously, and, on the other, its deeper humanity, which does not resort to the strongest terms to designate whatever is actually sinful. The words in Wisd. xiv. 9, $\epsilon\nu \iota\sigma\phi \mu\iota\sigma\eta\tau\acute{\alpha} \theta\epsilon\omega \kappa\alpha\iota \acute{o} \alpha\sigma\epsilon\beta\acute{\omega}\nu \kappa\alpha\iota \acute{\eta} \alpha\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\beta\epsilon\iota\alpha \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$, represent accordingly an unscriptural view. In the N. T. it occurs only in a very strong reference, 2 Pet. ii. 6, $\upsilon\pi\omicron\delta\epsilon\iota\gamma\mu\alpha \mu\epsilon\lambda\lambda\acute{o}\nu\tau\omega\nu \alpha\sigma\epsilon\beta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ (of Sodom and Gomorrah); Jude 15.—Isa. lix. 13, $\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\beta\acute{\eta}\sigma\alpha\mu\epsilon\nu \kappa\alpha\iota \epsilon\psi\epsilon\nu\sigma\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha \kappa\alpha\iota \alpha\pi\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\eta\mu\epsilon\nu \delta\pi\iota\sigma\theta\epsilon\nu \tau\omicron\upsilon \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon \acute{\eta}\mu\omega\nu$, comp. ver. 12.

$E \upsilon \sigma \epsilon \beta \acute{\eta} \varsigma$, $\epsilon\varsigma$, God-fearing, full of holy and devout reverence; in Plat. *Euthyphr.* 5 C, parallel to and interchangeable with $\delta\sigma\iota\omicron\varsigma$; Lucian, *de calum.* 14, in combination with $\phi\iota\lambda\acute{o}\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$; Xen. *Apol.* 19, $\gamma\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\nu \acute{\epsilon}\xi \epsilon\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\beta\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \alpha\nu\acute{o}\sigma\iota\omicron\nu$; *Mem.* iv. 8. 11, $\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\beta\acute{\eta}\varsigma \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu \omicron\upsilon\tau\omega\varsigma, \acute{\omega}\sigma\tau\epsilon \mu\eta\delta\acute{\epsilon}\nu \acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\upsilon \tau\acute{\eta}\varsigma \tau\acute{\omega}\nu \theta\epsilon\omega\acute{\nu} \gamma\nu\acute{\omega}\mu\eta\varsigma \pi\omicron\iota\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$; therefore of one who is ruled, in what he does and avoids, by reverence and godly fear. With a religious reference only, and not denoting moral behaviour, in *ibid.* iv. 6. 4, $\acute{o} \tau\acute{\alpha} \pi\epsilon\rho\iota \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \nu\acute{o}\mu\iota\mu\alpha \epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\acute{\omega}\varsigma . . . \acute{o} \nu\omicron\mu\acute{\iota}\mu\omega\varsigma \acute{\omega}\varsigma \delta\acute{\epsilon}\iota \tau\iota\mu\acute{\omega}\nu \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\varsigma . . . \epsilon\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\beta\acute{\eta}\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota$. For the strict range of the thought, see $\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\beta\epsilon\iota\alpha$. Cf. also Plat. *Phil.* 39 E, $\delta\acute{\iota}\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\varsigma \alpha\eta\eta\rho \kappa\alpha\iota \epsilon\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\beta\acute{\eta}\varsigma \kappa\alpha\iota \acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\theta\acute{o}\varsigma \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omega\varsigma$. Unknown as it is in older Greek, the word and its derivatives occur chiefly in the Tragedians, from Xenophon downwards, in prose. Seldom in the LXX.; only so far as is known in Isa. xxiv. 16, xxvi. 7 = P^{73} , xxxii. 6 = B^{73} . Often in Ecclus. xi. 15, 20, xii. 2, 4, xxxix. 27, xliii. 32, etc. In the N. T. opposed to $\alpha\delta\iota\kappa\omicron\varsigma$, 2 Pet. ii. 9. Elsewhere only in Acts x. 2, 7, of Cornelius, etc., $\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\beta\acute{\eta}\varsigma \kappa\alpha\iota \phi\omicron\beta\omicron\upsilon\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma \tau\omicron\nu \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$; Acts xxii. 12, Rec. text, $\alpha\eta\eta\rho \epsilon\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\beta\acute{\eta}\varsigma \kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha} \tau\omicron\nu \nu\acute{o}\mu\omicron\nu$; Lachm. reads $\epsilon\upsilon\lambda\alpha\beta\acute{\eta}\varsigma$; Tisch., $\alpha\nu. \kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha} \tau. \nu$. The adv. $\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\beta\acute{\omega}\varsigma$, 2 Tim. iii. 12, $\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\beta. \xi\eta\nu$; Tit. ii. 12, $\sigma\omega\phi\rho\acute{o}\nu\omega\varsigma \kappa\alpha\iota \delta\iota\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\omega\varsigma \kappa\alpha\iota \epsilon\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\beta\acute{\omega}\varsigma \xi$, as usually also $\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\beta\epsilon\iota\alpha$, $\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\beta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$, occur in a few places in the Acts and 2 Peter, and elsewhere only in the pastoral Epistles, where the language in other respects likewise closely approaches the manner of genuine Greek, see $\kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{o}\varsigma$. Accordingly, $\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\beta\acute{\eta}\varsigma$, $\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\beta\epsilon\iota\alpha$, must be taken in their widest sense, as above, Xen. *Mem.* iv. 8. 11.

$E \upsilon \sigma \acute{\epsilon} \beta \epsilon \iota \alpha$, $\acute{\eta}$, piety, the good and careful cherishing of the fear of God ($\epsilon\upsilon$). Luther, godliness; Nägelsbach, *nachhom. Theol.* iii. 1. 2, "the recognition of dependence upon the gods, the confession of human dependence, the tribute of homage, which man renders in the certainty that he needs their favour,—all this is $\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\beta\epsilon\iota\alpha$, manifest in conduct and conversation, in sacrifice and prayer." Again, ii. 23, " $\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\beta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ and $\sigma\omega\phi\rho\omicron\nu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ (the recognition of and keeping within the limits of one's own nature) so harmonize that the $\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\beta\acute{\omega}\nu$

is a *σώφρων* *περὶ τοὺς θεοὺς* (Xen. *Mem.* iv. 3. 2), the *σώφρων* is a *εὐσεβῶν* *περὶ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους*, as linguistic usage itself variously shows us, when *εὐσεβεῖν* is used of the equitable bearing of man to man; cf. Lübker, *Soph. Theol.* ii. 54." And as *σωφρονεῖν* and *εὐσεβεῖν* together denote the sum of man's moral and religious conduct, so also do *εὐσέβεια* and *δικαιοσύνη*, the latter = *σωφροσύνη*, Nägelsb. v. 227. Plat. *Deff.* 412 C, *δικαιοσύνη* *περὶ θεοὺς*, cf. Tit. ii. 12, *σωφρόνως καὶ δικαίως καὶ εὐσεβῶς ζῆν*. — In the LXX. seldom, Prov. i. 4, Isa. xi. 2, xxxiii. 6 = *נְהַיִן נִשְׁרָיִן*. Often in 4 Macc.; Wisd. x. 12; Ecclus. xlix. 3; 2 Macc. iii. 1. In Josephus, contrasted with *εἰδωλολατρεία*. In the N. T., besides Acts iii. 12, only in 1 and 2 Tim., Tit., 2 Pet., and in the very wide application as given under *εὐσεβής*; 2 Pet. i. 3, *τὰ πρὸς ζωὴν καὶ εὐσέβειαν*; vv. 6, 7; 1 Tim. ii. 2, iii. 16, *τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον*; iv. 7, *γύμναζε δὲ σεαυτὸν πρὸς εὐσέβειαν*; ver. 8, vi. 3, 5, 6, 11, *δικαιοσύνη, εὐσέβεια, πίστις κ.τ.λ.*; 2 Tim. iii. 5, *μόρφωσις εὐσεβείας*; Tit. i. 1; *ἀλήθεια ἣ κατ' εὐσεβείαν*. It is worthy of remark, that when once it was shown what the *μυστήριον τῆς εὐσεβείας* is as contrasted with heathen views of the expression, the word came unmistakeably to be the distinctive title for the sum of Christian behaviour. The plural, like *ἀσέβειαι, δικαιοσύναι*, etc., in 2 Pet. iii. 11.

Εὐσεβέω, to be pious, to act as in the fear of God, usually *περί, πρὸς τινά*, rarely with the accus., Acts xvii. 23, *ὁ (αἰ. δν) οὖν ἀγνοοῦντες εὐσεβεῖτε*; 1 Tim. v. 4, *τὸν ἴδιον οἶκον εὐσεβεῖν* = *to fulfil one's duty in reference to, etc., in the fear of God*. Not in the LXX.

Σθενόω, unknown in profane Greek. Only in 1 Pet. v. 10 = *to strengthen*. Hesych., *σθενώσει ἐπισχύσει, δυναμώσει*. Pape is in error, though he appeals to Hesych., when he makes it = *σθένω*, which means, intransitively, *to be strong, to have ability, δύνασθαι*. — From *σθένος*, in poetry = *strength, power, might*, in prose only *παντὶ σθένει* with *κατὰ τὸ δυνατόν*. LXX. Job xvi. 15, *τὸ δὲ σθένος μου εἰς γῆν ἔσβησαν* = *ἦν*.

Ἀσθενής, *es*, without strength, powerless. — (I.) In profane Greek almost always only in a physical sense = *weak, powerless, without ability, μικρός τε καὶ αἰσχροὺς καὶ ἀσθενής*, as against *καλός, μέγας, ἰσχυρός*, Xen. *Mem.* ii. 6. 12. So of bodily powers and of particular senses, of the number of an army, of a fortress, etc. Xen. *Cyrop.* viii. 7. 6, *γῆρας ἀσθενέστερον τῆς νεότητος γιγνόμενον*; 2 Cor. x. 10, *αἱ μὲν ἐπιστολαὶ, φησὶν, βαρεῖαι καὶ ἰσχυραί· ἡ δὲ παρουσία τοῦ σώματος ἀσθενής, καὶ ὁ λόγος ἐξουθενημένος*. In 1 Cor. xii. 22, of the members of the body; in 1 Pet. iii. 7, of the wife, *ἀσθενέστερον σκεῦος*. — 1 Cor. i. 25, *τὸ ἀσθενὲς τοῦ θεοῦ ἰσχυρότερον τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐστίν*, — with reference to Christ crucified, ver. 23. — Ver. 27, *τὰ ἀσθενή τοῦ κόσμου ἐξελέξατο ὁ θεός, ἵνα καταισχύνῃ τὰ ἰσχυρά*; 1 Cor. iv. 10. With this compare the synonymous *πένης* = the Hebrew *נָפֶשׁ*, Prov. xxii. 22, xxx. 14. Then = *sick*, Matt. xxv. 39, 43, 44; Luke ix. 2, x. 9; Acts iv. 9, v. 15, 16; 1 Cor. xi. 30. — (II.) Transferred to the mental sphere, Heb. vii. 18, *τὸ τῆς ἐντολῆς ἀσθενὲς καὶ ἀνωφελές*; Gal. iv. 9, *τὰ ἀσθενή καὶ πτώχα*

στοιχεία. Thus very rarely in profane Greek; in Thucyd., Aristotle, combined with λόγος, συλλογισμός; Herod. iv. 95, Ἑλλήνων οὐ τῷ ἀσθενεστάτῳ σοφίστη Πυθαγόρῃ. Sometimes in Josephus. — (III.) It does not occur at all in profane Greek or in the LXX. of moral states. Thus first in 1 Cor. viii. 9, 10, ix. 22, ὁ ἀσθενής, οἱ ἀσθενεῖς, of those who, oppressed with moral doubt, lack the ἐξουσία (viii. 9), by virtue of which the apostle can say, πάντα μοι ἔξεστι, 1 Cor. vi. 12, x. 23. Thus in 1 Thess. v. 14, ἀσθενής stands side by side with ὀλιγόψυχος. Hence 1 Cor. viii. 7, συνειδήσις ἀσθενὴς οὔσα. This use of the word is clearly occasioned both by the opposite ἐξουσία, and as an abbreviation of the fuller ἀσθενεῖν τῇ πίστει, Rom. xiv. 1; comp. ἀσθενεῖν, vv. 2, 21; 1 Cor. viii. 9, 11, 12; ἀσθένημα, Rom. xv. 1. It is used differently in Rom. v. 6, ἔτι γὰρ Χριστὸς, ὄντων ἡμῶν ἀσθενῶν, κατὰ καιρὸν ὑπὲρ ἀσεβῶν ἀπέθανεν. Thus absolutely of moral powerlessness, ἀσθενής, ἀσθένεια, ἀσθενεῖν occur nowhere in the N. T., and there is great difficulty in taking it, with reference to the thoughts which we find in Rom. vii. 18, cf. Matt. xxvi. 41, τὸ μὲν πνεῦμα πρόθυμον, ἡ δὲ σὰρξ ἀσθενής, as synonymous with the following ἀμαρτωλός, ver. 8, so that it would stand (Fritzsche, Hofmann) in antithesis to the capability of loving God as the gift of the Holy Spirit, ver. 5, or would receive its significance from this antithesis; apart from the fact that such capability is not spoken of in ver. 5, see under ἀγάπη. We must therefore take ἀσθενής in antithesis with the state and ability of the believer described in vv. 1–5, and therefore as if in analogy with ἀσθενεῖν or ἀσθενεῖν τῇ πίστει, see above.

Ἀσθένεια, ἡ, (I.) physically, powerlessness, weakness, 1 Cor. xv. 43, σπείρεται ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ, ἐγείρεται ἐν δυνάμει; 2 Cor. xiii. 4; with 1 Cor. ii. 3 comp. 2 Cor. x. 10; Gal. iv. 13. — 2 Cor. xi. 30, xii. 5, 9, 10; Heb. xi. 34. — Then, sickness, Matt. viii. 17; Luke v. 15, viii. 2, xiii. 11, 12; John v. 5, xi. 4; Acts xxviii. 9; 1 Tim. v. 23. — (II.) Transferred to the mental sphere, powerlessness, lack of power and capability (not in profane Greek), Rom. vi. 19, ἀνθρώπινον λέγω διὰ τὴν ἀσθενείαν τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν, comp. Matt. xxvi. 41; 1 Cor. iii. 1; Rom. viii. 26, τὸ πνεῦμα συναντιλαμβάνεται τῇ ἀσθενείᾳ ὑμῶν. It denotes the weakening of the life-power proceeding from the σὰρξ, and again showing itself therein; the weakening of the divine life-principle in all its manifestations metaphysically, morally, and intellectually; comp. Heb. vii. 28, ὁ νόμος γὰρ ἀνθρώπους καθίστησιν ἀρχιερεῖς ἔχοντας ἀσθενείαν, ὁ λόγος δὲ τῆς ὁρκωμοσίας τῆς μετὰ τὸν νόμον υἱὸν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τετελειωμένον; comp. 2 Cor. xiii. 4. It is just herein that the peculiar import of the human ἀσθένεια consists, and its closer though not necessarily causative connection with sin, Heb. iv. 15, οὐ γὰρ ἔχομεν ἀρχιερεᾶ μὴ δυνάμενον συμπάθῃαι ταῖς ἀσθενείαις ἡμῶν, πεπειραμένον δὲ κατὰ πάντα καθ' ὁμοιότητα χωρὶς ἀμαρτίας; comp. v. 2, μετριοπαθεῖν δυνάμενος τοῖς ἀγνοοῦσιν καὶ πλανωμένοις, ἐπεὶ καὶ αὐτὸς περικείται ἀσθενείαν. As ἀσθενεία τῆς σαρκὸς, it is the judicial consequence of sin, and in the issue it is in turn the cause of it, but at the same time it gives to sin a distinctive character; comp. ἀγνοέω, ἄγνοια.

Ἀσθενέω, (I.) to be weak or powerless, 2 Cor. xii. 10, xiii. 4; comp. 2 Cor. x. 10; Gal. iv. 13; 2 Cor. xi. 21, and other places. More frequently = to be sick, Matt. x. 8, xxv. 36, 39; Mark vi. 56; Luke iv. 40, vii. 10, ix. 2; John iv. 46, v. 3, 7, vi. 2, xi. 1, 2, 3, 6; Acts ix. 37, xix. 12, xx. 35; Phil. ii. 26, 27; 2 Tim. iv. 20; Jas. v. 14. — (II.) Transferred to the mental and moral sphere, 2 Cor. xiii. 3, Χριστὸς εἰς ὑμᾶς οὐκ ἀσθενεῖ, ἀλλὰ δυνατεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν; Rom. viii. 3, ὁ νόμος ἡσθένει διὰ τῆς σαρκός. Specially still in Paul's writings of those who are not in full possession of Christian ἐξουσία, through lack of energy in faith, lack of knowledge, etc.; see ἀσθενής. So in Rom. xiv. 2, 21; 1 Cor. viii. 9, 11, 12; 2 Cor. xi. 29; comp. ἀσθενεῖν τῇ πίστει, Rom. iv. 19, xiv. 1. The verb does not occur in the peculiar sense of ἀσθενεία, just as ἀσθενεία does not occur exactly in this sense of ἀσθενεῖν. This latter denotes a quality of the life of faith, the former a quality of human nature. The substantive answering to ἀσθενεῖν in its last-named sense is

Ἀσθένημα, τό, rendered admirably by Luther, *Gebrechlichkeit*, infirmity, Rom. xv. 1, comp. 2 Cor. xi. 29. In profane Greek very seldom = ἀσθενεία, but here, as already remarked, to be distinguished therefrom.

Σκοπέω, used only in the present and imperfect, the other tenses being supplied from σκέπτομαι, which is not used in these tenses; = to look towards an object, to contemplate, to give attention to; literally, to spy out, the word *spy* being, according to Curtius, 153, connected with it *per metathesin*, Luke xi. 35; Rom. xvi. 17; 2 Cor. iv. 18; Gal. vi. 1; Phil. ii. 4, iii. 17. σκοπός, a scout or spy, also goal, aim, end, Phil. iii. 14, κατὰ σκοπὸν διώκω ἐπὶ τὸ βραβεῖον.

Ἐπισκοπέω, to look upon, to observe, to examine how it is concerning anything; *e.g.* Xen. *Hell.* iii. 2. 11, ἐπισκοπῶν δὲ τὰς πόλεις, ἐώρα τὰ μὲν ἀλλὰ καλῶς ἐχούσας; to visit, *e.g.* the sick, to look after them; in a military sense, to review or muster (Xen.); to inspect, *e.g.* τὴν πολιτείαν, Plat. *Rep.* vi. 506 A. Of the superintending care of the gods, Aristoph. *Eq.* 1173, ἐναργῶς ἡ θεὸς σ' ἐπισκοπεῖ = to take care of. In the N. T. Heb. xii. 15, ἐπισκοποῦντες μὴ τις ὑστερῶν ἀπὸ τῆς χάριτος; 1 Pet. v. 2, ποιμάνετε τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν ποίμνιον τοῦ θεοῦ, ἐπισκοποῦντες μὴ ἀναγκαστῶς,—an exhortation to presbyters; Tisch., however, expunges ἐπισκ. here.

Ἐπίσκοπος, ὁ, watcher, overseer, *e.g.* Hom. *Il.* xxii. 255, of the gods, μάρτυροι ἔσσονται καὶ ἐπίσκοποι ἁρμονιάων, they watch over the keeping of treaties, Pape; Plat. *Legg.* iv. 717 D, πᾶσιν ἐπίσκοπος ἐτάχθη Νέμεσις; Plut. *Cam.* 5, θεοὶ χρηστῶν ἐπίσκοποι καὶ πονηρῶν ἔργων. "This was the name given in Athens to the men sent into subdued states to conduct their affairs" (Pape). LXX. = 𐤇𐤓𐤕, 𐤇𐤓𐤕, 𐤇𐤓𐤕, Num. xxxi. 14; 2 Kings xi. 16; Judg. ix. 28; 2 Chron. xxxiv. 12, 17; Num. iv. 16, *et al.*; 1 Macc. i. 51.—Wisdom. i. 6, τῆς καρδίας ἐπίσκοπος ἀληθής = searcher. In the N. T. of the presbyters, Acts xx. 28, προσέχετε τῷ ποιμνίῳ ἐν ᾧ ὑμᾶς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἔθετο ἐπισκόπους,

denoting the watchful care which those holding this office are to exercise; cf. 1 Pet. v. 2. In Phil. i. 1 the ἐπίσκοποι, who elsewhere are called πρεσβύτεροι, are mentioned side by side with the διάκονοι, and so also in 1 Tim. iii. 2 compared with ver. 8; see also Tit. i. 7 as compared with ver. 5. Cf. Clem. Rom. i. *ad Cor.* 42, κατὰ χώρας οὖν καὶ πόλεις οἱ ἀπόστολοι κηρύσσοντες καθίστανον τὰς ἀπαρχὰς αὐτῶν, δοκιμάσαντες τῷ πνεύματι (συνευδοκησάσης τῆς ἐκκλησίας πάσης, c. 44) εἰς ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακόνους τῶν μελλόντων πιστεύειν. Καὶ τοῦτο οὐ καινῶς· ἐκ γὰρ δὴ πολλῶν χρόνων ἐγγέγραπτο περὶ ἐπισκόπων καὶ διακόνων. Οὕτως γὰρ πού λέγει ἡ γραφή· καταστήσω τοὺς ἐπισκόπους αὐτῶν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, καὶ τοὺς διακόνους αὐτῶν ἐν πίστει (Isa. lx. 17). We must therefore say that πρεσβύτερος denotes the dignity of the office, and ἐπίσκοπος its duties; comp. also 1 Pet. v. 1, 2, πρεσβυτέρους παρακαλῶ· ποιμάνετε . . . ἐπισκοποῦντες. — In 1 Pet. ii. 25 Christ is called ποιμὴν καὶ ἐπίσκοπος τῶν ψυχῶν, and in 1 Pet. v. 4, ἀρχιποίμην, in distinction from the presbyters, and therefore in the same sense as ἐπίσκ. is used of them.

Ἐπισκοπή, ἡ, belongs, it would seem, almost exclusively to biblical and patristic Greek. In the classics we find it only in Lucian, *Dial. Deor.* xx. 6 = visitation. The word commonly used in the classics and LXX. is ἐπισκέψις, inspection, examination, visitation. — Often in the LXX. and Apocrypha. LXX. = ܐܬܪܐ, ܡܬܪܐ, ܡܝܬܪܐ. — (I.) Luther renders it *Heimsuchung*, in the twofold sense of inspection or examination, and guardianship or love. For the latter sense, see ἐπισκέπτομαι, Matt. xxv. 36, 43; Luke i. 78, vii. 16; Heb. ii. 6; Jas. i. 27; Luke i. 68, ἐπεσκέψατο καὶ ἐποίησε λύτρωσιν. For the former, see Ex. iii. 16, xiii. 19; Isa. x. 3; Jer. x. 15; Eccles. xviii. 19, xvi. 16; Wisd. iii. 13, xiv. 11, xix. 15. Hardly thus, however, in 1 Pet. ii. 12 (cf. v. 6, if we there read ἐν καιρῷ ἐπισκοπῆς, and not simply ἐν καιρῷ). The ἡμέρα ἐπισκοπῆς in 1 Pet. ii. 12 is perhaps like καιρὸς ἐπισκοπῆς, Wisd. ii. 20, iii. 7, in a good sense, *the time when God brings help, and is propitious*, cf. Gen. i. 24, 25; Job xxxiv. 9, *et al.* So also Luke xix. 44 compared with vii. 16, i. 68. — Then (II.) the office of an ἐπίσκοπος, 1 Tim. iii. 1; Acts i. 20; Ps. cix. 8; Num. iv. 16. — 1 Chron. xxiv. 3, ἐπισκέψις.

Ἀλλοτριεπισκοπος, ὁ, 1 Pet. iv. 15, only in biblical Greek, and only in this place, μὴ γάρ τις ὑμῶν πασχέτω ὡς φονεὺς ἢ κλέπτης ἢ κακοποιὸς ἢ ὡς ἀλλοτριεπισκοπος· εἰ δὲ ὡς Χριστιανός κ.τ.λ. Plato, *Phaedr.* 230 A, οὐ δύναμαί πω κατὰ τὸ Δελφικὸν γράμμα γινῶναι ἐμαντόν· γελοῖον δὲ μοι φαίνεται, τοῦτ' ἔτι ἀγνοοῦντα τὰ ἀλλότρια σκοπεῖν, may specially serve to explain this. Accordingly the interpretation of Oecumenius is right, ὁ τὰ ἀλλότρια περιεργαζόμενος, ἵνα ἀφορμὴν λοιδορίας ἔχῃ. Sins against the eighth commandment are meant. Luther's rendering, therefore, *he who seizes upon an office not his own*, is incorrect.

Στέλλω, στελῶ, ἔστειλα, ἔσταλκα; aorist passive, ἐστάλην. Akin to ἵστημι, it means literally, *to place, to arrange, to equip, to despatch*. In the middle, *to get oneself*

ready for, with following accusative, *e.g.* τὴν πορείαν, Polyb. ix. 24. 4. So 2 Cor. viii. 20, στελλόμενοι τοῦτο μή τις ἡμᾶς μωμήσῃται. It also means to establish, to restrain, to limit; thus in nautical and medical language, *to take in sail*, with or without ἰστία in Homer, *to stanch an issue of blood*, etc. Figuratively, *e.g.* στείλασθαι λόγον, as contrasted with παρρησία φράσαι, Eur. Bacch. 669; cf. Philo, *de spec. Legg.* 772 E, in Loesner, *observ. Philon. ad 2 Thess.* iii. 6, "*recta disciplina inhabitans animo, καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν ὑπομινύσκει τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος, ἀπὸ τῶν ὑψηλῶν καὶ ὑπερόγκων ἀντισπῶσα καὶ στέλλουσα.*" It is used, in the middle, of persons, with the signification to withdraw oneself, Polyb. viii. 22. 4; cf. Mal. ii. 5, ἔδωκα αὐτῷ ἐν φόβῳ φοβεῖσθαι με καὶ ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ ὀνόματός μου στέλλεσθαι αὐτόν. So 2 Thess. iii. 6, στέλλεσθαι ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ παντὸς ἀδελφοῦ ἀτάκτως περιπατοῦντος.

Ἀποστέλλω, (I.) to send away, to send forth upon a certain mission, for thus it is distinct from πέμπειν; *τινὰ εἰς, πρὸς τί, e.g.* Matt. xv. 24, xx. 2; Luke iv. 43, εἰς τοῦτο ἀπέσταλμαι; Heb. i. 14, εἰς διακονίαν, etc. With following infinitive, κηρύσσειν, Mark iii. 14; Luke ix. 2; λαλῆσαι, Luke i. 19. With two accusatives, Acts iii. 26, ἀπέστειλεν αὐτὸν εὐλογοῦντα; vii. 35, τοῦτον ὁ θεὸς ἄρχοντα καὶ λυτρωτὴν ἀπέστειλεν; 1 John iv. 10, ἀπέστειλεν τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἰλασμόν κ.τ.λ.; ver. 14, ὁ πατὴρ ἀπέσταλκεν τὸν υἱὸν σωτῆρα τοῦ κόσμου. Hofmann, in support of his view that Jesus is called the Son of God only in virtue of His being born of man, vainly urges that the simple accusative after ἀποστέλλω also denotes what the person is or becomes by being sent (*Schriftbew.* i. 118). What he states is true, but only when the name of the object spoken of is chosen to correspond with the purposed mission, as *e.g.* in Mark i. 2, ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἀγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου; Luke xiv. 32, πρεσβείαν, as in xix. 14. We can no more say, "God sent Jesus that He should be His Son," than we can render ἀποστέλλειν τοὺς δούλους, Matt. xxi. 34 sqq., δύο μαθητάς, xxi. 1, ἱερεῖς, John i. 19, in this manner. See Mark xii. 6, ἔτι ἕνα εἶχεν υἱὸν ἀγαπητόν· ἀπέστειλεν αὐτόν; Matt. xxi. 37, ὕστερον δὲ ἀπέστειλεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ. That the Sonship of Jesus is anterior to His mission to the world, is still more indisputably indicated when it is said, not only ὁ θεὸς ἀπέστειλεν τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ, or ὃν ἀπέστειλεν ὁ θεός, John iii. 34,—just as John is called the ἀπεσταλμένος παρὰ θεοῦ, i. 6,—but when it is added, *He sent Him*, εἰς τὸν κόσμον, John iii. 17, x. 36; 1 John iv. 9. And this does not simply mean He sent Him to the world after His birth,—as if denoting His outward mission and manifestation, as in John xvii. 18,—it signifies *into* the world, as is clear from John xvi. 28, ἐξῆλθον ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ ἐλήλυθα εἰς τὸν κόσμον· πάλιν ἀφίημι τὸν κόσμον καὶ πορεύομαι πρὸς τὸν πατέρα; comp. especially also the double accusative in 1 John iv. 14, ὁ πατὴρ ἀπέσταλκεν τὸν υἱὸν σωτῆρα τοῦ κόσμου. The expression that Jesus is sent by God, denotes the mission which He has to fulfil, and the authority which backs Him; John iii. 34, ὃν ἀπέστειλεν ὁ θεός, τὰ ῥήματα τοῦ θεοῦ λαλεῖ; v. 36, 38, vi. 29, 57, vii. 29, viii. 42, xi. 42, xvii. 3, 21, 23, 25, xx. 21; Matt. x. 40; Mark ix. 37; Luke iv. 18, 43, ix. 48, x. 16; Acts

iii. 20; and is contrasted with the ἀπ' ἑμαντοῦ ἔρχεσθαι in John viii. 42, v. 43, vii. 28. The importance of the mission is denoted by the fact that it is His Son whom God sends; see, with the texts in John, Matt. xxi. 37, xxiii. 34-36; Gal. iv. 4. Bengel on John xvii. 3, *ratio sub qua Jesus Christus agnoscendus est. Missio praesupponit Filium cum Patre unum.* — (II.) To send away, to dismiss, even to banish, Mark v. 10, etc.; Luke iv. 19, ἀποστέλλαι τεθραυσμένους ἐν ἀφέσει.

Ἀπόστολος, ον, primarily an adjective, *sent forth*; then a substantive, *one sent, apostle, ambassador*; rarely in profane Greek, *e.g.* Herod. i. 21, v. 38; usually πρέσβυς in the plural (see 2 Cor. v. 20; Eph. vi. 20). LXX. = ἡλψ, 1 Kings xiv. 6; John xiii. 16, οὐδὲ ἀπόστολος μείζων τοῦ πέμψαντος αὐτόν. Perhaps it was just the rare occurrence of the word in profane Greek that made it all the more appropriate as the distinctive appellation of "the Twelve" whom Christ chose to be His witnesses; see Luke vi. 13, προσεφώνησεν τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκλεξάμενος ἀπ' αὐτῶν δώδεκα οὓς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασεν; Acts i. 2, ἐντειλάμενος τοῖς ἀποστόλοις διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου οὓς ἐξελέξατο; ver. 8, ἔσεσθέ μου μάρτυρες . . . ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς. It first designates the office as instituted by Christ to witness of Him before the world,—see John xvii. 18;—and it secondly designates the authority which those called to it possess; see ἀποστέλλω, Rom. x. 15. Paul combines both these meanings in Rom. i. 1; 1 Cor. i. 1, ix. 1, 2, xv. 9; 2 Cor. i. 1, xii. 12; Gal. i. 1, and often. Comp. ἀπόστολος ἐθνῶν, Rom. xi. 13, with ἀποστολή τῆς περιτομῆς, Gal. ii. 8; διδάσκαλος ἐθνῶν, 2 Tim. i. 11. It is the distinctive name of the Twelve or Eleven with whom Paul himself was reckoned, as he says in 1 Cor. xv. 7, 9, justifying his being thus counted an apostle by the fact that he had been called to the office by Christ Himself. And yet the name seems from the first to have been applied, in a much wider sense, to all who bore witness of Christ, cf. Acts xiv. 4, 14 with xiii. 2; and even by Paul, 2 Cor. xi. 13; 1 Thess. ii. 6 (but hardly Rom. xvi. 7). But the fact that the looser and more general meaning of the word held its place side by side with its special and distinctive application,—the fact that it is not used exclusively in its special any more than in its general meaning, even by the Apostle of the Gentiles,—tells not for, but against the Irvingite doctrine of the continuity and permanence of the office. — The word is once used of Christ, Heb. iii. 1, κατανοήσατε τὸν ἀπόστολον καὶ ἀρχιερέα τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν, perhaps with reference to Isa. lxi. 1; Luke iv. 18, et. Bengel, ἀπ. *qui Dei causam apud nos agit*; ἀρχ. *qui nostram causam apud Deum agit*. It may be akin to the Rabbin. word ἡלפ, a name given to the priest as the representative of the people (and perhaps of God?). — The word is also used in a very general sense to denote any one sent, τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν, 2 Cor. viii. 23; Phil. ii. 25.

Ἀποστολή, ἡ, a despatching or sending forth, Thucyd., Plutarch; Deut. xxii. 7; also that which is sent, *e.g.* a present, 1 Kings ix. 16; 1 Macc. ii. 18; 2 Macc. iii. 2. Cf. Song iv. 13.—In the N. T., apostleship, Acts i. 25; Rom. i. 5; 1 Cor. ix. 2; Gal. ii. 8.

Στρέφω, στρέφω, second aorist passive ἐστράφην, to twist, to turn, also intransitively to turn oneself, as in Acts vii. 42. Passive, to turn oneself, Acts xiii. 46, στρεφόμεθα εἰς τὰ ἔθνη, and often. In a moral sense, to change, alter, to adopt another course, as in Matt. xviii. 3, ἐὰν μὴ στραφῇτε καὶ γένησθε ὡς τὰ παῖδιά. It does not thus occur either in profane Greek or in the LXX. We cannot regard 1 Sam. x. 6 as a case in point, ἐφαλεῖται ἐπὶ σὲ πνεῦμα κυρίου καὶ προφητεύσεις μετ' αὐτῶν, καὶ στραφήσῃ εἰς ἄνδρα ἄλλον, cf. Rev. xi. 6; Ex. vii. 14.

Ἐπιστρέφω, to turn towards, to turn about to, a positive expression corresponding with the negative ἀποστρέφειν. Usually intransitively, to turn oneself round to.—(I.) Literally, Matt. xii. 44, xxiv. 18; Mark xiii. 16; Luke xvii. 31; Acts ix. 40, xv. 36, xvi. 18; Rev. i. 12. Comp. 1 Kings xix. 6, ἐπιστρέψας ἐκοιμήθη = round again; so also Ps. lxxxv. 7, σὺ ἐπιστρέψας ζωώσεις ἡμᾶς. Absolutely, to return, Luke viii. 55; passive = to return again, Matt. ix. 22; Mark v. 30, viii. 33. Figuratively, Gal. iv. 9, ἐπιστρέφετε πάλιν ἐπὶ τὰ ἀσθενή καὶ πτωχὰ στοιχεῖα; 2 Pet. ii. 21, 22; Matt. x. 13.—(II.) In an ethical sense = to change, to change oneself, sometimes in profane Greek, e.g. Lucian, *conscr. hist.* 5, οἶδα οὐ πολλοὺς αὐτῶν ἐπιστρέφων; Plut., Aristotle, and others. In Scripture, it is generally used to denote the positive turning to God, which implies an abnegation of one's former sinful conduct, or of a tendency of life away from God = to repent, to change for the better. LXX. = נָשׁוּב, Kal and Hiphil, 1 Sam. vii. 3, 1 Kings viii. 33, 2 Chron. xxx. 9, Jer. iv. 1, iii. 12, 14, Isa. ix. 12, parallel with τὸν κύριον ἐκζητεῖν; 2 Chron. xxiv. 19 (not = μετανοεῖν). In the N. T. the active transitive, Luke i. 16, πολλοὺς ἐπιστρέφει ἐπὶ κύριον τὸν θεὸν αὐτῶν; ver. 17, ἐπιστρέφαι καρδίας πατέρων ἐπὶ τέκνα καὶ ἀπειθεῖς ἐν φρονήσει δικαίων; Jas. v. 19, 20, ὁ ἐπιστρέψας ἁμαρτωλὸν ἐκ πλάνης ὁδοῦ αὐτοῦ. Elsewhere intransitive, Matt. xiii. 15; Mark iv. 12; Luke xxii. 32; Acts iii. 19, ix. 35, xi. 21, xiv. 15, xv. 19, xxvi. 18, 20, xxviii. 27; 2 Cor. iii. 16. The passive = to be converted, John xii. 40; 1 Pet. ii. 25, cf. Jer. iii. 12, 14. The negative and positive elements are completely blended in Acts xiv. 15, εὐαγγελιζόμενοι ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ τούτων ματαίων ἐπιστρέφειν ἐπὶ θεὸν ζῶντα; 1 Thess. i. 9; Acts xxvi. 18, ἐπιστρέφαι ἀπὸ σκοτόους εἰς φῶς καὶ τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ σατανᾶ ἐπὶ τὸν θεόν. Very exceptional is its use in Acts xv. 19, ἀπὸ τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐπὶ τὸν θεόν. (Cf. the merely negative ἀποστρέφειν, Acts iii. 26, ἐν τῷ ἀποστρέφειν ἕκαστον ἀπὸ τῶν πονηριῶν ὑμῶν.) The negative element implied in the word is often left out, and only the positive sense retained; e.g. Luke i. 16, cf. ver. 17; Acts ix. 35, ἐπέστρεψαν ἐπὶ τὸν κύριον; xi. 21; 2 Cor. iii. 16, πρὸς κύριον; Acts xxvi. 20, ἐπὶ τὸν θεόν; 1 Pet. ii. 25, ἦτε γὰρ ὡς πρόβατα πλανώμενοι, ἀλλ' ἐπεστράφητε νῦν ἐπὶ τὸν ποιμένα καὶ ἐπίσκοπον τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν. The negative element is rarely alone referred to, as in Jas. v. 19, 20; we more frequently find ἐπιστρέφειν by itself used as = to change or convert oneself, Luke xxii. 32; Matt. xiii. 15; Mark iv. 12; John xii. 40; Acts iii. 19, xxviii. 27. It is joined with μετανοεῖν, Acts iii. 19, xxvi. 20, cf. Luke xvii. 4, ἐὰν . . . ἐπτάκις ἐπιστρέψῃ λέγων

Μετανοῶ, and includes πιστεύειν, Acts xi. 21, πιστεύσας ἐπέστρεψεν ἐπὶ τὸν κύριον, cf. Acts xxvi. 18, Luke xxii. 32, ἐδείθην περὶ σοῦ ἵνα μὴ ῥαπίδῃ ἡ πίστις σου, as in Acts ix. 35 ἐπέστρεψαν implies the more frequent ἐπίστευσαν, *they believed*. As it is a turning from a certain state or conduct, so it signifies a *positive entrance upon a certain state or conduct*, namely, *into* fellowship with and possession of salvation, *out of* a state of remoteness and lack of grace, cf. 1 Pet. ii. 25, ὡς πρόβατα πλανώμενοι κ.τ.λ.; Acts xxvi. 18; 2 Cor. iii. 16; Acts iii. 19, εἰς τὸ ἐξαλειφθῆναι ὑμῶν τὰς ἁμαρτίας; xxvi. 18, τοῦ λαβεῖν αὐτοὺς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ κλήρον ἐν τοῖς ἡγιασμένοις τῇ πίστει τῇ εἰς ἐμέ; Jas. v. 20. Thus it differs from μετανοεῖν, which includes only the behaviour as the *turning of* penitence. Conversion combines both penitence and faith, comp. Acts xx. 21.

Ἐπιστροφή, ἡ, a turning oneself round or to, Ecclus. xl. 7; Ezek. xlvi. 7.—In the N. T. only once = conversion, Acts xv. 3, ἐνδιηγόμενοι τὴν ἐπιστροφὴν τῶν ἐθνῶν. Cf. ver. 19; Ecclus. xlix. 2, xviii. 20, ἐπιστροφὴ πρὸς θεόν.

Σώζω, σώσω, ἐσώθην, σέσωσμαι, from σῶς (σάος), whence the kindred forms σόος (Homer, Herodotus), σῶς (σώιος), Herodotus, Thuc., Xen., Dem., Plut. = *healthy, sound* (Latin, *sanus*; Old High German, *gasunt* ?); hence = *to make sound, to save, to preserve*, e.g. ἐκ πολέμου, ἐκ κινδύνων, ἐκ θανάτου, ἐξ Ἀἴδαο, etc., and without any special limitation, with a reference determined by the context. Of the sick = *to heal, to restore*, especially in the passive = *to be healed, to recover*. Hence = *to keep*, e.g. τὰ ὑπάρχοντα, *to maintain intact what is established* (Thuc.); τοὺς νόμους, *to maintain the laws* (Soph., Eur.), as distinct from φυλάσσειν, *to keep or obey them*. Frequently in profane Greek, in contrast with ἀπολλύναι, ἀποθνήσκειν; cf. Xen. *Cyrop.* iii. 2. 15, σαφῶς ἀπολώλυναι νομίσαντες νῦν ἀναφαινόμεθα σεσωσμένοι; iii. 3. 45, οἱ μὲν νικῶντες σώζονται, οἱ δὲ φεύγοντες ἀποθνήσκουσιν; iii. 3. 51, αἰρετώτερόν ἐστι μαχομένους ἀποθνήσκειν μᾶλλον ἢ φεύγοντες σώζεσθαι; iv. 1. 5, πότερον ἢ ἀρετὴ μᾶλλον ἢ ἡ φυγὴ σώζει τὰς ψυχάς; Aristoph. *An.* 377, ἡ εὐλάβεια σώζει πάντα; Phavor., ῥύεσθαι, φυλάσσειν; see under ῥύομαι. Plat., Dem., Polyb. In the LXX. = נָצַח, חָנַן, and others. See under (II.).

(I.) Generally = *to rescue from danger or from death, etc.*, Matt. viii. 25, σῶσον, ἀπολλύμεθα; xiv. 30, xxvii. 40, 42, 49; Mark iii. 4, ψυχὴν σῶσαι ἢ ἀποκτεῖναι; xv. 30, 31; Luke vi. 9, xxiii. 35, 37, 39; John xii. 27, σῶσόν με ἐκ τῆς ὥρας ταύτης; Acts xxvii. 20, 31; Heb. v. 7. Of the sick = *to help or heal them*, Matt. viii. 25. Often ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέ σε, Matt. ix. 22; Mark v. 34, x. 52; Luke viii. 48, xvii. 19, xviii. 42. Sometimes, as in profane Greek, in the passive = *to be made whole, to recover*, Matt. ix. 21, 22; Mark v. 23, 28, vi. 56; Luke viii. 36, 50; John xi. 12; Acts iv. 9, xiv. 9.

(II.) Particularly, in a sense appertaining to the economy of grace, *to save, to be saved, from death, judgment, etc.*, like the Hebrew נָצַח, Hiphil and Niphal. This word is in the LXX. rendered by σώζειν, ἀνασώζειν, διασώζειν, and also by ῥύεσθαι, ἐξαιρεῖν, ἀμύνεσθαι, while נָצַח is always rendered σωτηρία, σωτήριον, and once also by ἔλεος, Isa. lxi. 10; נָצַח, נִצְחָה, always by σωτηρία (σωτήρ); and נִצְחָה is, with few exceptions (2 Sam. x. 11),

used only to express a *salvation wrought by God*, in contrast with misfortune, poverty, oppression by enemies. See Isa. xxvi. 1; Ps. iii. 3, 9, cxlix. 8; Job xiii. 16; Jonah ii. 10; 2 Chron. xx. 17; Ps. lxii. 2, cf. vv. 3, 7, cxl. 8. Also, and particularly, in the Messianic sense, Hab. iii. 8, cf. ver. 13; Ps. cxviii. 15, 21; Isa. xii. 2, 3, xlix. 8, cf. vv. 9, 10, lii. 7; Ps. xiv. 7, xcvi. 2, 3; Isa. vi. 1, li. 6, 8. Cf. Gen. xlix. 18; Ps. cxix. 166, 123, 174. It is opposed to God's wrath, and implies deliverance from guilt and punishment, and at the same time all positive blessing coming in the place of distress and sorrow; cf. the parallel word *εὐλογία*, Ps. iii. 3, 9, cxxxii. 16, xci. 16; Isa. xii. 2, 3; Ps. xiv. 7; Isa. lix. 17, 20, 9 sqq., lvi. 1, li. 6, 8; Isa. xlv. 13, xlv. 17, *Ἰσραὴλ σώζεται ὑπὸ κυρίου σωτηρίαν αἰώνιον*, cf. Heb. ix. 12, *αἰωνία λύτρωσις*. We also find the frequent expression, *the salvation of God*, and *my salvation* as used by God, Isa. lvi. 1, li. 6, 8; Ex. xiv. 13, xv. 2; Ps. lxvii. 3, l. 23, xci. 16; Gen. xlix. 18. This last-named text, *Lord, I wait for Thy salvation*, is thus paraphrased by the later Targums—"My soul waiteth, not for the salvation of Gideon the son of Joash, for that is but temporal; not for the salvation of Samson, for that is transitory: but for the salvation of the Messiah the son of David, the salvation which Thou hast promised in thy Word to accomplish for Thy people the children of Israel: for this Thy salvation my soul waiteth; for Thy salvation O Lord, is an everlasting salvation" (see Keil *in loc.*). According to the texts we have cited, it is clear that *πῶς* is distinctively a Messianic conception; see especially, Isa. xlix. 6, 8, 9, lii. 7; and we find the O. T. import of the word, as understood literally as well as spiritually, in Luke i. 71 compared with ver. 77. Ver. 71, *σωτηρίαν ἐξ ἐχθρῶν ἡμῶν καὶ ἐκ χειρὸς πάντων τῶν μισούντων ἡμᾶς*; ver. 77, *τοῦ δοῦναι γνώσιν σωτηρίας τῷ λαῷ αὐτοῦ ἐν ἀφέσει ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν*. Cf. Ezek. xxxvi. 29, *σώσω ὑμᾶς ἐκ πασῶν τῶν ἀκαθαρσιῶν ὑμῶν*; Zech. viii. 7, *ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ σώζω τὸν λαόν μου ἀπὸ γῆς ἀνατολῶν καὶ ἀπὸ γῆς δυσμῶν*.

Thus also *σώζειν* with its derivatives is a Messianic conception denoting an operation or work of the Messiah, and it first occurs with the further statement of what the salvation is from, *i.e.* *salvation from the penalty of death*, Jas. v. 20, *σώτει ψυχὴν ἐκ θανάτου*, cf. iv. 12, *εἰς ἐστὶν ὁ νομοθέτης, ὁ δυνάμενος σῶσαι καὶ ἀπολέσαι* (Luke vi. 9); 2 Cor. vii. 10, *ἡ γὰρ κατὰ θεὸν λύπη μετάνοιαν εἰς σωτηρίαν . . . ἐργάζεται· ἡ δὲ τοῦ κόσμου λύπη θάνατον κατεργάζεται*. *Salvation from wrath*, Rom. v. 9, *σωθησόμεθα δι' αὐτοῦ ἀπ' ὀργῆς*, cf. 1 Thess. v. 10; from *ἀπώλεια*, cf. Phil. i. 9, in antithesis with *ἀπόλλυναι*, Matt. xvi. 25; Mark viii. 35; Luke ix. 24, 56; 1 Cor. i. 18; 2 Cor. ii. 15; 2 Thess. ii. 10; Matt. xviii. 11, *σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός*; Luke xix. 10; Jude 5; as opposed to *κρίνειν, κατακρίνειν*, John iii. 17, xii. 47; Mark xvi. 16, *ὁ πιστεύσας . . . σωθήσεται, ὁ δὲ ἀπιστήσας κατακριθήσεται*. Cf. 1 Cor. v. 5, *ἵνα τὸ πνεῦμα σωθῇ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ κυρίου*; iii. 15; 1 Pet. iv. 18. Hence *σ. ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν*, Matt. i. 21, see Luke i. 77; Acts v. 31; Luke vii. 50; Jas. iv. 12. Also positively, corresponding with *εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασ. τ. οὐρ.*, Matt. xix. 25, cf. ver. 24; Mark vi. 24-26; Luke xviii. 25, 26, xiii. 23, 24; 2 Tim. iv. 18, *σώσει εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ*. See Eph. ii. 5, *ὄντας ἡμᾶς νεκροὺς τοῖς*

παραπτώμασιν συνεζωοποίησεν τῷ Χριστῷ, χάριτί ἐστε σεσωσμένοι. Also by itself, and absolutely = to be saved from perdition, condemnation, judgment, Luke xiii. 23, εἰ ὀλίγοι οἱ σωζόμενοι; Acts ii. 47, προσετίθει τοὺς σωζομένους . . . τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ; 1 Cor. i. 18; 2 Cor. ii. 15; Luke xviii. 26, τίς δύναται σωθῆναι; Matt. xix. 25; Mark x. 26; John v. 34, x. 9; Luke vii. 50, ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε, πορεύου εἰς εἰρήνην, cf. ver. 48. So also Matt. x. 22, ὁ δὲ ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος οὗτος σωθήσεται, xxiv. 13, Mark xiii. 13, for the connection forbids our understanding it here as merely *saving of one's life*; Matt. xxiv. 22; Mark xiii. 20; Acts ii. 21, iv. 12, xi. 14, xv. 1, 11, xvi. 30, 31, xxvii. 31; Rom. v. 10, viii. 24, ix. 27, x. 9, 13, xi. 14, 26; 1 Cor. i. 21, vii. 16, ix. 22, x. 33, xv. 2; Eph. ii. 8; 1 Thess. ii. 16; 2 Thess. ii. 10; 1 Tim. i. 15, ii. 4, 15, iv. 16; 2 Tim. i. 9; Tit. iii. 5; Heb. vii. 25; Jas. i. 21, ii. 14; 1 Pet. iii. 21, iv. 18; Rev. xxi. 24. The active occurs with *God* as its subject, 2 Tim. i. 9, iv. 18, Tit. iii. 5; or *Christ*, Matt. i. 21; John xii. 47; 1 Tim. i. 15; Heb. vii. 25. With other subjects, e.g. *πίστις*, Luke vii. 50, Jas. ii. 14; *λόγος*, Jas. i. 21, 1 Cor. i. 21; *βάπτισμα*, 1 Pet. iii. 21. When men are spoken of as the agents, it is only indirectly as by their efforts *helping* thereto; e.g. Rom. xi. 14, εἴ πως . . . σώσω τινὰς ἐξ αὐτῶν; 1 Cor. vii. 16, εἰ τὸν ἄνδρα, τὴν γυναῖκα σώσεις; ix. 22; 1 Tim. iv. 16, σεαυτὸν σώσεις καὶ τοὺς ἀκούοντας; Jas. v. 20, ὁ ἐπιστρέψας ἁμαρτωλὸν ἐκ πλάνης ὁδοῦ αὐτοῦ σώσει ψυχὴν ἐκ θανάτου; Jude 23, οὓς δὲ ἐν φόβῳ σώζετε.—It is clear that this is not analogous to the rare use of the word to denote *moral amelioration*. It rather corresponds with the meaning, *to make or to become happy*, e.g. Plat. *Hipp. min.* 233, ἐν δὲ τούτῳ θαυμάσιον ἔχω ἀγαθόν, ὃ με σώζει; *Theaet.* 176 D, οἱ σωθησόμενοι, *they who wish to be happy*.

Σωτήρ, ὁ, saviour, deliverer, preserver; a frequent attribute of the gods among the Greeks, especially of Jupiter; yet not at all akin to the biblical conception, but rather belonging to the sphere of *πρόνοια*. "*Imprimis pericula passuri vel periculis defuncti Jovi σωτήρι supplicabant,*" Sturz, *Lex. Xen.* Thus the Dioscuri were the σωτήρες of mariners, the Nile was the σωτήρ of the Egyptians, etc. The title *εὐεργέτης* was used synonymously as appropriate to useful men, to heroes, statesmen, etc. — LXX. = *נִשְׁׁ*, Ps. xxiv. 5, xxvii. 1, Isa. xvii. 10, Mic. vii. 7, Hab. iii. 18; *נִשְׁׁ*, Isa. xlv. 15, 21; *נִשְׁׁ*, Ps. lxii. 2, 7, Isa. xii. 2, 1 Sam. xiv. 39, 2 Sam. xxii. 3, as a name of God. In the Apocrypha, Wisd. xvi. 7, Ecclus. li. 1, Baruch iv. 22, Judg. ix. 11, 1 Macc. iv. 30, always of God as the author of all help, of all salvation, and especially of Messianic salvation; see *σώζω*. Cf. Ps. lxxxviii. 2, lxxxix. 2, cxl. 8; Isa. xxxiii. 2; Deut. xxxii. 15; Ps. xxxv. 3. In the N. T., (I.) *a name given to God*, Luke i. 47; 1 Tim. i. 1, ii. 3, iv. 10; Tit. i. 3, ii. 10, iii. 4; Jude 25, *μόνῃ θεῷ σωτήρι ἡμῶν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν δόξα κ.τ.λ.* The use of this name for God so often in the pastoral Epistles is surprising, because it was the common name for Zeus in classical Greek, where, from the habit of dedicating the third cup of wine at feasts to Zeus σωτήρ, various proverbs had arisen, e.g. *τὸ τρίτον τῷ σωτήρι, Διὸς τρίτον σωτήρος χάριν* = *of all good things there are three*. It is with this

word as with others, *e.g.* καλός, εὐσεβής, which have a definite and comprehensive meaning in the sphere of classical Greek; we find that it is adopted without hesitation in the pastoral Epistles to denote Christian ideas. — Elsewhere σωτήρ (II.) is used only of Christ, ὁ σωτήρ τοῦ κόσμου, John iv. 42; 1 John iv. 14. — Acts v. 31, τοῦτον ὁ θεὸς ἀρχηγὸν καὶ σωτήρα ὑψωσεν; Luke ii. 11; Acts xiii. 23; Phil. iii. 20; 2 Tim. i. 10; Tit. i. 4, ii. 13, iii. 6; 2 Pet. i. 1, 11, ii. 20, iii. 2, 18; Eph. v. 23, αὐτός ἐστιν σωτήρ τοῦ σώματος. — Cf. Heb. ii. 10, ὁ ἀρχηγὸς τῆς σωτηρίας; v. 9, αἴτιος σωτηρίας αἰωνίου.

Σωτηρία, ἡ, salvation, preservation; also welfare, prosperity, happiness, *e.g.* ἡ τοῦ κοινοῦ σ., Thuc. ii. 60. 3, just as the Hebrew נַשְׁוּאָה, which combines both meanings; see σώζω. Also = δόξα, Gen. xxvi. 31, xxviii. 21, xlv. 17. In the N. T. (excepting Acts vii. 25, xxvii. 34, Heb. xi. 7, where it is used in the general sense, as = salvation, and Rev. vii. 10, ἡ σωτηρία τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν! xii. 10, xix. 1, where it expresses an ascription of praise, like the Hebrew הַ נַשְׁוּאָה, Ps. cxviii. 25) it is used only in a sense peculiar to the economy of grace, as = salvation, redemption, Luke i. 71, 77; see σώζω. Contrasted with θάνατος, 2 Cor. vii. 10; ἀπώλεια, Phil. i. 28; ὁργή, 1 Thess. v. 9; John iv. 22, ἡ σωτηρία ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐστιν; 2 Tim. ii. 10, σωτηρίας τυγχάνειν τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ; Heb. v. 9, σωτηρία αἰώνιος, cf. Isa. xlv. 17, עֲרֹךְ נַשְׁוּאָה; Luke i. 69, κέρας σωτηρίας; Acts xiii. 26, ὁ λόγος τῆς σωτηρίας ταύτης; Eph. i. 13, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς σωτηρίας ὑμῶν; Acts xvi. 17, ὁδὸς σωτηρίας; 2 Cor. vi. 2, ἡμέρα σωτηρίας, cf. Isa. xlix. 8. It is represented as still future, 2 Thess. ii. 13; 1 Thess. v. 8, ἐλπίδα σωτηρίας; Heb. i. 14, κληρονομεῖν σωτηρίαν; ix. 28, ὁφθήσεται τοῖς αὐτὸν ἀπεκδεχομένοις εἰς σωτηρίαν; 1 Pet. i. 5, φρουρεῖσθαι διὰ πίστεως εἰς σωτηρίαν ἐτοιμῇ ἀποκαλυφθῆναι ἐν καιρῷ ἐσχάτῳ, cf. ver. 9; Rom. xiii. 11, νῦν γὰρ ἐγγύτερον ἡμῶν ἡ σωτηρία, ἣ ὅτε ἐπιστεύσαμεν. This is quite in accordance with the view of Holy Scripture throughout, which, while it represents the blessings of salvation as attainable in this present state, yet describes them as belonging to the future, and as fully unfolded and realized only at the consummation of all things; cf. τῇ ἐλπίδι ἐσώθημεν, Rom. viii. 24. — Elsewhere, Luke xix. 9; Acts iv. 12, xiii. 47; Rom. i. 16, x. 1, 10, 11; 2 Cor. i. 6; Phil. i. 19, ii. 12; 1 Thess. v. 9; 2 Tim. iii. 15; Heb. ii. 3, vi. 9; 1 Pet. i. 10, ii. 2; 2 Pet. iii. 15; Jude 3.

Σωτήριος, ον, saving, bringing salvation; rarely used as an adjective in biblical Greek; see Wisd. i. 14. — Tit. ii. 11, ἐπεφάνη ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ σωτήριος πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις. It occurs frequently in profane Greek, and always elsewhere in Scripture as a neuter substantive, τὸ σωτήριον = ἡ σωτηρία, LXX. = נַשְׁוּאָה, Ps. cxviii. 2, Isa. lvi. 1, lix. 17; = נַשְׁוּאָה, Ps. l. 24, lxxxv. 7, 10; Isa. li. 5. So in the N. T. Luke ii. 30, εἶδον τὸ σωτήριόν σου; iii. 6, τὸ σωτ. τοῦ θεοῦ, as in Acts xxviii. 28. In the same sense, absolutely, in Eph. vi. 17.

Σῶμα, τὸ, the body. "The derivation of σῶμα from σώος, σώως, σώς, is hardly possible, because in Homer, as Aristarchus observes, it signifies only *cadaver*," Curtius,

340. — (I.) In Homer, simply *corpse*, *dead body*, and so often in Attic Greek. In the N. T. Acts ix. 40 ; Matt. xiv. 12, xxvii. 52, 58, 59 ; Mark xv. 43, 45 ; Luke xxiii. 52, 55, xxiv. 3, 23 ; John xix. 31, 38, 40, xx. 12 ; Heb. xiii. 11 ; Jude 9. — (II.) **The body of a living man**, Mark v. 29, ἔγνω τῷ σώματι ὅτι ἵαται ; Matt. xxvi. 12, Mark xiv. 8, 1 Cor. xiii. 3 ; **the entire material organism**, Matt. vi. 22, 23, Luke xi. 34, 36, Rom. xii. 4, ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι μέλη πολλά ; 1 Cor. xii. 12, τὸ σῶμα ἓν ἐστίν, καὶ μέλη ἔχει πολλά κ.τ.λ. ; ver. 14, τὸ σῶμα οὐκ ἐστίν ἐν μέλος, ἀλλὰ πολλά ; vv. 15–20, 22–25,—quickenened by the spirit, Jas. ii. 26, τὸ σῶμα χωρὶς τοῦ πνεύματος νεκρὸν ἐστίν, which, as the inner man, is contrasted with the body as the outward appearance or self-representation, 1 Cor. v. 3, ὡς ἀπὸν τῷ σώματι, παρὼν δὲ τῷ πν. ; 2 Cor. x. 10, ἡ παρουσία τοῦ σώματος. The body is the vessel of the life or ψυχή, containing which and blended with which it constitutes one part of man's twofold essence (cf. ὁ ἔξωθεν ἄνθρωπος), and the ψυχή the other, both in profane Greek and in Scripture. See ψυχή. Matt. x. 28, φοβήθητε μᾶλλον τὸν δυνάμενον καὶ ψυχὴν καὶ σῶμα ἀπολέσαι ἐν γένει ; vi. 25, μὴ μεριμνᾶτε τῇ ψυχῇ ὑμῶν . . . μηδὲ τῷ σώματι ὑμῶν ; Luke xii. 22, 23. As here σῶμα and ψυχή are identified, so elsewhere they are distinguished, e.g. Matt. x. 28, μὴ φοβεῖσθε ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποκτενόντων τὸ σῶμα, τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν μὴ δυναμένων ἀποκτείνειν, see Luke xii. 4, so far, that is, as a separation of the two is possible (cf. 2 Cor. xii. 2, 3), and is accomplished at death. With reference to this separation, the body may be regarded as ἔνδυμα, κατοικητήριον, 2 Cor. v. 1–4 ; 2 Cor. v. 6, ἐνδymούντες ἐν τῷ σώματι ; ver. 8, ἐκδημήσαι ἐκ τοῦ σώματος. But the mutual connection between σῶμα and ψυχή is so close, and the significance of the body as an essential part of human nature is so great, that the restoration of the body at the resurrection is represented as the result of the renewal of the divine principle in the man, see Rom. viii. 10, 11, τὸ μὲν σῶμα νεκρὸν δι' ἁμαρτίαν, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ζωὴ διὰ δικαιοσύνην. εἰ δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἐγείραντος Ἰησοῦν ἐκ νεκρῶν οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν, ὁ ἐγείρας Χριστὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν ζωοποιήσει καὶ τὰ θνητὰ σώματα ὑμῶν διὰ τοῦ ἐνοικοῦντος αὐτοῦ πνεύματος ἐν ὑμῖν. Paul explains the relation of the resurrection body to the present body in 1 Cor. xv. 35 sqq., and expresses the difference between them by the designations σώματα ἐπουράνια . . . ἐπίγεια, ver. 40 ; σῶμα ψυχικόν . . . πνευματικόν, ver. 44, the latter of which expressions answers to the relation between πνεῦμα and ψυχή in the *threefold* division of human nature as conditioned by sin and regeneration, 1 Thess. v. 23, τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἡ ψυχή καὶ τὸ σῶμα. See ψυχή.

It is essential to the right understanding of Scripture language and thought firmly to maintain the significance of man's body as a necessary and constituent part of human nature. The body, as "the vessel" of life (an expression which we borrow from 2 Cor. iv. 7 and Dan. vii. 15), is the medium through which the life is manifested, and, with its organism of μέλη, it serves as the instrument through which the ψυχή works, 2 Cor. v. 10, ἵνα κομίσῃται ἕκαστος τὰ διὰ τοῦ σώματος πρὸς ἃ ἔπραξεν, "the acts which the man's body was the medium or instrument of" (Hofmann) ; 1 Cor. ix. 27, ὑπωπιάζω μου τὸ σῶμα, μή πως ἄλλοις κηρύξας αὐτὸς ἀδόκιμος γένωμαι ; Heb. xiii. 3, αὐτοὶ ὄντες

ἐν σώματι. The body is the necessary *medium* for the reception and possession of life, as the history of the creation teaches, and *e.g.* Lev. xvii. 11, 14. It is the organic basis of human nature, and hence we read in Heb. x. 5, *σῶμα δὲ κατηρτίσω μοι*. From it propagation proceeds, Rom. iv. 19, *οὐ κατενόησεν τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σῶμα νενεκρωμένον*; Gen. xxx. 2; 2 Sam. vii. 12, xvi. 11; 2 Cor. vii. 4. Hence we see the force of the Lord's words, *τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου*, at the last supper, Matt. xxvi. 26, Mark xiv. 22, Luke xxii. 19, 1 Cor. xi. 24, denoting a communication of the nature peculiar to Christ, and therefore divine, to man, cf. 1 Cor. x. 16, *κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ* (where *αἷμα* answers to the *ψυχή*, see John vi., *σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα*).

The importance, further, of the body in connection with man's *sinful* nature is closely connected with this its significance as a constituent part of humanity. While it is the medium for the reception and possession of life, the sinfulness of human nature is brought about and manifested by means of it, *i.e.* by the *σάρξ* which composes it, see Col. ii. 11, *ἐν τῇ ἀπεκδύσει τοῦ σώματος τῆς σαρκός*; Heb. x. 22; Col. i. 22, *ὑμᾶς ἀποκατήλλαξεν ἐν τῷ σώματι τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ διὰ τοῦ θανάτου*, see *σάρξ*; and the *ψυχή* identified with it and alienated from God, *i.e.* from the divine life-principle of the *πνεῦμα*, lays claim to the body as its own and for sin; whereas the body is said to be a temple of the Holy Ghost, see 1 Cor. vi. 19, *οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν ναὸς τοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐστιν*; cf. Rom. xii. 1; Col. ii. 23; John ii. 21; Rom. i. 24. Accordingly the body is called a *σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας*, Rom. vi. 6, and its members "instruments of sin," vi. 12, 13, *μὴ οὖν βασιλευέτω ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐν τῷ θνητῷ ὑμῶν σώματι εἰς τὸ ὑπακούειν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις αὐτοῦ, μηδὲ παριστάνετε τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν ὅπλα ἀδικίας τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ*, cf. Jas. iii. 2, 3, 6, and thus in the regenerate there takes place either an antithesis or a new union between *πνεῦμα* and *σῶμα*, see Rom. viii. 13, *πνεύματι τὰς πράξεις τοῦ σώματος θανατοῦν*; 1 Cor. vi. 19, 20, vii. 34, *ἵνα ᾗ ἁγία καὶ σώματι καὶ πνεύματι*. This is not contradicted by 1 Cor. vi. 18, *πᾶν ἁμάρτημα . . . ἐκτὸς τοῦ σώματος ἐστιν· ὁ δὲ πορνεύων, εἰς τὸ ἴδιον σῶμα ἁμαρτάνει*, for the apostle does not deny that all other sins are committed in or through the body; he asserts that no sin (not *ἁμαρτία*, but *ἁμάρτημα* δ' ἐὰν ποιήσῃ ἄνθρωπος) so directly attacks the natural basis and vessel of human life, and is so dangerous to man generally, and to the regenerate man especially, as fornication, cf. ver. 15, *οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν μέλη Χριστοῦ ἐστὶν κ.τ.λ.*, vv. 16, 13, 20,—as is evident from the great significance of man's corporeity.

The *σῶμα* as the external basis of human nature which has become sinful, the organized *σάρξ*, is consequently subject to death as the penalty of sin (*σῶμα τοῦ θανάτου*, Rom. vii. 24), and draws down the soul with it into the same doom, Matt. x. 28, unless the two be separated by the renewal of the divine principle of the soul, *viz.* of the *πνεῦμα*, in which case the body itself shall be finally exempted from the penalty, and made a *σῶμα πνευματικόν*, see Rom. viii. 23, *ἀπεκδεχόμενοι τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν*; but at present the life of the spirit asserts itself in contrast with the foil of the mortal body, Rom. viii. 10, *εἰ δὲ Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν, τὸ μὲν σῶμα νεκρὸν δι' ἁμαρτίαν, τὸ δὲ*

πνεῦμα ζωὴ διὰ δικαιοσύνην; ver. 11; 2 Cor. iv. 7, ἔχομεν δὲ τὸν θησαυρὸν τοῦτον ἐν ὀστροκίνοις σκεύεσιν; ver. 10, πάντοτε τὴν νέκρωσιν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῷ σώματι περιφέροντες, ἵνα καὶ ἡ ζωὴ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῷ σώματι ἡμῶν φανερωθῇ; Gal. vi. 17; Phil. iii. 21.

Considering these things, we may understand the emphasis laid upon the προσφορά τοῦ σώματος Ἰησοῦ, Heb. x. 10, cf. ver. 5; 1 Pet. ii. 24, τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν ἀνήμεκεν ἐν τῷ σώματι αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον; Rom. vii. 4, ἐθανατώθητε τῷ νόμῳ διὰ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ; Eph. ii. 16, ἵνα ἀποκαταλλάξῃ τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους ἐν ἐνὶ σώματι τῷ θεῷ διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ; 1 Cor. xi. 24, τοῦτό μου ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν; vv. 27, 29. The body of Christ, the manifestation of His humanity, the ὁμοίωμα σαρκὸς ἀμαρτίας, Rom. viii. 3,—this it is by virtue of which Christ can become a sacrifice for us, because herein His essential oneness with us is authenticated, Heb. x. 5, σῶμα δὲ κατηρτίσω μοι,—and just by means of this we become ourselves in turn partakers of the divine nature, Matt. xxvi. 26 (and parallels, see above).

The word σῶμα is figuratively applied to the church of Christ (σῶμα Χριστοῦ) and to the fellowship of believers (ἐν σῶμα) among themselves. In this latter sense it denotes the union and communion of spirit and life between the several members, Eph. iv. 4, ἐν σῶμα καὶ ἐν πνεῦμα, see ver. 3, τηρεῖν τὴν ἐνότητα τοῦ πνεύματος; 1 Cor. x. 17, ἐν σῶμα οἱ πολλοὶ ἑσμεν; xii. 13, ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι ἡμεῖς πάντες εἰς ἐν σῶμα ἐβαπτίσθημεν. This evidently is not a concrete expression of the idea of literal communion of membership, nor an abstraction of this idea, but is simply and necessarily (in the apostle's view) a postulate, arising from the fact of ἐν σῶμα, which denotes a natural and necessary unity and communion of life, cf. 1 Cor. vi. 16, ὁ κολλώμενος τῇ πορνῇ ἐν σῶμά ἐστιν· ἔσονται γὰρ οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν; Eph. v. 28; Rom. xii. 5, ἐν σῶμά ἐσμεν ἐν Χριστῷ. The designation of the church, too, as the body of Christ, is quite in keeping with this; Eph. v. 30, μέλη ἐσμεν τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ; 1 Cor. xii. 27, ὑμεῖς δὲ ἐστε σῶμα Χριστοῦ καὶ μέλη ἐκ μέρους. The church at large, too, is so called as the organism vivified by Christ as the Spirit (2 Cor. iii. 17, ὁ δὲ κύριος τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστιν; 1 Cor. vi. 16, ὁ κολλώμενος τῷ κυρίῳ ἐν πνεύμῳ ἐστιν), Christ standing to the church in a similarly necessary and natural connection as the spirit does to the body, Eph. i. 23, iv. 12, 16, v. 23, 30, Col. i. 22, 24, ii. 19, iii. 15, 1 Cor. x. 16, 17, xii. 27, while individual members are called μέλη, 1 Cor. xii. 27, cf. vi. 15.

In profane Greek, σῶμα is used also in the sense of the sum-total or whole, e.g. τὸ τοῦ κόσμου σῶμα, Plat. *Tim.* 31 B; Diod. Sic. i. 11; Joseph. *Antt.* vii. 3. 2, Δαυίδης δὲ τὴν τε κάτω πόλιν περιλαβὼν καὶ τὴν ἄκραν συνάψας αὐτῇ, ἐποίησεν ἐν σῶμα. It does not occur in this sense in the N. T. Further, σῶμα is used first by the poets and then by Xen., even in prose, to denote persons, e.g. Xen. *Hell.* ii. 1. 19, ἐλεύθερα σώματα; Diod. Sic. xvii. 46, αἰχμάλωτα σώμ. = prisoners of war. Afterwards (in Polyb., Arr., Plut.) σώματα by itself, and sometimes in the sing., is used of slaves, bondmen, etc. See Lobeck, *Phryn.* p. 378. So Rev. xviii. 13, cf. Gen. xxxvi. 6; Tob. x. 10; 2 Macc. viii. 11.

It is needless, in order to explain Col. ii. 17, ἃ ἐστὶν σκιὰ τῶν μελλόντων, τὸ δὲ σῶμα Χριστοῦ, to seek a special use of σῶμα = *res ipsa*,—a meaning which the word receives here through its antithesis (elsewhere also found) with σκιά, an antithesis which suggests the expression. Cf. Lucian, *Hermot.* 79, οὐχὶ . . . τὶς φαίη, τὴν σκιὰν ὑμᾶς θηρεύειν, ἐάσαντας τὸ σῶμα; Joseph. *de Bell. Jud.* ii. 2. 5, σκιὰν αἰτησόμενος βασιλείας, ἣς ἤρπασαν ἐαυτῷ τὸ σῶμα.

Σωματικός, bodily, corporeal, 1 Tim. iv. 8, ἡ σωματικὴ γυμνασία, cf. σωματικὴ ἔξις, Joseph. *de Bell. Jud.* vi. 1. 6. Also in contrast with ἀσώματος in Plat., Aristot., Philo, *de Opif. Mund.* 4, τῶν ἀσωμάτων ιδέων τὰς σωματικὰς ἐξομοίων οὐσίας. So Luke iii. 22, καταβῆναι τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον σωματικῶς εἶδει ὡς περιστερὰν. The adverb σωματικῶς, Col. ii. 9, ἐν αὐτῷ κατοικεῖ πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς θεότητος σωματικῶς—where the reference is to σῶμα as denoting the manifestation of human nature, as in all the texts where the body of Christ is spoken of; see σῶμα.

Σύσσωμος, *ον*, only in Eph. iii. 6, εἶναι τὰ ἔθνη συγκληρονόμα καὶ σύσσωμα καὶ συμμετοχα τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, and hence passing into patristic Greek. It is an independent self-contained conception, which does not need further definition = united in one body, that is, *members of the body of Christ*; comp. σῶμα of the church; = incorporated with.

T

Ταπεινός, ἡ, ὄν, (I.) locally, low, Josh. xi. 16; Ezek. xvii. 24. — (II.) Figuratively, (a.) low, unimportant, trifling, small, paltry, etc., e.g. δύναμις, insignificant power (Dem.); αἱ ταπειναὶ τῶν πόλεων, weak states, Isocr. *Or.* iv. 26. 95. So Jas. i. 9, ὁ ἀδελφὸς ὁ ταπεινός, as against ὁ πλούσιος; 2 Cor. x. 1, κατὰ πρόσωπον μὲν ταπεινὸς ἐν ὑμῖν = insignificant; Rom. xii. 16, μὴ τὰ ὑψηλὰ φρονούντες ἀλλὰ τοῖς ταπεινοῖς συναπαγόμενοι. Thus in the LXX. 1 Sam. xviii. 23 = עָלִי, poor; Isa. xxxii. 2, מְצַח; Lev. xiii. 21 = מְצַח, depressed, and often (b.) humbled, cast down, oppressed, e.g. ταπεινὸν ποιεῖν τινα, to humble one (Isocr.); Xen. *Hell.* ii. 4. 24, τῇ δ' ὑστεραίᾳ οἱ μὲν τριάκοντα πάνν δὲ ταπεινοὶ καὶ ἔρημοι ξυνεκάθηντο ἐν τῷ ξυνεδρίῳ; vi. 4. 16, σκυθρωποὺς καὶ ταπεινοὺς περιιόντας = afflicted, cast down. Thus parallel with θλιβόμενοι, 2 Cor. vii. 6, comp. as = לָחַץ, Isa. xi. 4, xxv. 4; מְצַח, Ps. xxxiv. 19, τ. τῷ πνεύματι, parallel with συντετριμμένος = מְצַח, Job v. 11, *et al.*; Luke i. 52, humbled. Akin to this (c.) is the signification modest, humble, Xenophon, Euripides, Plato, and others, as against ὑπερήφανος, Xen. *Ag.* xi. 11; also submissive, subject, Xen. *Hier.* v. 5, *Cyrop.* vii. 5. 69. Comp. Luke i. 51, 52, διεσκόρπισεν ὑπερηφάνους διανοίᾳ καρδίας αὐτῶν καθεῖλεν δυνάστας ἀπὸ θρόνων καὶ ὑψωσεν ταπεινοὺς, where it does not stand in the sense humble, but its passing into this meaning is shown by the context.—So Matt. xi. 29, πραῦς εἰμι καὶ ταπεινὸς τῇ καρδίᾳ, Jas. iv. 6, 1 Pet. v. 5, as opposed to ὑπερήφανος. Comp. Prov. xxix. 23, ὕβρις ἄνδρα ταπεινοῦ, τοὺς δὲ ταπεινούς

φρονας ἐρείδει δόξη κύριος = הָרָץ , which is = ταπεινός in Ps. cxxxviii. 6. Further, the word is used in profane Greek (*d.*) very often in a morally contemptible sense = cringing, servile, low, common, Plato, Xen., Isocr., and others; ταπεινότης, ignobleness, Aristotle, *Rhet.* ii. 6, with μικροψυχία, Diod. xvi. 70; and it is (*e.*) a notable peculiarity of Scripture usage that the LXX., Apocrypha, and N. T. know nothing of this import of the word, but rather, in connection with (*c.*), deepen the conception, and raise the word to be the designation of the noblest and most necessary of all virtues, which in contrast with ὕβρις in every form is still something quite different from the σωφροσύνη which is opposed to ὕβρις among the Greeks. It is the disposition of the man who esteems himself as small before God and men, takes a low estimate of himself, ταπεινοῦν ἑαυτόν, a representation foreign to profane Greek, though a presentiment of this virtue is traceable there. Nägelsbach, *Homer. Theol.* vi. 13, remarks that the σιγῇ, Hom. *Od.* xviii. 141, σιγῇ δῶρα θεῶν ἔχειν, Dem. *adv. Timocr.* lii. 717, ποιεῖν τὰ δίκαια σιγῇ, is the Greek expression for humility; but it must not be overlooked that this subdued stillness of feeling was no more than a part of humility, and the expression by no means attained or sufficed for the biblical conception, especially as denoting humility manifested before God, which arises from the perception of sin, or is at least inseparably connected therewith (comp. ταπεινοῦν ἑαυτόν, Luke xviii. 14); of this the Greeks had no presentiment. Humility with the Greeks was in fact nothing higher than modesty, unassuming diffidence. This and no more lies in the passage in Plato, *Legg.* iv. 716 A, τῷ θεῷ ἀεὶ ξυνέπεται δίκη τῶν ἀπολειπομένων τοῦ θεοῦ νόμου τιμωρός, ἥς ὁ μὲν εὐδαιμονήσκειν μέλλον ἐχόμενος ξυνέπεται ταπεινός καὶ κεκοσμημένος, εἰ δέ τις ἐξαρθεῖς ὑπὸ μεγαλαυχίας ἢ χρήμασιν ἐπαιρόμενος ἢ τιμαῖς ἢ καὶ σώματος εὐμορφίᾳ, ἅμα νεότητι καὶ ἀνοίᾳ, φλέγεται τὴν ψυχὴν μεθ' ὕβρεως, ὥς οὐτ' ἄρχοντος οὔτε τινὸς ἡγεμόνος δεόμενος, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἄλλοις ἱκανὸς ὢν ἡγεῖσθαι, καταλείπεται ἔρημος θεοῦ. The Greek ταπεινός is nothing more than an element of σωφροσύνη, and, in direct contrast with the ταπεινοφροσύνη of Scripture, it is in no way opposed to self-righteousness. But the other element in humility, Phil. ii. 3, τῇ ταπεινοφροσύνῃ ἀλλήλους ἡγούμενοι ὑπερέχοντας ἑαυτῶν, is opposed to the Greek conception of δικαιοσύνη, which, while not self-seeking, is not in the least unselfish, but gives to every one his own. Hence it is clear why we find in the N. T., as a substantival designation of humility, a new word, ταπεινοφροσύνη. It is noteworthy that, in contrast with Scripture usage, ταπεινός is used by Philo in a bad sense.

Ταπεινός, (I.) locally, to make low, Luke iii. 5, βουνὸς ταπεινωθήσεται. — (II.) Figuratively, (*a.*) to make small, to humiliate, to abase, *e.g.* Xen. *Mem.* iii. 5. 4, τεταπίνονται ἢ τῶν Ἀθηναίων δόξα; Phil. iv. 12, οἶδα καὶ ταπεινούσθαι, οἶδα καὶ περισσεύειν. Comp. 2 Cor. xi. 7. — Xen. *Anab.* vi. 3. 18, θεὸς τοὺς πλείον φρονούντας ταπεινῶσαι βούλεται. So 2 Cor. xii. 21. Answering to this ταπεινούσθαι, to humble oneself, 1 Pet. v. 5, ταπεινώθητε οὖν ὑπὸ τὴν κραταῖαν χεῖρα τοῦ θεοῦ, Jas. iv. 10, comp. ὑπερήφανος, ver. 6; Eccles. iii. 18. Thus also of the position or relation to his own claims, or to

others in which one puts oneself or is placed, 2 Cor. xi. 7, ἡ ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησα ἑμαυτὸν ταπεινῶν ἵνα ὑμεῖς ὑψωθῆτε, ὅτι δωρεὰν τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ εὐαγγέλιον εὐαγγελισάμην ὑμῖν; Phil. ii. 8, of Christ, ἐταπεινώσεν ἑαυτὸν γενόμενος ὑπὸ ἡκού κ.τ.λ., comp. Heb. v. 8, Luke xiv. 11, Matt. xxiii. 12, to humble oneself; (b.) specially in the biblical sense, see ταπεινός (c.); Matt. xviii. 4, Luke xviii. 14, ταπεινοῦν ἑαυτόν. Comp. Ecclus. vii. 17, μὴ προσλογίζου σεαυτὸν ἐν πλήθει ἁμαρτωλῶν ταπεινώσου σφόδρα τὴν ψυχὴν σου, μνήσθητι ὅτι ὀργὴ οὐ χρομεῖ.

Ταπεινώσις, ἡ, humiliation, appears in the N. T., as also in the LXX., only passively, to denote the position in which one finds oneself, not disposition; Luke i. 48, Acts viii. 33, Phil. iii. 21, Jas. i. 10 = lowness. Comp. Plut. Mor. 7a, ταπεινώσις τῆς λέξεως, too plain or common an exposition.

Ταπεινόφρων, ον, seldom in profane Greek; Plut. Fort. Alex. ii. 4, μικροὺς ἡ τύχη καὶ περιδεεῖς ποιεῖ καὶ ταπεινόφρονας = mean-spirited. In the LXX. only in Prov. xxix. 23 = 𐤒𐤓 𐤇𐤁𐤔, humble. In like manner in N. T. 1 Pet. iii. 8.

Ταπεινοφροσύνη, ἡ, humility, the disposition of the ταπεινός in the Scripture sense; the word is unknown in profane Greek, and in the LXX. also. As to its import, see ταπεινός, Acts xx. 19; Eph. iv. 2; Phil. ii. 3; Col. ii. 18, 23, iii. 12; 1 Pet. v. 5.

Τέλος, τό, does not, as is commonly supposed, primarily denote the end, termination, with reference to time, but the goal reached, the completion or conclusion at which anything arrives, either as issue or ending, and thus including the termination of what went before; or as result, acme, consummation, e.g. πολέμου τέλος, victory; τέλος ἀνδρός, the full age of man; also of the ripening of the seed. "It never" (according to Passow) "denotes merely an end as to time, a termination in and for itself; for this, τελευτή is always used. When τέλος is thus used, as in βίου τέλος, it always includes the idea of an inner completion. Nor does it signify merely an end in space, which is expressed by πέρας, or by the adjective ἔσχατος and ἄκρος." Even in pure definitions of time, the word never signifies the mere end or termination, but the qualitative end, the conclusion, e.g. Xen. Anab. vi. 1. 13, τῇ μὲν νυκτὶ ταύτῃ τοῦτο τὸ τέλος ἐγένετο; i. 10. 18, ταύτης μὲν τῆς ἡμέρας τοῦτο τὸ τέλος ἐγένετο. Apparently it occurs but rarely in classical Greek in the sense of termination. In the N. T. Luke i. 33, τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔσται τέλος; Mark iii. 26, οὐ δύναται στήναι ἀλλὰ τέλος ἔχει. Cf. Xen. Cyrop. vii. 3. 11, οὗτος ἔχει τὸ κάλλιστον τέλος, νικῶν γὰρ τετελεύτηκε. But here τέλος, as often, means death as the end or issue of life, e.g. Ael. V. H. iii. 25, τέλος εὐκλεές, a glorious death. The question here arises, however, whether the main reference is to the goal reached, or to the course now finished. The latter is the most usual; accordingly τέλος means (I.) the issue, end, conclusion, Matt. xxvi. 58, εἰσελθὼν ἔσω ἐκάθητο . . . ἰδεῖν τὸ τέλος; Jas. v. 11, τὸ τέλος κυρίου εἶδετε; 1 Pet. iv. 17, τί τὸ τέλος τῶν ἀπειθούντων; ver. 7, πάντων δὲ τὸ τέλος ἡγγικεν. So 1 Cor. x. 11, τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰώνων . . . ἔσχαται ἡμέραι; Acts ii. 17; 2 Tim.

iii. 1. Cf. Dan. xi. 13, i. 15, 18, iv. 31; Neh. xiii. 6; 2 Kings viii. 3, xviii. 10. Further, τὸ τέλος, which in Matt. xxiv. 14, τότε ἔξει τὸ τέλος, Mark xiii. 7, Luke xxi. 9, means *the termination of the present course and condition of the world*; in 1 Cor. xv. 24, on the contrary, it means, at the same time, *the goal reached, and the beginning of a new order of things*.—Heb. vii. 3, μήτε ζωῆς τέλος ἔχων. The decision or conclusion is to be kept in mind in the adverbial phrases εἰς τέλος, either as *=to the last*, to the conclusion of that spoken of, John xiii. 1, εἰς τέλος ἠγάπησεν αὐτούς, where the reference is to the issue of Christ's work of love, Matt. x. 22, xxiv. 13, Mark xiii. 13, or as *=at last, or in the end, finally*, Luke xviii. 5; it is used in both senses in profane Greek. Then ἕως, ἄχρι, μέχρι τέλους, Heb. iii. 6, 14, vi. 11; Rev. ii. 26; 1 Cor. i. 8; τὸ τέλος, finally, 1 Pet. iii. 8 (Plat. Legg. vi. 768 B, usually without the article, like the Pauline phrase τὸ λοιπόν). Comp. Rev. xxi. 6, xxii. 13, ἐγὼ ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ τὸ τέλος, with Pind. Pyth. x. 10, ἀνθρώπων τέλος ἀρχά τε, *the beginning and end of human undertakings*; Luke xxii. 37, καὶ γὰρ τὰ περὶ ἐμοῦ τέλος ἔχει, is hardly parallel with the Homeric τέλος ἐπιτιθέσθαι μύθῳ, *to perform His word*, for it means not simply performance or accomplishment generally, but the accomplishment of those last things, those sufferings which the Lord had now in view, ἔτι τοῦτο . . . δεῖ τελεσθῆναι ἐν ἐμοί. —(II.) The word refers to *the goal reached, the goal and end*, Rom. vi. 21, τὸ γὰρ τέλος ἐκείνων θάνατος; ver. 22; Phil. iii. 19; 2 Cor. xi. 15; Heb. vi. 8.—1 Pet. i. 9, τὸ τέλος τῆς πίστεως; 1 Tim. i. 5, τὸ τέλος τῆς παραγγελίας ἐστὶν ἀγάπη ἐκ κ.τ.λ., cf. Rom. xiii. 10, πλήρωμα τοῦ νόμου ἀγάπη. (On the contrary, in Rom. x. 4, τέλος γὰρ νόμου Χριστὸς, εἰς δικαιοσύνην παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι, see vv. 3, 5, and Acts xiii. 39, it denotes the final end, the conclusion which the dominion of the law has found in Christ.) With 2 Cor. iii. 13, cf. ver. 7. So in the adverbial phrases εἰς τέλος = *completely*, 1 Thess. ii. 16; Amos ix. 8; Dan. vii. 26; Ps. lxxxix. 47 (often in Polyb.); ἕως τέλους, 2 Cor. i. 13, as contrasted with ἀπὸ μέρους, ver. 14.

Τέλος, with the signification *toll or tax*, Matt. xvii. 25, Rom. xiii. 7, is, in the opinion of modern scholars, to be derived from another root.

Τελέω, τελέσω, Attic τελῶ, perf. pass. τετέλεσθαι, *to make an end or accomplishment, to complete anything*,—not merely to end it, but to bring it to perfection, to carry it through, *peragere*; generally, *to carry out a thing, to accomplish*, e.g. τελεῖν ἀέθλους, *to finish conflicts*, Hom. Od. iii. 262; μόχθους, *to endure affliction*, Theocr. xxiv. 81; ἔργον τελεῖν, both *to perform a work* (Eur. Or. 834) and *to complete it*, Hom. Il. vii. 465; τελεῖν τὰ ἱερά, *sacra peragere*, Xen.; προστάγματα τελεῖν, *to carry out and obey orders*, Plat. Legg. xi. 926 A. Frequently of promises and prayers, *to fulfil or answer them*. Of definite periods of time, *to pass, spend, or fulfil*, e.g. ἔτος ὀγδοηκοστὸν τελεῖν, Luc. Macroh. 10. In the N. T., (I.) τοὺς λόγους τελεῖν, Matt. vii. 28, xix. 1, cf. xiii. 53, xi. 1; τὴν μαρτυρίαν, *completely to bear one's testimony*, Rev. xi. 7; τὸν δρόμον, 2 Tim. iv. 7; τὰς πόλεις = *to finish*, an elliptical expression, cf. Josh. iii. 17, ἕως συνετέλεσε πᾶς ὁ λαὸς διαβαίνων τὸν

Ἰορδάνην; generally, to do anything fully or completely, Luke ii. 39. Passive, τελεῖσθαι, to be completed or fulfilled, Rev. xv. 1, 8, xvii. 17,—xx. 3, 5, 7, τὰ χίλια ἔτη; John xix. 28, εἰδὼς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι ἤδη πάντα τετέλεσται, ἵνα τελειωθῇ ἡ γραφή; ver. 30, τετέλεσται,—which signifies the perfect accomplishment of that work whereby the Scripture is fulfilled, and not merely = to fulfil, as in Luke xviii. 31, τελεσθήσεται πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα; xxii. 37; Rev. x. 7; Acts xiii. 29; Ezra i. 1. — 2 Cor. xii. 9, ἡ γὰρ δύναμις ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ τελεῖται (so Tisch., Received text, ἡ γ. δυν. μου ἐν ἀ. τελειοῦται), the greatness of Christ's power fully manifests itself in the sphere of human weakness; see what follows in ver. 10. — (II.) As referring not so much to the completion of a work as to the production or attainment of the object, e.g. ἔργον τελεῖν, to perform, or execute, or carry out, Ecclus. vii. 26, xxviii. 30. So Luke xii. 50, ἕως οὗ τελεσθῇ τὸ βάπτισμα; Rom. ii. 27, τὸν νόμον τελεῖν, as in Jas. ii. 8; Gal. v. 16, ἐπιθυμίαν σαρκὸς οὐ μὴ τελέσητε.

From τέλος, a tax = to pay taxes or tribute, Matt. xvii. 24; Rom. xiii. 6.

Τέλειος, α, ον; usually with two terminations in Attic Greek, and often there τέλεος, complete, perfect. — (I.) In a physical or literal sense, e.g. of spotless sacrifices, of that wherein nothing is deficient, e.g. τέλειος ἐνιαυτός, a full year; Arist. Pol. i. 3, οἰκία δὲ τέλειος ἐκ δούλων καὶ ἐλευθέρων. So ἔργον τέλειον, Jas. i. 4; 1 Cor. xiii. 10, τὸ τέλειον, in contrast with τὸ ἐκ μέρους. Figuratively, 1 John iv. 18, ἡ τελεία ἀγάπη, cf. τελεία καρδιά, 1 Chron. xxviii. 9; 1 Kings viii. 62. Frequently = full grown, of men and beasts; of man, in contrast with παιδίον νήπιον, Pol. v. 29. 2, Plat., Xen., and others. So Eph. iv. 13, εἰς ἄνδρα τέλειον, εἰς μέτρον ἡλικίας κ.τ.λ.; Heb. v. 14, τελείων δέ ἐστιν ἡ στερὰ τροφή; 1 Cor. xiv. 20; Phil. iii. 15, see ver. 12; 1 Cor. ii. 6, cf. iii. 1? — Generally, what is highest and pre-eminent, e.g. νόμος τέλειος ὁ τῆς ἐλευθερίας, Jas. i. 25; Heb. ix. 11, διὰ τῆς μείζονος καὶ τελειοτέρας σκηνῆς. So in classical Greek with reference to the gods and their exaltation; also of the eagle as the king of birds, τελειότατος πετεήνων, Hom. Il. viii. 247. In medical phraseology, τέλειον νόσημα, the sickness at its height. — (II.) In a moral sense, perfected, complete, blameless, e.g. δώρημα τέλειον with δόσις ἀγαθή, Jas. i. 17. Oftener in the LXX. = מְלֵךְ, מִלֵּךְ, Gen. vi. 9, Νῶε ἄνθρωπος δίκαιος τέλειος ὢν ἐν τῇ γενεᾷ αὐτοῦ; Deut. xviii. 13, 2 Sam. xxii. 16; Aristotle, Eth. i. 13, ἀρετὴ τελεία; Antonin. vii. 67, ἡ τελειότης τοῦ ἥθους. Otherwise it occurs more rarely by itself in an ethical sense in the classics. In the N. T. Jas. i. 4, ἵνα ᾗτε τέλειοι καὶ ὁλόκληροι ἐν μηδενὶ λειπόμενοι; iii. 2, εἴ τις ἐν λόγῳ οὐ πταίει, οὗτος τέλειος ἀνὴρ; Matt. v. 48, xix. 21; Rom. xii. 2; Col. i. 28, iv. 12. The adverb τελείως = perfectly, entirely, 1 Pet. i. 13; Xen. Cyr. iii. 3. 38, τελέως ἀγαθὸς ἀνὴρ; Isocr. 20 A, νόμιζε τελέως εὐδαιμονήσειν.

Τελειότης, ἡ, (I.) relatively, completeness, perfection, Plat. deff. 412 B, αὐτάρκεια τελειότης κτήσεως ἀγαθῶν; Wisd. vi. 15, φρονήσεως τελειότης; xii. 17, δυνάμεως τελ. — (II.) Absolutely = perfection in a moral sense, Col. iii. 15, ἀγάπη ἐστὶν σύνδεσμος τελειότητος; Judg. ix. 16, 19, εἰ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ καὶ τελειότητι ἐποιήσατε (מִלֵּךְ), perhaps = ἐν

καρδία τελεία, 1 Chron. xxviii. 9; 1 Kings viii. 62. — Heb. vi. 1, ἀφέντες τὸν τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγον ἐπὶ τὴν τελειότητα φερόμεθα, may signify either the στερεὰ τροφή according to its nature as contrasted with the γάλα, i.e. τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγος, the λόγος δικαιοσύνης, v. 13, 14, or the state of the τέλειοι in contrast with the νήπιοι, v. 13. The former explanation is perhaps the simpler and more probable. The word occurs but rarely, not only in profane, but also—notwithstanding the examples in Steph. *Thes.*—in biblical Greek.

Τελεῖόω, also τελέω, (L.) to make perfect, to complete, Her. i. 120, πάντα ἐτελέωσε ποιήσας; John xvii. 4, τὸ ἔργον ἐτελείωσα ὃ δέδωκάς μοι ἵνα ποιήσω; Acts xx. 24, τελειῶσαι τὸν δρόμον μου, καὶ τὴν διακονίαν ἣν ἔλαβον; 2 Chron. viii. 16, ἀφ' ἧς ἡμέρας ἐθεμελιώθη ἕως οὗ ἐτελείωσε Σαλωμών τὸν οἶκον κυρίου = ὁλῶ; to finish, to fulfil, Luke ii. 43, τὰς ἡμέρας; Plat. *Polit.* 272 D, ἐπεὶ δὲ χρόνος ἐτελεώθη; to make complete, so that nothing more is wanting, e.g. to bring to maturity, to ripen, etc., Plat. *Rep.* vi. 487 A, τελειωθεῖσι τοῖς τοιούτοις παιδεία τε καὶ ἡλικία; 498 B, ἐν ᾗ (ἡλικία) ἡ ψυχὴ τελειοῦσθαι ἄρχεται; Aristot. *H. Animal.* i. 15, ἡ μὲν οὖν κεφαλὴ πᾶσιν ἄνω πρὸς τὸ σῶμα τὸ ἐαυτῶν ὁ δ' ἄνθρωπος μόνος . . . πρὸς τὸ τοῦ ὅλου τελειωθείς ἔχει τοῦτο τὸ μόριον. So Heb. ii. 10, τὸν ἀρχηγὸν τῆς σωτηρίας διὰ παθημάτων τελειῶσαι—to make Him perfectly an ἀρχηγὸς τῆς σ. τέλειος, cf. v. 9, τελειωθείς ἐγένετο . . . αἷτιος σωτηρίας αἰωνίου, vii. 28, υἱὸς . . . τετελειωμένος, in contrast with ἀρχιερεῖς ἔχοντες ἀσθενείαν. So also John xvii. 23, ἵνα ὧσιν τετελειωμένοι εἰς ἓν; Jas. ii. 22, ἡ πίστις συνήργει τοῖς ἔργοις αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἔργων ἡ πίστις ἐτελειώθη, becomes πίστις τελεία, cf. ver. 26, ἡ πίστις χωρὶς τῶν ἔργων νεκρά ἐστίν. The passive meaning adopted here, to be kept or preserved intact, is quite untenable, and especially by John xix. 28, ἵνα τελειωθῇ ἡ γραφή, where the fulfilment of the prophecy is regarded as the completion and accomplishment of what was prophesied, of that which was not τέλειον, while the fulfilment was still wanting; cf. Hom. *Il.* ix. 456, θεοὶ δ' ἐτέλειον ἐπάρας, Luke i. 45, under τελείωσις. Cf. τελεῖν. Ecclus. xxxiv. 10 also does not sanction this meaning, τις ἐδοκιμάσθη ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ ἐτελειώθη, see τέλειος as denoting moral perfection. We may also refer to the words of St. John, τετελείωται ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν τινί, 1 John ii. 5, iv. 12, 17, 18,—it is complete in him, nothing is wanting of it, cf. iv. 17, 18. Very easy is the connection with this of τελειοῦν, in the sense, to bring to the end, to conclude; passive, to reach the goal. See in profane Greek, Plut. *Mor.* 111 C, ζῶα . . . ἔωθεν μὲν γεννώμενα, μέσης δ' ἡμέρας ἀκμάζοντα, δείλης δὲ γηρῶντα καὶ τελειοῦντα τὸ ζῆν; 159 C, φυγὴ δὲ μία [τῶν ἀδικημάτων] καὶ καθαρμὸς εἰς δικαιοσύνην τελειοῖ; 582 F, ἡ γὰρ χάρις οὐχ ἤττον δεομένη τοῦ λαμβάνοντος ἢ τοῦ διδόντος; ἐξ ἀμφοῖν γὰρ τελειοῦται πρὸς τὸ καλόν. The middle in Jamblich. *Vit. Pyth.* 322, ἔπειτα τὰ φυσικὰ πάντα ἀναδιδάσκει, τὴν τε ἠθικὴν φιλοσοφίαν καὶ λογικὴν ἐτελεώσατο = to conclude. The recognition of this meaning is in accordance with Greek usage, and helps us to understand the full force of the word, e.g. in Phil. iii. 12, οὐχ ὅτι ἤδη ἔλαβον ἢ ἤδη τετελειώμαι, see ver. 15 ὅσοι οὖν τέλειοι, τοῦτο φρονώμεν, from which it must be

carefully distinguished; Phil. *Lib.* II. *Alleg.* 74, πότε οὖν ὁ ψυχὴ μάλιστα νεκροφορεῖν σαυτὴν ὑπολήψη· ἀρά γε οὐχ ὅταν τελειωθῇς καὶ βραβεῖων καὶ στεφάνων ἀξιωθῇς; see also Heb. xi. 40, μὴ χωρὶς ἡμῶν τελειωθῶσιν; xii. 23, δίκαιοι τετελειωμένοι. Here the goal is evidently, according to xi. 39, x. 36, the κομίσασθαι τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν. Cf. also τελειοῦσθαι used of death, Ignat. *ad Trall.* 3, δέδεμαι μὲν διὰ Χριστόν, ἀλλ' οὐδέπω Χριστοῦ ἁξίος εἰμι· ἐὰν δὲ τελειωθῶ, τάχα γενήσομαι; Euseb. *Vit. Const.* iii. 47, τοῦ μὲν οὖν βασιλέως ἐτελειοῦτο ἡ μήτηρ, used by patristic writers with reference to the martyrs' death; Luke xiii. 32, ἰάσεις ἀποτελῶ σήμερον καὶ αὔριον, καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ τελειοῦμαι, see vv. 31, 33; Bengel, *finem nanciscor*. This signification, to go on towards the goal, passive, to reach the goal, perfectly suits the other places in the Hebrews, viz. x. 14, μὴ γὰρ προσφορᾷ τετελείωκεν εἰς τὸ διηκεῖς τοὺς ἁγιαζόμενους (see ix. 13); vii. 19, οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐτελείωσεν ὁ νόμος; x. 1, οὐδέποτε δύναται τοὺς προσερχομένους τελειῶσαι, cf. ver. 2, διὰ τὸ μηδεμίαν ἔχειν ἔτι συνείδησιν ἁμαρτιῶν τοὺς λατρεύοντας ἅπαξ κεκαθαρμένους; ix. 9, θυσίαι προσφέρονται μὴ δυνάμεναι κατὰ συνείδησιν τελειῶσαι τὸν λατρεύοντα. The goal to be attained is here, as the context shows, the removal of the evil conscience, as in xi. 40 it is the attainment of the promise; and it is unnecessary to take τελειοῦν either as = δικαιοῦν, like τέλειος, synon. with δίκαιος (Prov. x. 29, xx. 7),—according to which the word would stand in a sense quite remote from its meaning in the other passages,—or, with Köstlin (*Joh. Lehrbegriff*, p. 421), as synon. with ἀγιάζειν, καθαρίζειν (Heb. ix. 13, 14), ἀφαιρεῖν ἁμαρτίας (x. 10, 2, 4, 14, 11); as if it included all these, “for cleansing, forgiveness, and sanctification make the man what God purposed and designed he should be,”—an explanation which has neither simplicity nor naturalness to recommend it.—(II.) Synonymous with ποιεῖν, without special reference to the completion of the work; like τελεῖν, John iv. 34, v. 36; Eccclus. i. 21.

Τελείωσις, ἡ, completion, successful issue, Diod. ii. 29, ἀποτρεπαὶ κακῶν καὶ τελειώσεις ἀγαθῶν. The attainment of a perfect whole, a τέλειον which needs nothing further to complete it, Heb. vii. 11, εἰ μὲν οὖν τελείωσις διὰ τῆς Λευιτικῆς ἱερωσύνης ἦν, see ver. 19.—The fulfilment of a promise, Luke i. 45; Judith x. 9. Contrasted with νεότης, Jer. ii. 2, as often in Aristotle, denoting a state of ripeness, perfect culture, etc.

Τελειωτής, ὁ, one who makes a τέλειον, who completes anything; it occurs in patristic Greek, and in the N. T. only in Heb. xii. 2, τὸν τῆς πίστεως ἀρχηγὸν καὶ τελειωτὴν Ἰησοῦν; see ἀρχηγός.

Συντελέω, (I.) to bring things to an end together, to bring to the goal, to complete, to finish, e.g. τὰς ναῦς, Pol. i. 21. 3. So with plural object, Matt. vii. 28, τοὺς λόγους; Acts xxi. 27, ἔμελλον αἱ ἑπτα ἡμέραι συντελεῖσθαι; Luke iv. 2. Or with a substitute for the plural, see Luke iv. 13, συντελέσας πάντα πειρασμόν. So also Mark xiii. 4, ὅταν μέλλῃ ταῦτα συντελεῖσθαι πάντα, all together.—(II.) Perfectly to complete anything, as σύν often denotes in composition, e.g. συμπληρῶ, συντέμνω, Polyb. vi. 53. 1, συντελουμένης

τῆς ἐκφορᾶς. So Rom. ix. 28, λόγον συντελῶν, *bringing to an accomplishment a purpose* (Isa. x. 23); Lam. ii. 17, συνετέλεσε ῥῆμα αὐτοῦ; Heb. viii. 8, συντελέσω . . . διαθήκην καινὴν, where the word (instead of the διαθήσομαι of the LXX.) may also have reference to the fellowship in this διαθ. both of Israel and Judah, συντελέσω ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰουδα διαθήκην καινὴν. It is not used in biblical Greek of the combination of a plurality of subjects.

Συντέλεια, ἡ, termination, completion; often used when there are not several objects or subjects (as in Plato, *Legg.* x. 905 B, τῶν θεῶν ἡ συντέλεια, *the co-operation of the gods*), and thus corresponding with συντελεῖν (II.). Pol. iv. 28. 3, συντέλειαν λαμβάνει ὁ πόλεμος; Strabo, xvii. 804, ἀφῆκε τὸ ἔργον περὶ συντέλειαν. In the N. T. only συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος, Matt. xiii. 39, 40, 49, xxiv. 3, xxviii. 20; τῶν αἰώνων, Heb. ix. 26, *the end, the termination of the course of this world*; see αἰών. LXX. Dan. ix. 26, ἕως καιροῦ συντελείας, ver. 27, xii. 4; also ix. 27, κατὰ συντέλειαν καιρῶν; xii. 13, εἰς συντέλειαν ἡμερῶν; Theodot. Dan. ix. 27, ἕως τῆς συντελείας καιροῦ; xii. 4, ἕως καιροῦ συντελείας.

Τίθημι, to set, to place, to lay.

Ἀνατίθημι, to lay upon, to attribute something to some one; ἀναθέσθαι τινὶ τι sometimes is = to lay a thing before some one, i.e. to communicate, to leave for consideration; Plut. *Mor.* 772 D, τὴν πράξιν ἀνέθετο τῶν ἐταίρων τισίν; Artemidor. *Oneirocr.* ii. 64, ἀνατιθέμενός τινι τῶν ἐπιστημόνων τὸ ὄναρ. So 2 Macc. iii. 9; Acts xxv. 14; Gal. ii. 2. — Particularly of the presentation of offerings, to consecrate, to devote; and so in the LXX. = נָשַׁם, 1 Sam. xxxi. 10, ἀνέθηκαν τὰ σκεύη αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ Ἀσταρτεῖον. Not of that which the O. T. calls “holy unto the Lord,” but in the few other places where the word occurs = הִחַרִּים, Lev. xxvii. 28, 29; Mic. iv. 13. But הִחַרִּים signifies *to give over to destruction*, for חָרַם is literally = *to cut off* (see Lev. xxi. 18, רִמָּה, *flat-nosed*), *to separate from*; Phoen. חָרַם, *to curse*; Hiphil, *to cut asunder* (Isa. xi. 15?), usually = *to put under a ban*, לְ for, a person or thing, e.g. חָרַם לְפָנַי, *to consecrate to the sword for destruction*; חָרַם לַיהוָה, *to consecrate to the Lord for destruction*; when used alone it generally denotes, *to devote to punishment or destruction*, Isa. xxxiv. 2, 2 Kings xix. 11, Jer. li. 3; with חָרַם, Dan. xi. 44. Cf. the Hophal, Ex. xxii. 19; Lev. xxvii. 29; 2 Esdr. x. 8. Now the LXX. render this in some places by ἀνατιθέναι, Lev. xxvii. 28, 29, Mic. iv. 13; ἀναθεματίζειν, Num. xviii. 14, xxi. 2, 3, Deut. xiii. 15, Josh. vi. 21, Judg. i. 17, Dan. xi. 14 (= נָחַם, Hiphil, Deut. iii. 3), but elsewhere always by verbs signifying simply *destruction*, ἐρημοῦν, ἐξερημοῦν, ἀφανίζειν, ἀπολλύναι, ἐξολοθρεῖν, φονεύειν. This conception, which is not included in the word as used in profane Greek, belongs in Scripture to ἀνατιθέναι, so that, like the Hebrew, it means *to put under a ban* (Luther); but the LXX. use ἀνατιθέναι strictly perhaps only as the *vox media*, because they complete the conception by some addition; see Judg. i. 17, חָרַם אֶת־בְּנֵי חֶתְתִּי, ἀναθεμάτισαν αὐτὴν καὶ ἐξωλόθρευσαν αὐτήν; Lev. xxvii. 28, πᾶν δὲ ἀνάθεμα ὃ ἐὰν ἀναθῇ ἄνθρωπος τῷ κυρίῳ . . . οὐκ ἀποδώ-

σεται οὐδὲ λυτρώσεται. πᾶν ἀνάθεμα ἅγιον ἀγίων ἔσται τῷ κυρίῳ; ver. 29, καὶ πᾶν ἀνάθεμα ὃ ἐὰν ἀνατεθῇ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, οὐ λυτρωθήσεται, ἀλλὰ θανάτῳ θανατωθήσεται. Through the representation connected with the Hebrew אֲנָתָהּ , אָנָה , the derivative

Ἀνάθεμα, τό, receives its distinctive meaning in the N. T. It is properly a Hellenistic form of the Attic ἀνάθημα, *votive offering*, see Möris, ἀνάθημα ἀπτικῶς, ἀνάθεμα ἑλληνικῶς, and it occurs in this form, Plut. *Pelop.* 25. Also with the same meaning in 2 Macc. ii. 13, side by side with ἀνάθημα, 2 Macc. ix. 13. In the LXX. = אָנָה , and with the signification, a thing devoted to destruction, to ruin; Zech. xiv. 11, καὶ οὐκ ἔσται ἀνάθεμα ἔτι, καὶ κατοικήσει Ἱερουσαλὴμ πεποιθότως. Cf. Num. xxi. 3, ἀνεθεμάτισεν αὐτὸν καὶ τὰς πόλεις αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐπέκασαν τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ τόπου ἐκείνου ἀνάθεμα = אָנָה ; Judg. i. 17, ἐξολόθρευσαν αὐτοὺς, καὶ ἐκάλεσε τὸ ὄνομα τῆς πόλεως ἀνάθεμα. Elsewhere still, in Deut. vii. 26, xiii. 17, xx. 17, 18; 1 Chron. ii. 7; Josh. vii. 1, 12. The form ἀνάθημα, Lev. xxvii. 28, 29—a passage often misunderstood—is not sufficiently certified. אָנָה is elsewhere rendered by ἀπώλεια, Isa. xxxiv. 4; ἐξολόθρευμα, 1 Sam. xv. 21; ὀλέθριος, 1 Kings xx. 42; ἐκθλιβή, ἐκθλιψις, Mic. vii. 2. See also the rendering (according to the sense rather than the words) of Mal. iv. 6, μὴ ἔλθω πατάξω τὴν γῆν ἄρδην. It is observable that the LXX., in those texts where the meaning of אָנָה was doubtful, whether it meant consecrated to God, or given up and devoted to destruction for God's sake, used the words ἀφορισμα, ἀφορισμένον, Lev. xxvii. 21; Ezek. xliv. 29. It is now generally admitted, however, that אָנָה signifies *devoted to destruction*, something given up to death on account of God, as in Deut. xiii. 16–18; Num. xxi. 1–3. The texts urged on the other side, Lev. xxvii. 21, Ezek. xliv. 29, Num. xviii. 14, are explained by the distinction made in Lev. xxvii. 28, 29 between men and things as אָנָה : men who are אָנָה are to be put to death; but things are eventually given to the priests, they are *forfeited*, as we would say. See Deut. ii. 34; 1 Sam. xv. 3; Ezra x. 8. Of the *Cherem* it is said, “it is to be ἅγιον ἀγίων τῷ κυρίῳ,” Lev. xxvii. 28, meaning that it is to be set apart from all human fellowship or use, nothing being said as to its continuance or permanence. See Hengstenberg's *Christologie* on Mal. iii. 24, iii. 655 sqq.

In the N. T. we find ἀνάθημα used (Luke xxi. 5) to denote a consecrated gift, but ἀνάθεμα to denote what is given up to the curse and to destruction, accursed, Gal. i. 8, 9; 1 Cor. xvi. 22, εἴ τις οὐ φιλεῖ τὸν κύριον, ἦτω ἀνάθεμα; xii. 3, λέγει Ἀνάθεμα Ἰησοῦς; Rom. ix. 3, ἡχόμην γὰρ ἀνάθεμα εἶναι αὐτὸς ἐγὼ ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Some have supposed that ἀνάθεμα, in the last-named passage, simply denotes an act of church discipline, just as the Hebrew אָנָה sometimes signifies the second stage of excommunication from the synagogue (see, however, Gildemeister, quoted by Tholuck in his Commentary). But the words ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ (not merely παρὰ or ὑπὸ τ. Χριστοῦ) show that the reference is not to mere excommunication from the church, but to estrangement from Christ and His salvation; and the use of ἀνάθεμα elsewhere by Paul (1 Cor. xvi. 22;

Gal. i. 8, 9) shows that the word denotes not punishment intended as discipline, but *a being given over*, or *devotion to divine condemnation*. As to the thing meant, see Ex. xxxii. 32; Gal. iii. 13.

That ἀνάθεμα also denotes *an indissoluble vow*, "which, if made concerning a person, devotes him even to death" (Tholuck on Rom. ix. 3), cannot certainly be proved from Judg. xi. 31 sqq., where we have an instance not of an ἀνάθεμα, but of an ὀλοκαύτωμα, nor from 1 Sam. xiv. 24, cf. ver. 45 with Lev. xxvii. 29. Such voluntary vows concerning man do not appear in Scripture; and Acts xxiii. 14, ἀναθέματι ἀνεθεματίσαμεν ἑαυτοὺς μηδενὸς γεύσασθαι ἕως οὗ ἀποκτείνωμεν τὸν Παῦλον, may be explained by comparing Deut. xiii. 15, xx. 17, as the use of a strong word for a minor act, the ἀναθέματι ἀναθεματίζειν τινα being narrowed into the μηδ. γεύσ., or used to denote a fanaticism quite out of the range of Scripture sanction.—Ἀναθεματίζειν occurs also in Mark xiv. 71; Acts xxiii. 12, 14, 21; see ἀνατίθημι.

Διατίθημι, to place separately, to distribute, to arrange, *e.g.* ἀγῶνας. To appoint any one to a place, 2 Macc. ix. 28, ὡς ἑτέρους διέθηκεν, Xen., Plat., Lucian, and others. Usually in the middle in biblical Greek = to dispose of or arrange for one's self, *e.g.* to set out one's goods for sale, to arrange or deliver one's discourse. Commonly = to arrange and dispose of one's effects by will and testament; often in Plato, Aeschin., Aristotle, etc., with and without διαθήκη. Thus in Heb. ix. 16, 17, ὅπου γὰρ διαθήκη, θάνατον ἀνάγκη φέρεσθαι τοῦ διαθεμένου· διαθήκη γὰρ ἐπὶ νεκροῖς βεβαία, ἐπεὶ μή ποτε ἰσχύει ὅτε ζῇ ὁ διαθέμενος. Followed by the dative of the person = to bequeath a thing to any one, as in Luke xxii. 29, καὶ γὰρ διατίθεμαι ὑμῖν, καθὼς διέθετό μοι ὁ πατήρ μου βασιλείαν, ἵνα ἔσθητε κ.τ.λ. Cf. Joseph. *Antt.* xiii. 16. 1, τὴν βασιλείαν εἰς τὴν Ἀλεξάνδραν διέθετο = to allot or assign. We also find the expression νόμον διατίθεσθαι, Wisd. xviii. 9, κρυφῇ γὰρ ἐθυσίαζον ὅσοι παῖδες ἀγαθῶν, καὶ τὸν τῆς θειότητος νόμον ἐν ὁμονοίᾳ διέθεντο, τῶν αὐτῶν ὁμοίως καὶ ἀγαθῶν καὶ κινδύνων μεταλήψεσθαι τοὺς ἀγίους. It is clear that this does not simply correspond with νόμον τιθέναι, to institute laws, or νόμον τιθέσθαι, to give laws for one's self or for the state, in classical Greek; and it cannot therefore be explained according to Judith v. 18, ἀπέστησαν ἀπὸ τῆς ὁδοῦ ἧς διέθετο αὐτοῖς, where it is = to direct, to appoint. The accusative, with infinitive which follows, shows that it must be = to come to an agreement with; it cannot mean to carry out, to execute, on account of the future infinitive. See also Plat. *Legg.* viii. 834 A, διαθεμένους αὐτὰ περὶ τούτων νόμους, the only recognised passage in classical Greek, and here the word means to harmonize laws, cf. 833 E, ξυννομοθετεῖν, to give laws jointly or in common. But διατίθεναι νόμους is in Strabo = to ordain laws, cf. Plat. *Legg.* i. 624 A, θεὸς ἢ τις ἀνθρώπων ὑμῖν εἵληφε τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς τῶν νόμων διαθέσεως. The middle, with the idea of arrangement or agreement, is found in Xen. *Mem.* ii. 6. 23, δύνανται δὲ καὶ τὴν ἔριν οὐ μόνον ἀλύπως, ἀλλὰ καὶ συμφερόντως ἀλλήλοις διατίθεσθαι; and also Aristoph. *Av.* 440, ἦν μὴ διάβωνται διαθήκην ἐμοί. Cf. Appian, *Civ.* ii. 8, διαθέμενος τοὺς ἐνοχλοῦντας = to come

to terms with one's creditors. This use of διατίθεσθαι is important in its bearing upon the Scripture use of διαθήκη, διαθήκην, διατίθεσθαι τινι, Heb. viii. 10 ; πρὸς τινα, Acts iii. 25, Heb. x. 16, cf. 1 Macc. i. 11, διαθώμεθα διαθήκην μετὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν τῶν κύκλω ἡμῶν ; 2 Sam. x. 19, לַיְיָ־חַוֵּֽל־בְּיָדֵינוּ־לְעַלְמֵי־עַד, LXX, ἡντομόλησαν μετὰ Ἰσραήλ, *complot.* διέθεντο διαθήκην.

Διαθήκη, ἡ, in profane Greek always signifies the disposition which a person makes of his property in prospect of death, *i.e.* testament ; this is its meaning when used either in the singular or plural, αἱ διαθήκαι being the testamentary arrangements of a person (Isoc., Isaeus, Dem.), *e.g.* ταύτας τὰς διαθήκας διέθετο (Isaeus). St. Paul takes the word thus in Gal. iii. 15, ἀνθρώπου κεκυρωμένην διαθήκην οὐδεὶς ἀθετεῖ ἢ ἐπιδιατάσσεται ; ver. 17, διαθήκη προκεκυρωμένη ὑπὸ θεοῦ, parallel and synonymously with ἡ ἐπαγγελία. So also in the Hebrews, ix. 16, 17, ὅπου γὰρ διαθήκη, θάνατον ἀνάγκη φέρεσθαι τοῦ διαθεμένου· διαθήκη γὰρ ἐπὶ νεκροῖς βεβαία, ἐπεὶ μὴ ποτε ἰσχύει ὅτε ζῇ ὁ διαθέμενος. Accordingly we may render also the plural in Rom. ix. 4 as = testament, ὧν ἡ υἰοθεσία καὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ αἱ διαθήκαι καὶ ἡ νομοθεσία καὶ ἡ λατρεία καὶ αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι ; Eph. ii. 12, ξένοι τῶν διαθηκῶν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας. Comp. Ecclus. xlv. 18, διαθήκαι αἰῶνος ἐτέθησαν πρὸς τὸν Νῶε, ἵνα ἐξαλειφθῇ κατακλυσμῷ πᾶσα σάρξ. But see Wisd. xviii. 22, 2 Macc. viii. 15, where διαθήκαι mean manifold covenants. In the LXX. and in the texts quoted from the Hebrews, as well as in St. Paul's writings, διαθήκη is a translation of the O. T. word בְּרִית, but it is doubtful whether the word testament corresponds with this O. T. word. בְּרִית usually signifies covenant, agreement ; but D. Schulz and Hofmann render it institution, ordainment, *i.e.* divine ordainment, for the latter says (*Schriftbeweis*, i. 415), “ בְּרִית, like עֲוֶה or קֹה, may be the will which ordains or appoints a relationship either in the form of a promise or a command, and this even where it refers to a mutual relationship or bearing, as in 2 Kings xi. 17, הָכֵרְתָּ יְהוֹדָע, אֶת־הַבְּרִית בֵּין יְהוָה וּבֵין הַפִּלְזִים וּבֵין הָעַם לִהְיוֹת לָעַם לַיהוָה ; whereas in 2 Chron. xxxiv. 31, which is said to tell specially in favour of the signification covenant, בְּרִית לְלִבְתָּ אֲהָרִי יְהוָה, clearly is nothing but a promise or vow, as is evident from the words וַיִּכְרֹת הַבְּרִית לִפְנֵי יְהוָה. Thus Hofmann explains the word by bringing בְּרִית into connection with בָּרָא, with the meaning of חָק (Ezek. xxi. 24), so that “ בְּרִית and חָק may be regarded as kindred conceptions.” Delitzsch, however (on Heb. vii. 22), pronounces this explanation simply and directly erroneous, “ because a verb, בָּרָא, meaning to establish or determine, as syn. with חָק, cannot be proved, either etymologically or by usage, to exist.”

A threefold inquiry is thus suggested ; first, what is the signification of the Hebrew word בְּרִית, not only in and for itself, but as a *term. techn.* ? Secondly, what does διαθήκη, as used in the LXX. as a translation of בְּרִית, signify ? Thirdly, in what relation does the N. T. διαθήκη stand to this ?

First, as to the meaning of בְּרִית, all lexicographers, and almost all O. T. expositors (at least with very few exceptions), agree in rendering it primarily and mainly as = covenant, agreement. It is derived from the unused verb בָּרַח = to cut, which occurs, however, with

the signification *to select, to choose out*, in 1 Sam. xvii. 18; in Arabic it has the meaning *to cut*, and corresponds with ברא, *to create*, originally *to cut, to form*, see Ezek. xxi. 24. Hence we have the phrase ברית ברת, *to make a covenant*, in connection with the custom of cutting in two or dividing the victims in covenants, Gen. xv. 9-18, as also the parallel חוה, Isa. xxviii. 15, ἐποιήσαμεν διαθήκην μετὰ τοῦ ἄδου, καὶ μετὰ τοῦ θανάτου συνθήκας; see חוה, Isa. xxviii. 18, which is in like manner to be derived from חוה, *to divide*. Still Hofmann is right in making ברא, Ezek. xxi. 24, synonymous with חקק, in so far as the fundamental meaning of חקק, *to cut*, is akin with *to divide*, as ברא is with ברה. But to infer from this that ברית is synon. with חק, *ordainment, statute*, is a hasty inference, not justified by usage; and when Hofmann says that ברית, like עדות or קח, may be explained as “will, which ordains some relation either by way of promise or command,” he introduces an element inadmissible upon his derivation, namely, *the setting up or ordainment of a relationship*; and yet this is the characteristic feature of the conception. Still this unintentional admission may be regarded as a confirmation of the fact that in the meaning of ברית reference is made *to the setting up of a relationship*, not of a state nor of a behaviour. When Hofmann further refers to Isa. xlii. 6, where the servant of Jehovah, as a personal law to the people of God, is called ברית, this explanation is quite inappropriate and forced when applied to the other passage, Jer. xlix. 8. He cannot understand how circumcision in Gen. xvii. 13 can be called ברית in the sense of *covenant*; but a glance at the context, vv. 9-12, will show that it is called ברית simply because it is said to be אות ברית ביני וביניכם, ver. 11. Compare Gen. ix. 10, 12, 13, 15, 16. It is indeed a mistake to suppose that ברית always expresses emphatically a mutual relationship between two parties, because for the conception of a covenant it is quite indifferent whether the relationship is mutual, as in Gen. xvii. 9-11, xxi. 27, or whether the relation is on one side only towards another, as in Lev. xxvi. 45; Deut. iv. 31; Isa. ix. 15; 1 Sam. xi. 1; 2 Sam. xxiii. 5; Gen. xiv. 13, and other places. Compare Lev. xxvi. 45, Ex. xxiii. 32, with Judg. viii. 33. The phrase ברית צוה, Jer. xi. 5, Josh. xxiii. 16, 1 Chron. xvi. 15-17, does not sanction the signification *will or pleasure*, any more than עבר ברית, *and others*, comp. Ps. cv. 8 sqq. On the contrary, we read indeed, for example, חקים ברית, Gen. vi. 18, ix. 9, 11, and elsewhere, but not חקים חוה; comp. Jer. xxxiv. 18, חקים אֶת־דְּבַר הַבְּרִית. — Other texts which seem to favour the meaning *settlement or ordainment*, such as Josh. xxiv. 25, may be explained by comparison with such parallels as 2 Chron. xxiii. 16 and Num. xxv. 13, וְהִנֵּנִי נָתַן לֹא אֶת־בְּרִיתִי שָׁלֵם, compared with ver. 12, בְּרִית כְּהֵנֶת עֹלָם; Ecclus. xlv. 7, 15. When the sanctity of the Sabbath is in the Decalogue specially insisted upon as בְּרִית עֹלָם, Ex. xxxi. 16, and the shew-bread, Lev. xxiv. 8, and the salt of the sacrifice, Lev. ii. 13, are described as בְּרִית מֶלֶךְ, בְּרִית אֱלֹהִים in these places can no more mean *enactment, ordainment, institution*, than can בְּרִית מֶלֶךְ in Num. xviii. 19, 2 Chron. xiii. 5. They are really parallel with Gen. xvii. 13, and Num. xviii. 19 may be compared with xxv. 12, 13. Nor can this meaning be inferred from the names given to the ark of the covenant and the tables of the law, both אֶרֶץ הַבְּרִית, אֶרֶץ הַבְּרִית, and אֶרֶץ הָעֵדוּת, אֶרֶץ הָעֵדוּת, see 1 Kings

viii. 21, אֶרֶן אִשְׁרָשָׁם בְּרִית יְהוָה אִשֶּׁר כָּרַת עִם־אַבְרָהָם; Deut. xxxi. 26, לִקַּח אֶת סֵפֶר הַתּוֹרָה הַזֶּה; For it cannot be lost sight of that the Torah or the book of the Torah (Ex. xxiv. 7) may be called סֵפֶר הַבְּרִית without בְּרִית and עֲרֹזָה or תּוֹרָה being synonymous.

There are, in fact, a great many passages in which בְּרִית cannot mean anything but **covenant**, and in which there is no trace whatever of the supposed primary or still existing signification *ordainment* or *will*; and if, moreover, בְּרִית is said to have this latter meaning precisely where it stands as a *term. techn.*, a union of both meanings must appear impossible. See, *e.g.*, 1 Sam. xvii. 3, xxiii. 18; 1 Kings xx. 34. The word, where it first occurs, Gen. vi. 18, indisputably signifies **covenant**; and this meaning is also the simplest in Gen. ix. 9, compare with vv. 11 sqq.,—**covenant**, which is established by the conduct of God towards men,—and not, as Hofmann would explain it, a parallel with Ps. ii. 7. The word means *covenant* again in Gen. xiv. 13. So also in Gen. xv. 9–18, xvii. 9–11, xxi. 27, 32, xxvi. 28, xxxi. 44; Ex. xxiii. 32; Deut. vii. 2. In Gen. xv. 18 it is not the promise that is called בְּרִית, but בְּרִית is the *covenant relation* of God to Abraham, into which He enters by means of the promise, just as in Ex. xxxiv. 27 and Deut. iv. 23 it is the covenant relation which He establishes with Israel, cf. Ex. xxxiv. 27, עַל־פִּי הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה, בְּרִיתִי אֲחִיד בְּרִית, according to the direction of these words, etc. The prepositions עִם, אֶת, which so often occur, likewise show that the meaning must be **covenant**. The meaning *vow*, which is maintained for 2 Chron. xxxiv. 31, Ezra x. 3, may be met by a comparison of like applications of the word, such as Job xxxi. 1, compare also and particularly, Jer. xxxiv. 18; and when mention is made of a בְּרִית in God's promises, the word never means the promise itself, but the relationship into which God enters with His people, in which He will act towards His people in accordance with His promise, comp. Isa. lv. 3, Jer. xxxi. 31, or the promise itself as the expression of the covenant.

In a word, we must affirm that בְּרִית, as a *term. techn.*, signifies primarily the **covenant relation into which God has entered, or will enter, with Israel, then the relation into which Israel enters with God**; see Jer. xxii. 9 compared with Ex. xxiii. 32, Jer. xxxiv. 18; and, correspondingly, next, the *twofold and mutual relationship*; thus, finally, the *stipulations or promises* which are given as signs, which set forth and embody the covenant, in which the covenant is expressed. The primary meaning is the most frequent; and when the covenant of God or of Jehovah is so often spoken of, it does not mean primarily the twofold and mutual relationship, but rather the **covenant which God on His part enters into, in which He chooses His people**. This priority of God's part is very important in its bearing upon *διαθήκη* in the N. T., and in a less degree upon *διαθήκη* in the LXX.

The LXX. usually render בְּרִית by *διαθήκη*, except in 1 Kings xi. 11, where it is = *ἐντολή*, and Deut. ix. 15 = *μαρτύριον*, a substitution accounted for by the context. When this rendering of בְּרִית by *διαθήκη* is taken as a proof that בְּרִית signifies *ordainment*, it is forgotten that *διαθήκη* is not at all used in this very general sense in profane Greek. We only find it thus used, and this not fully, in Ecclus. xxxviii. 33, *διαθήκη κληματος* = *rule*

or order of judgment, and Ecclus. xlv. 17, ἔδωκεν . . . ἐξουσίαν ἐν διαθήκαις κριμάτων. It only signifies either a *testament* or *agreement*. Further, it would be strange that the LXX., contrary to their usual practice, should never, except in the two texts named, render it by those words which answer to its supposed synonyms בְּרִית and עֲוֵלָה. And, lastly, the signification *agreement* or *covenant*, for διαθήκη, is clear from those texts where בְּרִית is unquestionably used in this sense; see 1 Kings xx. 34, ἐν διαθήκῃ ἀποστελῶ σε· καὶ διέθετο αὐτῷ διαθήκην καὶ ἐξαπέστειλεν αὐτόν; Isa. xxviii. 15, ἐποιήσαμεν διαθήκην μετὰ τοῦ ἄδου, καὶ μετὰ τοῦ θανάτου συνθήκας; and especially from 1 Sam. xviii. 3, διέθετο Ἰωναθὰν καὶ Δαυὶδ ἐν τῷ ἀγαπᾶν αὐτόν = בְּרִית יְדֻד וְחֶן יְחֻד, where διατίθεσθαι = to make an agreement with, to unite and agree, see διατίθημι. Comp. also 1 Macc. i. 11, xi. 9. The διαθήκη of the LXX. thus corresponds with that of the quotation already given from Aristophanes, signifying *agreement*. See also Zech. xi. 14, where διαθήκη is = חֶן, fraternization. When it is = עֲוֵלָה (see Ezek. xxxi. 7), it may be explained, like Deut. ix. 15, as a mistake that might easily occur, cf. Josh. iv. 15, הָאֵלֶּה הֵיוּ הַיָּמִים הַלְלוֹתָם הַיָּמִים הַלְלוֹתָם = ἡ κιβωτὸς τῆς διαθήκης τοῦ μαρτυρίου.—It is of importance to observe how in the Apocrypha διαθήκη is indisputably used to signify *covenant*. Thus Ecclus. xlv. 20, Ἀβραὰμ συνετήρησε νόμον ὑψίστου, καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν διαθήκῃ μετ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐν σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ ἔστησε διαθήκην, see ver. 22. The fact that the LXX. have not preferred the elsewhere adopted συνθήκη,—this with them very seldom appears (Isa. xxviii. 15 = חֶן; Dan. xi. 6; Isa. xxx. 1),—while Aqu., Symm., Theod. often render בְּרִית by it, can hardly be explained except by the fact that בְּרִית so generally denoted only God's side of the covenant relation, and συνθήκη was, on this account, regarded as a less appropriate rendering. Observing that Philo does not use διαθήκη as = *covenant*, we may, perhaps, descry in this an attempt on the part of the LXX. to use a special word for a special biblical expression; and, further, observing that Philo adopted the διαθήκη of the LXX., but always uses it in the sense of *disposal of property* or *testament*, we perceive how the LXX. succeeded in their attempt, but at the cost of introducing a change of conception. That they were led to this rendering of בְּרִית by the frequent reference of this word to God's part only, is confirmed even by Philo's use of διαθήκη, which he adopts as the symbol of the divine χάρις (see Delitzsch on Heb. vii. 22).

As Philo adopts the διαθήκη of the LXX. as = *testament*, we cannot think it strange that in the N. T. the διαθήκη of the Old was taken as signifying *testament*, especially as the O. T. הַבְּרִית would be remembered in connection with the Greek διαθήκη (see κληρος). It is questionable, however, whether the meaning *testament* can be retained in all the N. T. texts. Judging from Heb. ix. 17, 20, cf. ver. 15, it does not seem that the διαθήκης ἑγγυος and μεσίτης of that Epistle (see vii. 22, viii. 6, ix. 15, xii. 24) forbid this rendering, as Delitzsch thinks; and as the διαθήκη of chap. ix. 17, so often mentioned (vii. 22, viii. 6, 8, 9, 10, ix. 4, 15, 16), so clearly and unquestionably signifies *testament*, it seems best to take this as the meaning of the word throughout the Epistle. The same holds of διαθήκη as used by St. Paul. In Gal. iii. 15, 17, the בְּרִית of the O. T. is quite

as a matter of course taken to mean *διαθήκη* in the sense of *testament*, and it seems best to explain the word thus in the other passages, viz. Rom. ix. 4, xi. 27; 1 Cor. xi. 25; 2 Cor. iii. 6, 14; Gal. iv. 24; Eph. ii. 12; and this all the more remembering that, from Philo's use of the word, we may infer that *διαθήκη* as naturalized by the LXX. was thus taken. The substance of the *διαθήκη* was thus regarded as embodied in the promises, Gal. iii. 15–18, Eph. ii. 12; and as in the N. T. the idea of *sonship* took the place of that of *covenant*, this is just what we should have expected. The expression, moreover, *πλάκες τῆς διαθήκης*, and the idea of a written covenant (2 Cor. iii. 14, cf. ver. 6), codified in the collected writings of the O. T., in like manner suggested *διαθήκη* with the meaning *testament*. But while we find in St. Paul, in the Hebrews, and in Philo, that *διαθήκη* is = *testament*, there are passages in the N. T. where the word occurs rather in the other sense, viz. Matt. xxvi. 28; Mark xiv. 24; Luke i. 72, xxii. 20; Acts iii. 25, vii. 8; Rev. xi. 19. The only choice, however, is between *covenant* and *testament*. In the Apocrypha *διαθήκη* means *covenant*, not *testament*; and if we thus explain such kindred passages as Luke i. 72, Acts iii. 25, vii. 8, we must suppose an alternation of meanings suggested by biblical usage elsewhere, varying with circumstances and with the progress of thought. This perhaps was suggested by the plural *διαθήκαι*, Eph. ii. 12; Rom. ix. 4, cf. Wisd. xviii. 22; 2 Macc. viii. 15; see above. Finally, Bengel's words on Matt. xxvi. 8 are worthy of consideration,—“*Ipsa vocabula בְּרִית et διαθήκη differunt, eamque habent differentiam, quae rei ipsi mirabiliter respondet, nam בְּרִית magis congruit oeconomiae veteri, quae habet formam foederis; διαθήκη oeconomiae novae, quae habet formam testamenti.*—*Foederis autem ratio non ita congruit cum plena filiatione, quae est in N. T.*”

Προτίθημι, to set or lay before, (I.) in a local and literal sense, e.g. meat, a goal, etc., to put forth to view, or *openly to display*; often also in the middle, e.g. Herod. iii. 148, *ποτήρια χρύσεια προθεῖτο*; Herodian, vi. 6. 2, *τὰς εἰκόνας Μαξίμου καὶ Βαλβίνου*, for veneration.—So Rom. iii. 25, *ὃν προέθετο ὁ θεὸς ἱλαστήριον*.—(II.) The local signification figuratively applied, to establish or ordain, a goal, a punishment, a reward, etc. In the middle, to set before oneself, to purpose, Rom. i. 13; Eph. i. 9.

Πρόθεσις, ἡ, (I.) a setting forth, a setting up, an exposition, Heb. ix. 2, *ἡ πρόθεσις τῶν ἁρτῶν*; Matt. xii. 4, *οἱ ἄρτοι τῆς προθέσεως*, as in Mark ii. 26; Luke vi. 4; Hebrew, *הַמִּצְוָה הַזֶּה הָיָה לְפָנֶיךָ*, Ex. xxv. 30; 1 Chron. ix. 32.—(II.) Purpose, resolve, design, e.g. *κατὰ πρόθεσιν ἐψευσμένος*, Polyb. xii. 11. 6, who often uses the word; i. 54. 1, *τὰ κατὰ τὴν πρόθεσιν ἀπετέλεσαν*. The notion of time is not in the preposition, but the meaning is derived from its literal and local import, just as in *προτίθασθαι*. Thus it is = thought or purpose, in Acts xi. 23, *ἡ πρόθεσις τῆς καρδίας*; xxvii. 13, *τῆς προθέσεως κεκρατηκέναι*. Of the purpose of God exclusively with reference to salvation, 2 Tim. i. 9, *τοῦ σώσαντος ἡμᾶς καὶ καλέσαντος . . . οὐ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα ἡμῶν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ ἰδίαν πρόθεσιν καὶ χάριν*. Hence Rom. viii. 28, *οἱ κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοί*; ix. 11, *ἡ κατ' ἐκλογὴν πρόθ.*, synonymously with *εὐδοκία*, Eph. i. 8, 9. The reference to time is not contained in the word itself, but is

expressed by other and additional words; *e.g.* Eph. i. 11, προορισθέντες κατὰ πρόθεσιν; iii. 11, κατὰ πρόθεσιν τῶν αἰώνων = αἰώνιος, cf. 1 Esdr. iv. 40, ἡ μεγαλειότης τῶν πάντων αἰώνων. — Also = intention, *e.g.* Pol. iv. 73. 2, ἡ πρ., ἣν ἔχει πρὸς τινα. So perhaps 1 Tim. iii. 10; but see Acts xi. 23, παρεκάλει πάντας τῇ προθέσει τῆς καρδίας προσμένειν τῷ κυρίῳ.

Τίκτω, τέξομαι, ἔτεκον, τέτοκα, to bear, to bring forth, Matt. i. 21, 23, 25, ii. 2, etc.

Τέκνον, τό, child, Matt. ii. 18, and frequently; distinguished from υἱός in that τέκνον expresses the origin, υἱός the fellowship of life. Often in profane Greek as the familiar name used by older men to the younger, cf. 1 Sam. iii. 16; in Holy Scripture, not only with reference to difference of age, but on the ground of authority or of love, Matt. ix. 2; Mark ii. 5, x. 24; Matt. xxi. 28; Luke ii. 48, xv. 31, xvi. 25. St. Paul thus uses it in his letters to Timothy, 1 Tim. i. 18; 2 Tim. ii. 1 (where, however, another reference is traceable; see below). See also St. John's τέκνια, John xiii. 33; 1 John ii. 1, 12, 28, iii. 7, 18, iv. 4, v. 21; and by St. Paul, Gal. iv. 19. This corresponds with Hebrew usage, according to which יָלַד, נָסַב denote generally the relation of dependence (*fixedness* or *limitation*), and property or character, *e.g.* הָיָה לְיִשְׂרָאֵל, Ezra iv. 1; הָיָה לְיִשְׂרָאֵל, Ps. lxxix. 11; הָיָה לְיִשְׂרָאֵל, lxxxix. 23, and others. These two—the derivation of the person's nature, and, as following therefrom, his belongings—are implied in the expression, though sometimes the one and sometimes the other element is prominent. Both equally are implied and distinguished in Rom. ix. 7, 8, οὐ τὰ τέκνα τῆς σαρκὸς, ταῦτα τὰ τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ ἀλλὰ τὰ τέκνα τῆς ἐπαγγελίας λογίζεται εἰς σπέρμα, where τ. τοῦ θεοῦ denotes distinctive property, and τ. τῆς σαρκὸς . . . τῆς ἐπαγγελίας tells us whence the distinctive kinship is derived; see Gal. iv. 28, 31; John viii. 39, εἰ τέκνα τοῦ Ἀβραάμ ἦτε, τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Ἀβραάμ ἐποιεῖτε.

(I.) This tracing back of any one's distinctive nature to its source appears comparatively seldom. We find it in Eph. v. 8, ὡς τέκνα φωτὸς περιπατεῖτε, cf. ii. 2, υἱοὶ ἀπειθείας, and see υἱός; τέκνα ἀδικίας, Hos. x. 9, cf. Eph. v. 1, γίνεσθε οὖν μιμηταὶ τοῦ θεοῦ ὡς τέκνα ἀγαπητά. It is especially prominent in St. John's expression τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ, 1 John iii. 10, v. 2, as contrasted with τὰ τέκνα τοῦ διαβόλου, parallel with ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἐκ τοῦ διαβ., vv. 8, 10; cf. ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ γεγέννησθαι, v. 1; τὸ σπέρμα τοῦ θεοῦ, iii. 9. See also Phil. ii. 15. (Still this is not the only element of St. John's conception of τέκνα. The element of *character* or *what belongs to one* is prominent in 1 John iii. 1, 2, John i. 12, xi. 52, just as in St. Paul.)

Upon this representation it is that the position of the disciple or the church to its teacher or apostle is expressed by τέκνον. It denotes the dependence which has its foundation in the influence which determines the idiosyncrasy. See Philem. 10, περὶ τοῦ ἐμοῦ τέκνου, ὃν ἐγέννησα ἐν τοῖς δεσμοῖς; 1 Tim. i. 2, Τιμοθέε γνησίῳ τέκνῳ ἐν πίστει; Tit. i. 4, γνησίῳ τέκνῳ κατὰ κοινὴν πίστιν; 1 Cor. iv. 14, 17; 2 Tim. i. 2; 3 John 4; Rev. ii. 23. — Cf. John viii. 39, εἰ τέκνα τοῦ Ἀβραάμ ἦτε, τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Ἀβραάμ ἐποιεῖτε;

cf. 1 Pet. iii. 6, ἥς (Σάρρας) ἐγενήθητε τέκνα. — Akin to this are the expressions *παῖδες μουσικῶν, φιλοσόφων, ῥητόρων*, occasionally to be met with in classical Greek, which, however, merely stand for the simple *ῥήτορες*, etc.

(II.) Now the other element in the conception, viz. that of **character** or **belongings**, rests upon this dependence and tracing back of origin, nature, etc., and often appears as the main element in these expressions borrowed from the relation of children. Thus, *e.g.*, *children of Jerusalem*, Matt. xxiii. 37; Luke xiii. 34, xix. 44, cf. Gal. iv. 25 sqq.; Ps. cxlix. 2; Ezek. xvi. 28. Comp. also the name given to the servants in Gen. xv. 3, בְּנֵי-בְרִית. The expression implies a real, essential, and effective dependence, by virtue of which alone this idiosyncrasy exists, otherwise it could not be designated by this expression. What one person is leads back to another. The special and distinctive property which the relation of children implies, and which is not merely fellowship, is always expressed by the word; and this is evident from such phrases as בְּנֵי-חַיָּה, 1 Sam. xx. 31, *child of death*; בֶּן-חַיָּה, Deut. xxv. 2; בְּנֵי-עֵינִי, Prov. xxxi. 5; בְּנֵי-הַנֶּחֱלָה, Ezra iv. 1; Jer. xvii. 19, בְּנֵי-הָעֵץ, *et al.*; Isa. lvii. 4, τέκνα ἀπωλείας (Hebrew נַפְשֵׁי-יִשְׂרָאֵל corresponds with τέκνα φωτός, Eph. v. 8). See for more examples, *υἱός*. So *κατάρας τέκνα*, 2 Pet. ii. 14; *τέκνα φύσει ὀργῆς*, Eph. ii. 3 (*vid.* ὀργή). In particular, the Pauline *τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ*, Rom. viii. 16, 17, 21, ix. 8, and in John i. 12, xi. 52; 1 John iii. 1, 2. Cf. Ps. lxxx. 16; Ex. iv. 22, υἱὸς πρωτότοκός μου Ἰσραήλ. The *τέκνα ὑπακοῆς*, 1 Pet. i. 14, cannot be taken as an example, because the *ὑπακ.* is a Hebraistic genitive of quality, *obedient children*. The people of Israel are called *τέκνα σοφίας*, Luke vii. 35, Matt. xi. 19, not because they really had become what they might have been through the influence of divine wisdom, but in order (though they were not this) to give prominence to the relation in which they stood to that wisdom; like the analogous phrase *υἱοὶ τῆς βασιλείας*, Matt. viii. 12; see *δικαιώω*. In this last-named phrase the idea of *property* or *character* is prominent; but in *τέκνα σοφίας* that of dependence warrants the use of the term, though the design is to give prominence to the relation in which Israel stood to divine wisdom. There is this difference between *υἱός* and *τέκνον* in these connections, that the latter is never used in the singular, but the former occurs both in the singular and plural, and expresses the individual relationship. See Winer, § xxxiv. 3. 3.

Πρωτότοκος, first-born, rarely in profane Greek. In the LXX. = בְּכֹרִית, as a substantive, *ὁ, ἡ πρωτότοκος*, and *τὰ πρωτότοκα*, *the first-born collectively*, Heb. xi. 28; Ex. xi. 15; Gen. xxv. 31; Deut. xii. 17. — (I.) As an adj. joined to *υἱός*, Matt. i. 25, Luke ii. 7, *ἔτεκεν τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς τὸν πρωτότοκον*, which, from the connection, is evidently added to give prominence to the virginity of the mother of Jesus hitherto, cf. the ordinary addition in the O. T., *διανοῖγον μήτρην*, Ex. xiii. 2, 15, xxxiv. 19, and often. According to the laws of the O. T., the first-born male was holy to Jehovah, and had to be redeemed, Num. xviii.; Luke ii. 23, 24. The first-born son also has special rights as the head of the family and the heir, Gen. xxv. 31, xlix. 3; 2 Chron. xxi. 3, cf. Luke i. 32. — (II.)

As a substantive, ὁ πρωτότοκος, the first-born, a name given to Christ, with various attributes, ὁ πρ. ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, Col. i. 18 ; τῶν νεκρῶν, Rev. i. 5 ; with reference to His pre-eminence or priority as asserted in His resurrection, Col. i. 18, ἵνα γένηται ἐν πᾶσιν αὐτὸς πρωτεύων ; 1 Cor. xv. 20, ἀπαρχὴ τῶν κεκοιμημένων. His priority and pre-eminence are also referred to in Rom. viii. 29, . . . προώρισεν συμμόρφους τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν πρωτότοκον ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς. According to Col. i. 15, Christ holds the same relation to all creation ; not that He is included as part of the creation, but that the relation of the whole creation to Him is determined by the fact that He is πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως, so that without Him creation could not be, see ver. 16. It is not said of Christ that He was κτισθείς, nor of the creation that it was τεχθείσα ; and this is specially explained by the fact that the relationship as to time, in which He stands to creation, and which is quite a different and far more general one than that of the precedence of a first-born, is specially brought in after ver. 17, a verse which has no sense if πρωτότοκος does not denote Christ's superiority in dignity as well as in time. The καὶ αὐτὸς ἔστιν πρὸ πάντων, ver. 17, shows that πρωτότοκος does not merely imply precedence in point of time, as if Christ were the beginning of a series of creations. The clearer and more definite our views, the less illusory will expressions such as this be. In Heb. i. 6, Christ is called ὁ πρωτότοκος, without any further qualification, ὅταν δὲ πάλιν εἰσαγάγῃ τὸν πρωτότοκον εἰς τὴν οἰκουμένην ; and here, as in ver. 5, the distinction between υἱός and ἄγγελος is referred to, and in ver. 6 this distinction is recognised. With reference to the angels, we are led to conclude that πρωτότοκος is here used instead of υἱός on account of this superiority, so that we here have before us a mode of expression analogous to that of Col. i. 15, for the relationship of γεγέννηκα, of "being born" of God, can no more be applied to the angels than to the κτίσις generally. The reference, therefore, to the resurrection, to the πρωτότοκος ἐκ νεκρῶν or πρ. ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς, Rom. viii. 29 (see Hofmann, Delitzsch, Stier), is unnecessary here—at least the former.—Whether implied in this apostolic designation or not, the remark of Pressel (in Herzog's *Realencykl.* iv. 146) is important, "The N. T. represents both the responsibilities and the rights of primogeniture as blended in Christ."

In Heb. xii. 23 the Christian church is called ἐκκλησία πρωτοτόκων ἀπογεγραμμένων ἐν οὐρανοῖς, as holding a relationship to God analogous to that of Israel, Ex. iv. 22, *Israel is my first-born son*, and perhaps as also holding a special relationship to all other creatures, Jas. i. 18, εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἡμᾶς ἀπαρχὴν τινα τῶν αὐτοῦ κτισμάτων. Cf. Heb. xii. 16.

Τύπτω, ἔτυπον, to strike, Matt. xxiv. 49, and often ; to injure, to wound, 1 Cor. viii. 12.

Τύπος, ὁ, (I.) stroke ; (II.) the impression left by a stroke, a trace, print, John xx. 25, τ. τῶν ἥλων, parallel with τόπος τῶν ἡλ. Often in profane Greek, τ. τῶν ὀδόντων, τῶν πλεγῶν κ.τ.λ. Hence it is used of the stamping of coin, the impression of pictures, of

any engraving or hewn out work of art, cf. Pol. ix. 10, *γραφαὶ καὶ τύποι*, *pictures and sculpture*; in Isoc. 204b both these are called *τύποι*. Often = a monument or statue, Anth. xii. 57. 2, *μορφᾶς κωφὸς τύπος*; Herod. ii. 86, *ξύλινος τύπος ἀνθρωποειδής*. So Acts vii. 43, *τοὺς τύπους, οὓς ἐποιήσατε προσκυνεῖν αὐτοῖς*, Amos v. 26 = עֲצָוֹת. Hence in general, *image, form*, always with a statement of the object, *ὄψεος τύπον ἀλλάσσειν*, Eur. *Bacch.* 1332; Diod. i. 24, *Ἰὼ εἰς βοὸς τύπον μεταποιηθεῖσαι*. Akin to this is the signification, *pattern, model*, cf. Plat. *Rep.* vi. 396 C, *αὐτὸν ἐκμάττειν τε καὶ ἐνιστάναι εἰς τοὺς κακίωνων τύπους*; ii. 383b, *τοὺς τύπους τούτους ξυγχωρῶ καὶ ὡς νόμοις ἂν χροῖμην*, though it has not directly this meaning, cf. ii. 383a, *τοῦτον δεύτερον τύπον εἶναι ἐν ᾧ δεῖ περὶ θεῶν καὶ λέγειν καὶ ποιεῖν*; still it may be rendered, as in N. T. Greek, *type*, the meaning which it always has in the N. T., except in a few places; 2 Thess. iii. 9, *ἵνα ἑαυτοὺς τύπον δώμεν ὑμῖν εἰς τὸ μιμεῖσθαι ἡμᾶς*; 1 Tim. iv. 12; Tit. ii. 7; 1 Thess. i. 7; Phil. iii. 17; 1 Pet. v. 3; Acts vii. 44, *ποιῆσαι τὴν σκηνὴν κατὰ τὸν τύπον ὃν ἑώρακει*; Heb. viii. 5, corresponding with Ex. xxv. 40, עֲצֹנָה. The further word *πρωτότυπος* has not exactly this meaning; it signifies *prototype, the original*; but *ἀντίτυπος*, which sometimes signifies *copy*, favours this sense. The word is also used to signify a prophetic type, *i.e. an image or similitude which is essentially intended as a type or pattern*. Thus of Adam, Rom. v. 14, *ὅς ἐστι τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος*, 1 Cor. x. 6, 11. Cf. Philo, *de opif. mund.* 36 C, *ἐστὶ δὲ ταῦτα . . . δείγματα τύπων ἐπ' ἀλληγορίαν καλούντων*.

Akin to the meaning *image or form*, is the use of the word to denote the *outline or scope* of a treatise, or the *general contents* of a book or epistle, Aristot. *Eth.* ii. 2, *ὁ λόγος τύπῳ καὶ οὐκ ἀκριβῶς λέγεται*; 3 Macc. iii. 30, *ὁ μὲν τῆς ἐπιστολῆς τύπος οὕτως ἐγγέγραπτο*. (Elsewhere *τρόπος*, 1 Macc. xv. 2, xi. 29.) So Acts xxiii. 25, *ἐπιστολὴν περιέχουσαν τὸν τύπον τοῦτον*. It is doubtful whether the *τύπος διδαχῆς*, Rom. vi. 17, is akin to this and = *form of doctrine*, see 1 Cor. xv. 2, *τίνι λόγῳ εὐηγγελισάμην ὑμῖν*, or whether it be = *type or pattern*, which equally suits the context. The preceding *ὑπηκούσατε* is appropriate in both cases; the *εἰς ὃν παρεδόθητε* is as difficult in both.

Ἀντίτυπος, ον, literally, *what gives a counter-stroke*, *e.g. τύπος ἀντίτυπος = hammer and anvil*; *μάχη ἀντίτυπος*, of a *long contested and doubtful battle*, Xen. *Ag.* vi. 2. Hence = *obstinate, stiff-necked*, Esth. iii. 13. Next, it means *similar, like*, *τὸ ἀντίτυπον, copy*; Hesych., *ἴσος, ὅμοιος*; Pol. vi. 31. 3, *ἀντίτυπος τίθεμαί τινι = like to any one*. So in Heb. ix. 24, *ἀντίτυπα τῶν ἀληθινῶν*, 1 Pet. iii. 21, of the water of baptism as the *image* (not the *counterpart* or *antitype*, cf. *ὁ καὶ ὑμᾶς ἀντίτυπον σώζει βάπτισμα*) of the waters of the flood, which were the means of saving Noah and his family. It is not the copy that answers to the type as its model, and it is not therefore used in the sense in which we use the words *type* and *antitype*. Cf. *Const. Ap.* iv. 14, *τὰ ἀντίτυπα μυστήρια τοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος Χριστοῦ*.

Ὑποτύπωσις, ἡ, *design or outline of a representation*, Poll. vii. 128. *Pattern*,

1 Tim. i. 16, πρὸς ὑποτύπωσιν τῶν μελλόντων πιστεύειν. See also 2 Tim. i. 13, ὑποτύπωσιν ἔχε ὑγμαιόντων λόγων ὧν παρ' ἐμοῦ ἤκουσας, where the meaning *summary*, *brief exposition* (see τύπος), is inadmissible. The meaning *instruction*, *institutio*, is also inappropriate, because in the titles of books this term simply means *summary*; but it may here, and yet here only, be taken as synonymous with εἰσαγωγή. See the passage quoted by Wetstein from Sext. Empir., ὑποτυπώσεις γὰρ ἔγραψαν ἔνιοι τῶν πρὸ ἐμοῦ τὰ τοιαῦτα βίβλια, καθάπερ τινὰς ὑπογραφάς, ἕτεροι δ' εἰσαγωγὰς ἢ συνόψεις ἢ ὑφηγήσεις.

Τ

Τίος, ὁ, son. We must notice (I.) the Hebraistic uses of this word, wherein υἱός, like τέκνα, is used as the Hebrew בן, בְּנֵי, distinctly to characterize any one according to idiosyncrasy, whether this be a matter of derivation or be expressed as a quality that belongs to him, as in the case of the child, conditioned by the origin or starting-point which fixes the relation of the character, and therefore a character based upon an inner connection. Thus men are called not simply ἄνθρωποι, but υἱοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, Mark iii. 28, Gen. xi. 5, Num. xxiii. 19, Deut. xxxii. 8, 1 Sam. xxvi. 19, Job xxxi. 33, Hos. vi. 7, Ps. cxiv. 2, xlix. 3, xii. 2, xlv. 3, and frequently, not merely as a periphrasis, but because the expression denotes more clearly man's origin and nature than does the simple ἄνθρωποι. Comp. γεννητοί, γεννήματα γυναικῶν, Matt. xi. 11, Luke vii. 28, Job xiv. 1, Ecclus. x. 18, *et al.*; υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου, Ezek. ii. 1, 3, 6, 8, iii. 1, 3, 4, etc. In the N. T. we have the expressions υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, Luke xvi. 8, xx. 34; τοῦ φωτός, Luke xvi. 8, John xii. 36, 1 Thess. v. 5; τῆς ἀπειθείας, Eph. ii. 2, v. 6, Col. iii. 6; υἱοὶ τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς, Matt. v. 45; ὑψίστου, Luke vi. 35; υἱὲ διαβόλου, Acts xiii. 10, wherein the reference hits upon the origin or starting-point of the persons named, or of their behaviour. Analogous to these is the expression in Mark iii. 17, υἱοὶ βροντῆς. Cf. Artemid. ii. 85, where children are called τύποι of their parents. On the other hand, the properties, idiosyncrasies, associations, etc., of the persons named are denoted by the phrase in the following places, οἱ υἱοὶ τῶν προφητῶν καὶ τῆς διαθήκης, Acts iii. 25, cf. τὰ τέκνα τῆς σοφίας, Matt. xi. 19; τῆς ἀναστάσεως, Luke xx. 36; τῶν φονευσάντων, Matt. xxvi. 31; τοῦ νυμφῶνος, Matt. ix. 15, Mark ii. 19, Luke v. 34; τῆς βασιλείας, Matt. viii. 12, xiii. 38; τοῦ πονηροῦ, Matt. xiii. 38; υἱὸς γεέννης, Matt. xxiii. 15; εἰρήνης, Luke x. 6, cf. Matt. x. 13, ἄξιος; John xvii. 12, ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας, 2 Thess. ii. 3; υἱὸς παρακλήσεως, Acts iv. 36, is quite general. The characteristics of the person, *what belongs to him* in his relationship as a child, are the main elements denoted by the term, "a child of God," and this is represented as the blessing of salvation, Matt. v. 9; 2 Cor. vi. 18; Rev. xxi. 7; Luke xx. 36; Rom. viii. 14, 19, ix. 26; Gal. iii. 26; υἱοὶ stands by itself for υἱοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ, Gal. iv. 6, 7; Heb. ii. 10. While τέκνον occurs in these phrases only in the plural, υἱός is used also of individuals, Matt. xxiii. 15; Luke x. 6; John xvii. 12; 2 Thess. ii. 3; Acts iv. 36, xiii. 10.—In the O. T. see Judg. xix. 22,

υἱοὶ παρανόμων; 1 Sam. xx. 30, υἱὸς θανάτου; 2 Sam. ii. 7; υἱοὶ δυνάμεως, xiii. 28; υἱοὶ τῆς ἀποικεσίας, Ezra iv. 1, vi. 19.

(II.) The uses of *υἱός* as applied to Christ; (a.) υἱὸς Δαβίδ, the successor of David and heir of the promises given to him, Matt. i. 1, βιβλος γενέσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ υἱοῦ Δαβὶδ υἱοῦ Ἀβραάμ; xii. 23, μήτι οὗτός ἐστιν υἱὸς Δαβίδ; xv. 22, xx. 30, 31, xxii. 42-45; Luke i. 32, δώσει αὐτῷ κύριος ὁ θεὸς τὸν θρόνον Δαβὶδ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ; Mark x. 47, xii. 35; Luke xviii. 38, 39, xx. 41, 44. Nowhere else. By this phrase what is true of Christ is traced back to David as the starting-point of the promises, and all the O. T. prophecies concerning Him are referred to, such as 2 Sam. vii.; Isa. vii. 13-15, xi. 1 sqq.; Ezek. xxxiv. 23 sqq., and others.

(b.) ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, used only by Christ Himself, excepting in Acts vii. 56. The reference of this title, which Christ gives Himself, to Dan. vii. 13 is very doubtful, because in Daniel the contrast is between the kingdom "of the saints of the Most High," vv. 18, 27, on the one hand, and the kingdoms of the world (of the beasts, ver. 12) on the other, and the expression there being without the article, בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים denotes clearly (see ver. 18) a collective conception; the particle of comparison also, כְּ, "like," is used just as in vv. 4, 5, 6, and reminds us of בְּנֵי אָדָם, Dan. x. 16; דְּמוּת בְּמַרְאֵה אָדָם, Ezek. i. 26; ὁμοῖος υἱῷ ἀνθρώπου, Rev. i. 13, xiv. 14, in all which places resemblance only is denoted, or likeness where there is at the same time evident difference of nature; so that these expressions cannot therefore be taken as identical with the absolute ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, signifying human origin, and what not only resembles but essentially belongs to man. That the phrase ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου in Dan. vii. 13 does, in fact, imply this, if it be taken to denote not only a collective conception, but the expected Messiah (as Rev. xiv. 14, Matt. xxiv. 30, xxvi. 64, etc., decidedly oblige us to take it), is evident from the very fact that the form or similitude of man is set forth consolingly in contrast with the form and similitude of beasts.

That the phrase ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου signifies what essentially appertains to man, to human nature in its inner reality (comp. Heb. ii. 14), is clear from those passages where that is attributed to the Son of man which can belong to Him only in an extraordinary manner, passages wherein the humiliation which this phrase denotes is placed over against the dignity of Him who calls Himself by this name. Thus Matt. ix. 6, ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας, cf. Mark ii. 7, τίς δύναται ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας εἰ μὴ εἷς ὁ θεός; further, comp. with Matt. ix. 6, ver. 8, ἐδόξασαν τὸν θεὸν τὸν δόντα ἐξουσίαν τοιαύτην τοῖς ἀνθρώποις; Matt. xvi. 13, τίνα λέγουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι εἶναι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου; ver. 16, σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ζῶντος; xxvi. 64, ἀπ' ἄρτι ὄψεσθε τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καθήμενον ἐκ δεξιῶν τῆς δυνάμεως καὶ ἐρχόμενον ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. Observe especially the clear and conclusive argument of the Lord Himself in Mark ii. 27, 28, τὸ σάββατον διὰ τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐγένετο καὶ οὐχ ὁ ἄνθρωπος διὰ τὸ σάββατον ὥστε κύριός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ τοῦ σαββάτου. It is on account of this humiliation in antithesis with the dignity of Christ that, except

in Acts vii. 56, the disciples of Christ never use this title; Stephen (Acts vii. 56), in the face of those who only acknowledged the man Jesus, once more declares the dignity and exaltation conferred upon this Son of man. There is no text which justifies the opinion that He who calls Himself *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀ.* must *on this account* be essentially other than one who really partakes of human nature. Comp. also John vi. 27, *ἦν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀ. ὑμῖν δώσει· τοῦτον γὰρ ὁ πατήρ ἐσφράγισεν ὁ θεός*; see *πατήρ*. This explains why it should appear in the highest degree strange to the Jews that He at whose self-designation as *ὁ υἱ. τ. α.* they took no offence, should call Himself *the Son of God*, and call God His Father. Comp. John v. 18, 27.

This explanation, however, is not exhaustive, because *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* signifies somewhat more definite than, *e.g.*, in John v. 27, *ἐξουσίαν ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ καὶ κρίσιν ποιεῖν, ὅτι υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐστίν*; see Heb. ii. 6. That Christ is *υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου* is the first element, that He is *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* is the second. The use of the emphatic article implies that He claims to be in a somewhat special sense, and prominently among the *בְּרֵאשִׁית*, one and alone among His brethren. This distinctiveness cannot consist in anything that would alter the true conception of His human sonship, as if, *e.g.*, it meant that He was the Son of man only because He was God's Son; it must denote something which does not modify but rather completes the true conception of human sonship. This we find in the fact that He was "the seed of the woman" who was promised from the beginning in the *protēvangelium*, which was (as is clear from Gen. v. 28, 29) from the outset taken as referring to a distinct and special person. Thus it does not mean, as Hofmann says, "that type and character of the human race which history at the beginning aimed at but failed to realize by the first *ἄνθρωπος*, who was not *υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου*" (*Schriftbew.* ii. 1. 81); it means Him among the sons of men to whom mankind, now become sinful, ever has and ever must look forward to. Hence the point of the expression, Matt. xvii. 22, *μέλλει ὁ υἱὸς τ. ἀ. παραδίδοσθαι εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπων κ.τ.λ.*; and viii. 20, "foxes have holes," etc., "but the Son of man hath not where to lay His head." Hence, too, it was self-evident, *ἦλθε γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς τ. α. σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολλολός*.

The expression occurs Matt. viii. 20, ix. 6, x. 23, xi. 19, xii. 8, 32, 40, xiii. 41, xvi. 13, 27, 28, xvii. 9, 12, 22, xviii. 11, xix. 28, xx. 18, xxiv. 30, 37, 39, 44, xxv. 13, 31, xxvi. 2, 24, 45, 64; Mark ii. 10, 28, viii. 31, 38, ix. 9, 12, 31, x. 33, 45, xiii. 26, xiv. 21, 41, 62; Luke v. 24, vi. 5, 22, vii. 34, ix. 22, 26, 44, 56, 58, xi. 30, xii. 8, 10, 40, xvii. 22, 24, 26, 30, xviii. 8, 31, xix. 10, xxi. 27, 36, xxii. 22, 48, 69, xxiv. 7; John i. 52, iii. 13, 14, vi. 27, 53, 62, viii. 28, xii. 23, 34, xiii. 31; Acts vii. 56.

Thus *ὁ υἱὸς τ. ἀ.* is a Messianic conception, a Messianic name given to Jesus by Himself, chosen and adopted by Him on account of the relation in which He stands as the promised "seed of the woman" to His brethren. The corresponding title given to the Messiah by the children of men is

(III.) *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ*. We must first distinguish this from the analogous title *υἱὸς*

θεοῦ without the article, which, like υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου to ὁ υἱὸς ἀνθρ., stands in the relation to it of genus to species. Υἱὸς θεοῦ denotes the relationship established by the elective love of God Himself between the children of Israel and Him, inasmuch as what this people are rests upon God's own act, and God acknowledges them. Comp. πατήρ. We must view it in the light of such expressions as Rev. xxi. 7, ἔσομαι αὐτῷ θεὸς καὶ αὐτὸς ἔσται μοι υἱός; 2 Cor. vi. 18; Jer. xxxi. 9. Thus we read, "Israel is my first-born son," Ex. iv. 22, 23; "out of Egypt have I called my son," Hos. xi. 1 (Hebrew). Cf. Deut. xiv. 1, xxxii. 6, 18; Mal. ii. 10; Isa. lxiii. 8, lxiv. 8. That it denotes a special relationship dependent upon God's election, and not common to all mankind, is evident from Deut. xiv. 1, Ps. lxxxii. 6 with ver. 7, Ps. lxxiii. 15. King David and He to whom David's kingship points specially stand in this relationship to God, 2 Sam. vii. 14; Ps. lxxxix. 27-29, ii. 7. It denotes a belonging to God, a partaking of what appertains to Him from whom the whole life is derived. In this general sense it is said of the man Christ Jesus that He is υἱὸς θεοῦ, Matt. xxvii. 40, 43, 54, Mark xv. 39, Luke i. 32, with reference clearly to the act of God which places Him in this relationship, Luke i. 35; Acts xiii. 33; Rom. i. 4, cf. Acts ii. 32, 36; see γεννάω. Now when Jesus is called ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, this relationship is attributed *in a special and distinctive manner* to Him, and by it He is raised above the rank of the more general υἱοὶ θεοῦ, just as ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρ. elevates Him above the ordinary υἱοὶ ἀνθρώπων, and above those of the sons of men who should become υἱοὶ θεοῦ, as πρωτότοκος ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς, Rom. viii. 29, above those who had previously been called υἱοὶ θεοῦ (John x. 35, 36). He is thus called ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, as the Messiah, upon whom the relation of all others as "sons of God" depended, who was specially chosen of God to accomplish His saving purpose; see Matt. iii. 17, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα; Luke ix. 35, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἐκλελεγμένος; Matt. xvii. 5; Mark i. 11, ix. 7; Luke iii. 22; 2 Pet. i. 17, *vid.* εὐδοκεῖν, ἐκλέγειν. Thus ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ is that title of the Messiah which denotes His relation to God, Matt. xxvi. 63, ἵνα ἡμῖν εἴπῃς εἰ σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ; John i. 50, σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, σὺ ὁ βασιλεὺς εἶ τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ; and the confession of Peter, Matt. xvi. 16, σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος (John vi. 69, as compared with x. 36), is, above all, a recognition of the Messiahship of Jesus. Jesus adopts this designation of His Messianic dignity in Matt. xxvi. 64, over against the other title, ὁ υἱὸς τ. ἀ.; and the adoption of this by Him (Matt. xxvi. 63, 64) was regarded as blasphemy, because the elective act of God was hidden and unknown to His judges, and the manifest recognition of the Messiah as the Son of God with power was to be accomplished in His resurrection. Accordingly, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ was a title given to the man Christ Jesus as Messiah, on the ground of His place in the history of redemption, and in consequence of God's election having been centred in Him. See John i. 34, *κἀγὼ ἐώρακα καὶ μεμαρτύρηκα ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ.*

But we must bear in mind that this title as belonging to Jesus has yet another ground. In Luke i. 35 the divine power exercised in His conception (ver. 34) is stated

as justifying the designation of the child of Mary as *υἱὸς θεοῦ*, and thus a reference to the manner in which His birth was brought about is blended in the title, which designates the relation wherein Jesus was to stand to God (ver. 32). The miraculous conception is thus represented as the outward expression and sign of the election of one who was *γενόμενος ἐκ γυναικός*.

But the title *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ* still refers to somewhat more than this appointment of Jesus as the accomplisher of God's saving purpose. We never find a reference to His supernatural birth associated with this title, but always a reference to *a relation of the Son to God subsisting previously to the humanity of Jesus*,—a relation not brought about merely by the miraculous birth, but one by virtue of which the man Christ Jesus is distinctively among men *the Son of God*, by virtue of which His Messiahship, His Messianic election, call, and office are possible, in short, by virtue of which the humanity of Jesus possesses its special significance, Rom. viii. 3. This is evident in those passages where the Father's sending the Son into the world is spoken of, John iii. 16, 17; Rom. viii. 3; Gal. iv. 4, etc.; see *ἀποστέλλω*. Comp. John xvi. 28, *ἐξῆλθον ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ ἐλήλυθα εἰς τὸν κόσμον· πάλιν ἀφήμι τὸν κόσμον καὶ πορεύομαι πρὸς τὸν πατέρα*. (The words of Jesus in John x. 36, *ὃν ὁ πατὴρ ἡγάσεν καὶ ἀπέστειλεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ὑμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι βλασφημεῖς, ὅτι εἶπον υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ εἰμί*, do not contradict this, for it is clear from ver. 35 that it is only the theocratic conception of a son of God which Jesus here lays claim to as belonging to Himself, *e concessis* or *concedendis* (iii. 2), see *ἀγιάζω*, and the *ἀπέστειλεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον* affirms no more than the fact of Christ's being sent into the world, whereas elsewhere it signifies much more; it simply affirms Christ's coming into the world, and reminds us of Jer. i. 5.) It is evident also in such declarations as Heb. vii. 3, John viii. 54, 58, xvii. 5, where the divine sonship of Christ cannot without violence be separated from His pre-existence. It is further plain in those sayings of Christ Himself, wherein He speaks of His divine sonship, declaring Himself not only in a Messianic sense *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ*, but as essentially one with and equal to God, Matt. xi. 27; John x. 33, xi. 27; Matt. xxviii. 19. (See Gess, *Lehre von der Person Christi*, §§ 6, 7.) Thus in *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ*, as in the *υἱὸς θεοῦ* of St. Luke, two thoughts are implied, viz. that *the man* Christ Jesus is the Messiah elect and chosen of God, and that a relationship of the Son to God, previous to His humanity, lies at the foundation of this Messiahship. We cannot, indeed, strictly say that *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ* always denotes the pre-existent relationship of Christ to the Father, but it must distinctly be remembered that this is always implied as predicated of the man Christ Jesus, cf. John v. 26, 27; Matt. xi. 27; Mark iii. 11; Luke iv. 41, x. 22; John i. 18. The phrase denotes that the man Jesus stands in a relation of Son to the Father which He possessed before His incarnation, that He is the Son of the Father before all worlds; see 1 John v. 5, 6; see also *μονογενής*.

Besides the texts already named, the expression *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ* occurs in John iii. 16, 17, 18, v. 25, vi. 69, ix. 35, xi. 4, 27, xx. 31; 1 John i. 3, 7, iii. 8, 23, iv. 9, 10, 15,

v. 5, 9–13, 20; Rev. ii. 18; 2 John 3, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ πατρὸς; Rom. i. 3, 9, v. 10, viii. 3, 29, 32; 1 Cor. i. 9; Gal. i. 16, ii. 20, iv. 4, 6; Eph. iv. 13; Col. i. 13; 1 Thess. i. 10; Heb. iv. 14, vi. 6, vii. 3, x. 29. Ὁ υἱός simply in Matt. xi. 27; Mark xiii. 32; Luke x. 22; John i. 18, iii. 35, 36, v. 19–23, 26, vi. 40, viii. 35, 36, xiv. 13, xvii. 1; 1 John ii. 22–24, v. 10, 12; 2 John 9; 1 Cor. xv. 28; Heb. i. 2, 8, iii. 6, vii. 28.

Υἱοθεσία, ἡ, adoption, receiving into the relationship of a child; thus Diog. Laert. iv. 53, εἰώθει νεανίσκων τινῶν υἱοθεσίας ποιεῖσθαι, and in inscriptions. Cf. υἱὸς θέτος, Herod. vi. 57; Plat. Legg. ix. 929 C, and elsewhere; = υἱὸς εἰσπολήτος, adopted son; Test. Epictetae, Boeckh, inscr. 2, n. 2448. 3. 15, Ἀντισθένης Ἰσοκλεῦς, κατὰ δὲ υἱοθεσίαν Γρίνου. Cf. Hesych., υἱοθετεῖ υἱοποιεῖ, οὐ φύσει, ἀλλὰ θέσει. In the N. T. we find it used by St. Paul, Rom. ix. 4, ὧν ἡ υἱοθεσία, with reference to the filial relationship into which Israel was admitted by election to God, Deut. xiv. 1. In Rom. viii. 15, Gal. iv. 5, Eph. i. 5, with reference to the N. T. adoption, answering to the Pauline τέκνα θεοῦ in the sense of belonging to God; see τέκνον, υἱός. In Rom. viii. 23, υἱοθεσία denotes the adoption as it regards the future, see Rev. xxi. 7, and in contrast with the δουλεία τῆς φθορᾶς (ver. 21) of the present. The only question is whether υἱοθεσία, besides the receiving into the relationship of children, denotes also this relationship itself, as based upon adoption. In no case is it ever equivalent to υἰότης, comp. Eph. i. 5, where it is precisely adoption which illustrates the greatness of divine love. To assume as the meaning, “the relationship of children, based upon adoption,”—which answers to the primary meaning, as in Latin words in *io* the passive signification answers to the active,—is quite unnecessary in Rom. ix. 4, though perhaps it is to be admitted in viii. 15, where the word stands in antithesis with δούλος, δουλεία. But in Eph. i. 5, προορίζειν εἰς υἱοθ. signifies to appoint beforehand to adoption.

Φ

Φαίνω, φανῶ, second aorist pass. ἐφάνην, from the root φα, like φάος—φῶς, light, (I.) transitive = to make to shine, to cause to appear, to bring to light. In the N. T. only passive = to appear, Matt. i. 20, ii. 13, 19, Mark xvi. 9, Luke ix. 8, xxiv. 11, of the appearing or rising of the stars; in later Greek τὰ φαινόμενα, the stars, which appear above the horizon; thus Matt. ii. 7, cf. xxiv. 30. Hence, of the shining of the stars, starlight, Lucian, dial. deor. iv. 3, ἀστέρα σου φαίνεσθαι ποιήσω κάλλιστον. Thus Rev. xviii. 23; Matt. xxiv. 27; Phil. ii. 15. Figuratively, to make one's appearance, to show oneself, of persons, things, or circumstances, Matt. ix. 33, οὐδέποτε ἐφάνη οὕτως ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ; xiii. 26, τότε ἐφάνη καὶ τὰ ζιζάνια; 1 Pet. iv. 18; Jas. iv. 14; to be visible, Matt. vi. 5. In Heb. xi. 3, φαινόμενα is not quite identical with τὰ βλεπόμενα, but the φαίνεσθαι is the condition of the βλέπεσθαι; φαινόμενα are things which can be seen, in contrast with ῥῆμα θεοῦ and πίστει νοεῖν. Sometimes joined with a participle or adjective in the nominative,

as = to show oneself as something, outwardly to appear to be as, Matt. vi. 16, 18, xxiii. 27; Rom. vii. 13; 2 Cor. xiii. 7. — (II.) Intransitively, to shine, John i. 5, v. 35; 1 John ii. 8; 2 Pet. i. 19; Rev. i. 16, viii. 12; *τινι*, to shine upon one, Rev. xxi. 23.

Φῶς, φωτός, τό, contracted from φάος (Homer), light, the antithesis of σκότος, Hellenistic σκοτία, νύξ. — (I.) In a literal and objective sense, the light of day, of the sun, of the stars; generally, what is light, shining, clear, and manifest, Matt. xvii. 2, 5; Luke viii. 16; Acts ix. 3, xii. 7, xvi. 29, xxii. 6, 9, 11, xxvi. 13; Rev. xviii. 23, xxii. 5. The light of the fire, or fire itself, Xen. *Hell.* vi. 2. 19, φῶς ποιεῖν; Mark xiv. 54; Luke xxii. 56. The light of the eyes, the eye, Eur. *Cycl.* 629, ἐκκαίειν τὸ φῶς Κύκλωπος. See Matt. vi. 22, ὁ λύχνος τοῦ σώματος ἐστὶν ὁ ὀφθαλμός . . . ver. 23, εἰ οὖν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἐν σοὶ σκότος ἐστίν (Luke xi. 35) = ὁ ὀφθαλμός ὁ ἐν σοί, signifying the heart within, by which the life is guided (Prov. iv. 23, ἐκ τῆς καρδίας ἐξοδοὶ ζωῆς). Then (II.) it is used figuratively in many ways, e.g. of what is manifest (what is clear, πᾶν γὰρ τὸ φανερούμενον φῶς ἐστίν, Eph. v. 13), Xen. *Ag.* ix. 1, Matt. x. 27, ὃ λέγω ὑμῖν ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ, εἶπατε ἐν τῷ φωτί, Luke xii. 3, to denote clearness of speech or of exposition (e.g. Dion. Hal. of the historical works of Thucydides), etc. See Dan. ii. 22, γινώσκων τὰ ἐν τῷ σκότει, καὶ τὸ φῶς μετ' αὐτοῦ ἐστίν. Here φῶς is objective, and signifies what is distinct and clear. Akin to this is the N. T. φῶς, used in an ethical sense (not in the O. T.), Rom. xiii. 12, ἀποθώμεθα οὖν τὰ ἔργα τοῦ σκότους (cf. Eph. v. 11, 12, τὰ ἔργα τὰ ἄκαρπα τοῦ σκότους . . . τὰ κρυφῇ γινόμενα), ἐνδυσώμεθα δὲ τὰ ὄπλα τοῦ φωτός. Hence, *that which has no need to shun the light* (cf. John iii. 20, πᾶς ὁ φαῦλα πράσων μισεῖ τὸ φῶς καὶ οὐκ ἔρχεται πρὸς τὸ φῶς) is itself called *light*, by an easy blending and interchange of the objective and transitive meanings; and thus Eph. v. 8 sqq. is explained. Light denotes righteousness and truth in contrast with darkness, the emblem of sin (Eph. vi. 12); see 2 Cor. vi. 14, τίς γὰρ μετοχὴ δικαιοσύνης καὶ ἀνομίας; ἢ τίς κοινωνία φωτὶ πρὸς σκότος; xi. 14, αὐτὸς γὰρ ὁ σατανᾶς μετασχηματίζεται εἰς ἄγγελον φωτός. Cf. Eph. v. 8, 9, ὁ γὰρ καρπὸς τοῦ φωτός ἐν πίσσῃ ἀγαθῶσύνης καὶ δικαιοσύνης καὶ ἀληθείας. This ethical significance of light in the N. T. corresponds with the use of the word *transitively*, *that which makes manifest*. In the O. T. light denotes a state of undisturbed happiness, of prosperity and safety, of salvation, just as darkness means a state of perdition, because every form and development of life is conditional upon light; see Gen. i. 3. Thus יָאֵר, Job xxxiii. 30; Ps. lvi. 14; Job xxxiii. 28, ἡ ζωὴ μου φῶς ὄψεται, where it is added, σώσον ψυχὴν μου τοῦ μὴ ἐλθεῖν εἰς διαφθοράν; iii. 16, ὥσπερ νήπιοι οὐκ οὐκ εἶδον φῶς. Cf. ver. 20, where *light* and *life* stand as parallel to each other, Ps. xlix. 20, xcvi. 11. Thus, too, we find it in Greek (and similarly, indeed, everywhere), τὸ φῶς ὄραν, βλέπειν = *to live*; εἰς, πρὸς, τὸ φῶς ἔρχεσθαι, *to come into the world*. Hence light is the designation of happiness and well-being, e.g. Job xviii. 5, xxxviii. 15; Ps. xcvi. 11, φῶς ἀνέτειλε τῷ δικαίῳ καὶ τοῖς εὐθέσι τῇ καρδίᾳ εὐφροσύνη; Esth. viii. 16; Ps. cxii. 4. Now יָאֵר, φῶς, metaphorically denotes, specially, the salvation which comes from God, see Ps. xxvii. 1,

נִרְאֶה לְפָנֶיךָ יְיָ; Isa. x. 17, of God Himself, ἔσται τὸ φῶς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ εἰς πῦρ.; Mic. vii. 8; Ps. xxxvi. 10. The object of saving promise is often **light**, Isa. ix. 1, xlii. 6, xlix. 6, lx. 1–3, 19, cf. lix. 9; Mal. iii. 20; Jer. xiii. 16; Amos v. 18, 20; Mic. vii. 9. Cf. נִרְאֶה לְפָנֶיךָ, Ps. iv. 7, xliv. 4, lxxxix. 16. Here φῶς is viewed directly in its transitive sense, *that which enlightens*, though the distinction between this transitive and the objective meaning is not, strictly speaking, excluded. In quotations from the O. T. in the New we thus find it, Matt. iv. 16 (Isa. ix. 1); Acts xiii. 47 (Isa. xlix. 6); see Luke ii. 32. Cf. φωσφόρος, 2 Pet. i. 19. — Acts xxvi. 23, εἰ πρῶτος ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν φῶς μέλλει καταγγέλλειν τῷ τε λαῷ καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν; Col. i. 12, ἡ μέρος τοῦ κλήρου τῶν ἁγίων ἐν τῷ φωτί; 1 Pet. ii. 9, ὅπως τὰς ἀρετὰς ἐξαγγείλητε τοῦ ἐκ σκότους ὑμᾶς κατέσαντος εἰς τὸ θαυμαστὸν αὐτοῦ φῶς; cf. φωτίζεσθαι, Heb. vi. 4, x. 32; Jas. i. 17, πᾶσα δόσις ἀγαθὴ . . . ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς τῶν φώτων, where the plural is = *all that is light*. (So also φῶς in classical Greek, by the poets, to designate happiness and joy.) This is the primary meaning of the word in John i. 4, ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἦν καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἦν τὸ φῶς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, *that which brings salvation*; viii. 12, ἐγὼ εἰμι τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου· ὁ ἀκολουθῶν ἐμοὶ οὐ μὴ περιπατήσει ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ, ἀλλ' ἔξει τὸ φῶς τῆς ζωῆς; i. 5, 7–9, ἦν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινὸν ὃ φωτίζει πάντα ἄνθρωπον ἐρχόμενον εἰς τὸν κόσμον. Cf. v. 35, ἠθέλησατε ἀγαλλιαθῆναι πρὸς ὥραν ἐν τῷ φωτὶ αὐτοῦ, comp. ix. 5 with vv. 3, 4, xii. 35, 36. Cf. xii. 46 with ver. 47. As with St. John light denotes not only the means of unfolding life, but the form which it assumes, viz. as a state of health and salvation from the ruin of sin (Acts xxvi. 18), light is contrasted with misery as well as sin, and is to be taken not only with an ethical, but with a soteriological import; see John iii. 19, τὸ φῶς ἐλήλυθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον καὶ ἠγάπησαν οἱ ἄνθρωποι μᾶλλον τὸ σκότος ἢ τὸ φῶς· ἦν γὰρ αὐτῶν πονηρὰ τὰ ἔργα; ver. 20, πᾶς γὰρ ὁ φαῦλα πράσσων μισεῖ τὸ φῶς κ.τ.λ. Hence ἀκολουθεῖν τῷ φωτί, John viii. 12. Cf. xi. 9, 10, xii. 35, ὁ περιπατῶν ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ οὐκ οἶδεν ποῦ ὑπάγει; ver. 36; Ps. xliii. 3. The fact that light excludes unhappiness and sin, enables us to explain the employment of the word in a way seemingly contradictory to the usage of the Gospel, in the first Epistle, 1 John i. 5, ὁ θεὸς φῶς ἐστὶν καὶ σκοτία ἐν αὐτῷ οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδεμία; ver. 7, ii. 9, 10, cf. ver. 8, ἡ σκοτία παράγεται καὶ τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινὸν ἡδὲ φαίνει,—a passage which could not be understood if light in and for itself were an emblem of God's holiness, inasmuch as it is ordinarily taken as the correlative of righteousness, and the soteriological aspect of it is overlooked. But φῶς, as it stands in antithesis with unhappiness and sin, is clearly used here with reference to the full idea of God's holiness, as also light and holiness stand as parallels in Isa. x. 17, נִרְאֶה לְפָנֶיךָ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֵי אֲבוֹתֵינוּ (where the rendering of the LXX. already shows blending of the idea of holiness). 'Ο θεὸς φῶς ἐστίν = **God is the fountain of pure and blessed life**. An analogous blending of the two meanings explains the Pauline use of φῶς, which makes the ethical φῶς one with φῶς, as denoting *salvation*, cf. 2 Cor. iv. 6 with Eph. v. 8 sqq., 1 Thess. v. 5. With 1 Tim. vi. 16 comp. Col. i. 12, 1 Pet. ii. 9. — In a subjective sense, φῶς denotes **the light which enlightens any one**, John xii. 35, and is used ethically and of the intellect, Rom.

ii. 19, ὁδηγὸν εἶναι τυφλῶν, φῶς τῶν ἐν σκότει, cf. Wisd. xviii. 4, δι' ὧν ἡμελλε τὸ ἄφθαρτον νόμου φῶς τῷ αἰῶνι δίδοσθαι; see φωτίζειν. Eph. i. 18, iii. 9; Judg. xiii. 8; 2 Kings xii. 2; Hos. x. 13.

Φανερός, ἄ, ὄν, visible, manifest, 1 Cor. xi. 19; Phil. i. 13; 1 Tim. iv. 15; Acts vii. 13, iv. 16; in contrast with κρυπτός, 1 Cor. xiv. 25; Rom. ii. 28; Luke viii. 17; known, Mark iii. 12; Matt. xii. 16; Gal. v. 19, φανερά δέ ἐστι τὰ ἔργα τῆς σαρκός; 1 John iii. 10. Cf. Xen. *Anab.* iv. 1. 23, εἴ τινα εἰδεῖεν ἄλλην ὁδὸν ἢ τὴν φανεράν. Also celebrated, e.g. πόλις, Xen. *Cyr.* vii. 5. 58; see Mark iii. 12. — Τὸ φανερόν, openly; εἰς φανερόν ἔρχεσθαι, to become public, a strengthening of γνωσθῆναι in Luke viii. 17, δ' οὐ γνωσθήσεται καὶ εἰς φανερόν ἔλθῃ. See Acts iv. 16; Rom. i. 19.

The adverb φανερώς = manifestly, visibly, Acts x. 3; openly, Mark i. 45; John vii. 10.

Φανέρω, to make manifest, to make known, to show; rarely, and in later Greek only; once in the LXX. Jer. xxxiii. 6 = πλῆ. Oftener in the N. T., and notably as synonymous with ἀποκαλύπτειν, to denote the act of divine revelation, or with reference to the subject-matter of divine revelation (John xvii. 6, τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς; Rom. i. 19, τὸ γνωστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ; iii. 21, δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ; xvi. 26, μυστήριον κ.τ.λ.; Col. iv. 4, i. 26; 2 Tim. i. 10, χάρις; Tit. i. 3, ὁ λόγος τ. θ.; Heb. ix. 8, ἡ τῶν ἁγίων ὁδός; 1 John i. 2, ἡ ζωή; iv. 9, ἡ ἀγάπη, et al.). It differs from ἀποκαλύπτειν as to exhibit differs from to disclose, so that in their relation to each other ἀποκαλύπτειν must precede φανεροῦν, cf. 1 Cor. iii. 13, ἐκάστου τὸ ἔργον φανερόν γενήσεται ἢ γὰρ ἡμέρα δηλώσει, ὅτι ἐν πυρὶ ἀποκαλύπτεται. Ἀποκαλ. refers only to the object revealed, but φανεροῦν directly refers to those to whom the revelation is to be made. Comp. Col. iv. 4, ἵνα φανερώσω τὸ μυστήριον, with ἀποκαλύπτειν τὸ μυστήριον, Eph. iii. 5; Col. i. 26, iii. 4; Tit. i. 3, ἐφανέρωσε τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ ἐν κηρύγματι. See especially the combination κατ' ἀποκάλυψιν ἐγνωρίσθη μοι τὸ μυστήριον, Eph. iii. 3. — Φανεροῦν signifies to make visible, to show, John ii. 11, ἐφανέρωσε τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ; xxi. 1, ἐφανέρωσε ἑαυτόν; to make known, John xvii. 6; Rom. i. 19; 2 Cor. ii. 14, cf. ἐν παρρησίᾳ εἶναι, John vii. 4; to make public, 1 Cor. iv. 5; Col. iv. 4. The passive = to become or be made visible or manifest, Mark iv. 22, John iii. 21, ix. 3, 2 Cor. iv. 10, 11, Eph. v. 13, 1 John ii. 19, Rev. iii. 18, xv. 4, Heb. ix. 8; to appear, Mark xvi. 12, 14, John xxi. 14, 2 Cor. v. 10, 2 Tim. i. 10, 1 Pet. i. 20, v. 4, 1 John i. 2, ii. 28, iii. 2, 5, 8, iv. 9, Heb. ix. 26; to be made known, or to be known, John i. 31; Rom. iii. 21, xvi. 26; 2 Cor. iii. 3, v. 11, vii. 12; Col. i. 26, iv. 4; Tit. i. 3.

Φανέρωσις, ἡ, manifestation, making known, 2 Cor. iv. 2, τῆς ἀληθείας. In 1 Cor. xii. 7 the *charismata* are called φανέρωσις τοῦ πνεύματος, either because they manifest the πνεῦμα, or, passively, because the πνεῦμα is made manifest in them. The word is used elsewhere in patristic Greek only to denote the manifestation of Christ in

the flesh, and His second coming to judgment, and in these cases apparently in a passive sense = **appearing**; in an active sense, however, in, *e.g.*, Chrys. in *Psalm*. cvi. (i. 972. 13), ἐπιτρέψαντος τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς τὴν τῶν δικαίων γυμνασίαν καὶ φανέρωσιν.

Ἐπιφαίνω, (I.) transitively, to show forth, to show light upon, *e.g.* upon the surface; ἐν τοῖς πράγμασιν ἐπιφαίνεσθαι, Pol. xxxi. 20. 4, to be present in. Usually in the passive, to show oneself openly. Plut. *Galb.* 11, ἐπιφανῆναι τῷ δήμῳ, to show oneself before the people, to come forward, to appear, usually with the idea of sudden or unexpected appearing; often of the gods, in Herodotus and elsewhere; and hence perhaps the significance of the N. T. ἐπιφάνεια, cf. Gen. xxxv. 7; Tit. ii. 11, ἐπεφάνη ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ σωτήριος πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις; iii. 4, ἡ χρηστότης καὶ ἡ φιλάνθρωπία ἐπεφάνη τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ. Often in patristic Greek of the incarnation of Christ. — (II.) Intransitively, to show oneself, *e.g.* of the break of day, Acts xxvii. 20, μῆτε δὲ ἡλίου, μῆτε ἄστρον ἐπιφαινόντων; to appear, to shine, Luke i. 79, ἐπιφάναι τοῖς ὕσκότει κ.τ.λ., cf. φαίνειν τινί.

Ἐπιφανής, ἐς, visible, especially = celebrated, distinguished, renowned, etc., *e.g.* πόλεμος, ἔργον, ἄνδρες κ.τ.λ., 1 Macc. i. 10. In the N. T. Acts ii. 20, ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ κυρίου ἡ μεγάλη καὶ ἐπιφανής, as the LXX. render the Hebrew מָנִיחַ, Judg. xiii. 6; Joel ii. 11, 31; Hab. i. 7; Mal. i. 14, iii. 24; 1 Chron. xvii. 21. They seem to have confounded מָנִיחַ and מָנִיחַ, cf. 2 Sam. vii. 23.

Ἐπιφάνεια, ἡ, manifestation, “especially of the help-bringing appearing of the gods, Dion. Hal. ii. 69, Plut., and others; also of the manifestation of divine power and providence in extraordinary events, ἡ ἐν ταῖς θεραπαίαις ἐπιφάνεια, Diod. Sic. i. 25; Plut. *Them.* 30, *Camill.* 16” (Pape). Cf. 2 Macc. xii. 22, xv. 27. In the N. T. of the appearing or manifestation of Jesus Christ on earth, 2 Tim. i. 10, cf. 1 Pet. i. 20. It is commonly used thus in patristic Greek, Phavor., ἡ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐνσαρκος οἰκονομία. In other N. T. texts of Christ’s *second advent*, 2 Thess. ii. 8; 1 Tim. vi. 14; 2 Tim. iv. 1, 8; Tit. ii. 13. — In 2 Macc. frequently of a miraculous interposition of God in behalf of His people, iii. 24, v. 4, ii. 21. — LXX. only 2 Sam. vii. 23 = מָנִיחַ; Amos v. 22 = מָנִיחַ, for in the latter text they clearly confounded the word with מָנִיחַ, and in the former they confounded מָנִיחַ with מָנִיחַ.

Φημί, to say, “from the same root (φα) as φαίνω, for the idea of explaining, speaking, is a development of the primary notion of enlightening, showing” (Schenk), and the elementary conception is *manifestation*; φημί in the Odyssey, Herodotus, and the Tragedians signifies a divine revelation by words or signs (φήμη, a divine voice).

Προφήτης, ὁ, is used, indeed, of soothsayers who announced beforehand the will of the gods with reference to the future; but this is only a secondary and derived sense, for the *προ* must be regarded not as having reference to time, but rather as local, as in

πρόφασις, pretext, what one states or puts forth before another (καὶ ἡ ἀληθὴς καὶ ἡ ψευδὴς αἰτία, Phav.). It signifies one who speaks openly before any one, and is the technical name for an interpreter of the oracle, an interpreter of a divine message. This signification is never lost in profane Greek. Cf. Pind. *Fragm.* 118, μαντεύεο Μοῖσα, προφατεύσω δ' ἐγώ; Plat. *Tim.* 72 B, τὸ τῶν προφήτων γένος ἐπὶ ταῖς ἐνθέοις μαντείαις κριτὰς ἐπικαθιστάναι νόμος· οὗς μάντις ἐπονομάζουσιν τινες, τὸ πᾶν ἡγνοηκότες ὅτι τῆς δι' αἰνιγμῶν οὗτοι φήμης καὶ φαντάσεως ὑποκριταὶ καὶ οὐτι μάντις, προφήται δὲ μαντευσόμενων δικαιοτάτα ὀνομάζουσιν ἄν; Dion. Hal. *Ant. R.* ii. 73, τοῖς ἰδιώταις ὁπόσοι μὴ ἴσασιν τοὺς περὶ τὰ θεῖα ἢ δαιμόνια σεβασμούς· ἐξηγηταὶ γίνονται καὶ προφήται; Eur. *Bacch.* 211, ἐπεὶ σὺ φέγγος, Τειρεσία, τόδ' οὐχ ὄρας, ἐγὼ προφήτης σοι λόγων γενήσομαι. Hence in a more general sense = interpreter, e.g. πρ. Μουσῶν, Plat. *Phaedr.* 262 D, of the cicadae; Sext. *Empir.* 227, ὁ προφήτης τῶν Πύρρωνος λόγων Τίμων; Lucian, *Vit. Auct.* 8, where to the question, ἀλλὰ τί μάλιστα εἰδέναι σε φῶμεν; ἢ τίνα τὴν τέχνην ἔχεις; Diogenes answers, ἔλευθερωτὴς εἰμι τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ ἱατρὸς τῶν παθῶν, τὸ δ' ὅλον, ἀληθείας καὶ παρρησίας προφήτης εἶναι βούλομαι; Diod. i. 2, τὴν προφήτιν τῆς ἀληθείας ἱστορίαν.—The conception of the προφήται τῶν μελλόντων was obviously akin to this technical use of the word as interpreter of the gods; see Plato, *Charm.* 173 C.

Now in the LXX. προφήτης is the ordinary word for נְבִיָּא (once = נְבִיָּא, 2 Chron. xxxvi. 15), and it harmonizes not, indeed, fully with the primary meaning of this word, but perfectly with its ordinary use. It is disputed whether the primary meaning of נְבִיָּא is to be derived from נָבִיא = נָבִיא, נָבִיא, “one in whom the Divinity permits His word to spring forth;” or from נָבִיא = נָבִיא, נָבִיא, to whisper, “one to whom anything is whispered,” Hupfeld; see Tholuck, *die Propheten und ihre Weissagungen*, pp. 21, 22. The usage of the word, however, is clear; it signifies one to whom and through whom God speaks, Num. xii. 2; one to whom God makes known His mysteries, Amos iii. 7, especially cf. ver. 8; and this use of the word is so constant, that it appears in its figurative employment to describe Aaron's relation to Moses, וְנָבִיא יְהוָה אֶחָד מִן הָאֲנָשִׁים לְפָנָיו אֵלֶיהֶם יְתַתֵּיךָ, Ex. vii. 1, as compared with iv. 16, הִנֵּה יְהוָה לְפָנֶיךָ וְנָבִיא יְהוָה אֶחָד מִן הָאֲנָשִׁים לְפָנָיו אֵלֶיהֶם יְתַתֵּיךָ. Hence it means generally, one to whom God reveals His purposes, one to whom God speaks, Gen. xx. 7, cf. ver. 18 with ver. 17; Philo, *quis rer. div. haer.* 510, προφήτης γὰρ ἴδιον μὲν οὐδὲν ἀποφθέγγεται, ἀλλότρια δὲ πάντα ὑπηχοῦντος ἑτέρου. That prediction of the future, while belonging to the subject-matter of prophecy, did not form part of the true conception of נְבִיָּא, is especially plain from the promise given in Deut. xviii. 15, 18–20 compared with Num. xii. 8. The fact, moreover, that the earlier name for a prophet was נָאִי, shower, seer, 1 Sam. ix. 9, clearly indicates that what really constitutes the prophet is immediate intercourse with God, a divine communication of what the prophet has to declare. This is further confirmed by the relation of the ἀποκαλύπτεσθαι to the προφητεύειν, 1 Cor. xiv. 26–30. Cf. 1 Pet. i. 12, οἷς ἀπεκαλύφθη; Eph. iii. 5, νῦν ἀπεκαλύφθη τοῖς ἀγίοις ἀποστόλοις αὐτοῦ καὶ προφήταις ἐν πνεύματι. That the special element of prophesying was not merely prediction, but a showing forth of God's will, especially of His saving purpose, is confirmed by 1 Cor.

xiv. 3, ὁ προφητεύων ἀνθρώποις λαλεῖ οἰκοδομὴν καὶ παράκλησιν καὶ παραμυθίαν. Cf. Jer. i., Isa. i., Ezek. ii., and other passages. Two things therefore go to make the prophet, **an insight granted by God** into the divine secrets or mysteries, and **a communication to others** of these secrets, which, from the very nature of the case, are *His purposes of grace*, with the warnings, announcements of judgment, etc., pertaining thereto; and hence, in the case of the O. T. prophets, their preaching was **a foretelling of the salvation yet to be accomplished**, while in the case of the N. T. prophets it was **a publication of the salvation already accomplished**, so far at least as it had not in turn to do with realities still future. Accordingly, in Eph. iii. 5, ii. 20, the **prophets**, named side by side with the apostles as the foundation of the N. T. church, are to be understood as exclusively *New Testament prophets*, named again in Eph. iv. 11 between apostles and evangelists. See 1 Cor. xii. 28, and εὐαγγελιστής. N. T. prophets were for the Christian church what O. T. prophets were for Israel, inasmuch as they maintained intact the immediate connection between the church and (not the Holy Spirit in her, but) the God of her salvation above her,—“messengers or media of communication between the upper and the lower world,” as they have been aptly called (Fr. in Zeller's *bibl. Wörterbuch*). As to the place and significance of N. T. prophecy, see 1 Tim. i. 18, iv. 14; 1 Cor. xiv. 3, xiii. 8; Rev. xi. 6. Hence the significant admonition in 1 Thess. v. 20, **προφητείας μὴ ἐξουθενεῖτε**.—The German *weissagen*, *to prophesy*, does not in the least coincide with *vorhersagen*, *to foretell*; it comes from *Wizac*, *Wizan*, *to know*, cf. = *vorawizac*, *foreknowing*. Sanscrit, *vedas*, *holy scripture*; Latin, *videre*.

In the N. T., generally, οἱ πρ. denote the prophets of the O. T.; ὁ πρ. is applied to Christ with obvious reference to Deut. xviii.; John (i. 21) vi. 14, vii. 40, cf. Acts iii. 22, vii. 37. **προφήτης** is used of Christ in Matt. xiii. 57, xiv. 5, xxi. 11; Mark vi. 4, 15; Luke iv. 24, vii. 16, 39, xiii. 33, xxiv. 19; John iv. 19, 44, ix. 17. Of N. T. prophets in Acts xi. 27, xiii. 1, xv. 32, xxi. 10; 1 Cor. xii. 28, 29, xiv. 29, 32, 37; Eph. ii. 20, iii. 5, iv. 11; Rev. xi. 10, xxii. 9.—Once in a general sense of the Cretan poet Epimenides, Tit. i. 12. The fem. **προφήτις**, Luke ii. 36; Rev. ii. 20.

Προφητεύω, **to be a prophet**, i.e. specially *to hold the office of a prophet, to proclaim God's will*, Eur. *Ion*. 413, τίς προφητεύει θεοῦ. Hence, generally = **to appear as a prophet, to prophesy, to announce something hidden on the strength of a divine revelation**, Matt. xxvi. 68; Mark xiv. 65; Luke xxii. 64.—John xi. 51; LXX. נִפְּחַל and הִתְּפִיחַ. As to its meaning, see above. Used of the O. T. prophets, Matt. xi. 13, xv. 7, Mark vii. 6, 1 Pet. i. 10, Jude 14, cf. Luke i. 67, John xi. 51; of N. T. prophesying, Matt. vii. 22; Acts ii. 17, 18, xix. 6, xxi. 9; 1 Cor. xi. 4, 5, xiii. 9, xiv. 1, 3, 4, 5, 24, 31, 39; Rev. x. 11, xi. 3.—The augment follows the preposition, **προεφήτευσα**. Lachm. and Tisch., however, write **ἐπροφήτευσα**, except in Jude 14, where Lachm. reads **προεφ**.

Προφητεία, ἡ, (I.) the prophetic rank or work, the office or gift of a prophet,

Lucian, *Alex.* 40. 60. So Rom. xii. 6 with διακονία, διδασκαλία as a *charisma*. See also 1 Cor. xii. 10, xiii. 2; 1 Thess. v. 20; 1 Tim. iv. 14; Rev. xix. 10, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς προφητείας; Rev. xi. 6, αἱ ἡμέραι τῆς προφητείας αὐτῶν. Elsewhere (II.) prophecy, that which is prophesied, Matt. xiii. 14, ἡ προφητεία Ἡσαίου, ἡ λέγουσα; 1 Cor. xiii. 8, xiv. 6, 22; 1 Tim. i. 18; 2 Pet. i. 20, 21; Rev. i. 3, xxii. 7, 10, 18, 19.

Β λ ά σ φ η μ ο ς, ο ν, the derivation is uncertain; probably not from βλάπτειν, for it would in this case be βλαψίφημος, like βλαψίφρων, *insane, maddening*, but from βλάξ, *sluggish, slow, stupid*, corresponding with βραδύς; one might be tempted to connect it with βάλλειν, Eustath. *ad Hom. Il.* ii. p. 219, ὁ ταῖς φήμαις βάλλον, *λοιδόρος*. Like the synonymous λοιδόρος, διάβολος (*Poll.* v. 118), it signifies abusive, reviling, destroying one's good name; Herod. vii. 8. 21, βλάσφημα πολλὰ εἰπὼν εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην καὶ σύγκλητον. Often in Plutarch; Acts vi. 11, ῥήματα βλάσφημα εἰς Μωϋσῆν καὶ τὸν θεόν. Already in profane Greek it signifies in particular what is blasphemous; at least βλασφημεῖν, βλασφημία are thus used, and by themselves, without expressly stating the reference to God and divine things, *e.g.* Plat. *Legg.* vii. 800 C, εἴ τις ἰδίᾳ παραστὰς τοῖς βωμοῖς τε καὶ ἱεροῖς . . . βλασφημοῖ πάσαν βλασφημίαν, and often. So βλάσφημος, 2 Macc. ix. 28, x. 4, 36, Wisd. i. 6, Ecclus. iii. 16, Isa. lxvi. 3 = *חַסְדֵּי הַבְּרִיָּה*, *cultum exhibens vano numini*.

It is used in the N. T., except in Acts vi. 11, Rev. xiii. 5, as a substantive, and (I.) *in a general sense*, 2 Tim. iii. 2; 2 Pet. ii. 11.—(II.) Specially, *in a religious sense*, Acts vi. 11; 1 Tim. i. 13; Rev. xiii. 5.

Β λ α σ φ η μ ί α, ἡ, calumniation, abuse, κατὰ τινος, Dem.; εἰς τινά, Herodian. It seems to denote the very worst kind of slander, see Dem. *pro cor.* iv. 12. 3, εἰς τοῦτον πολλάκις ἀπέσκωψε καὶ μέχρι αἰσχρᾶς βλασφημίας.—(I.) Matt. xv. 19 with ψευδομαρτυρία; Mark vii. 22; Eph. iv. 31; Col. iii. 8; 1 Tim. vi. 4; Jude 9, οὐκ ἐτόλμησεν κρίσιν ἐπενέγκειν βλασφημίας, cf. 2 Pet. ii. 11, κρίσις βλάσφημος.—(II.) Specially, *in a religious sense*, Plat. *Legg.* vii. 800 C, see βλάσφημος; Menand. *fr.* 169; 1 Macc. ii. 6; cf. 2 Macc. viii. 4, Ezek. xxxv. 12 = *חַסְדֵּי הַבְּרִיָּה*. So in the N. T. βλ. πρὸς τὸν θεόν, Rev. xiii. 6; ἡ τοῦ πν. βλασφημία, Matt. xii. 31, cf. Heb. x. 29, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος ἐνυβρίζειν, and βλασφημεῖν in contrast with δόξαζειν in 1 Pet. iv. 14; Matt. xii. 32, εἰπεῖν κατὰ τοῦ πν. τοῦ ἁγ. (The import of this *speaking* against the Holy Ghost corresponds with the import of the word as oppositely used in the confession, see Rom. x. 9, 10; and for the rest, comp. ἅγιος, p. 50.) By itself = *blasphemy, attacking sacred things*, see Rev. xiii. 6. So also Matt. xii. 31, xxvi. 65; Mark ii. 7, iii. 28, xiv. 64; Luke v. 21; John x. 33; Rev. ii. 9, xiii. 1, 5, xvii. 3.

Β λ α σ φ η μ έ ω, to revile, to calumniate; εἰς τινά, περί, κατὰ τινος, also in later Greek βλ. τινά. Herodian, ii. 6, 20 with κακῶς ἀγορεύειν. In a religious sense, εἰς θεούς, Plat. *Rep.* ii. 381 E, and by itself, *Legg.* vii. 800 C, *Alc.* ii. 149 C. LXX. 2 Kings

xix. 6 = 𐤇𐤓𐤁, parallel with *ὀνειδίζειν θεὸν ζῶντα*, ver. 4, cf. ver. 22, *τίνα ὀνειδίσας καὶ τίνα ἐβλασφήμησας*; Isa. lii. 5 = 𐤏𐤃𐤁𐤁. — In the N. T., (I.) generally, as synonymous with *ὀνειδίζειν*, *λοιδορεῖν*, Matt. xxvii. 39; Mark xv. 29; Luke xxii. 65, xxiii. 39; Rom. iii. 8, xiv. 16; 1 Cor. iv. 13 (where some read *δυσφημούμενοι*); Tit. iii. 2; 2 Pet. ii. 10; Jude 8.—(II.) Specially, to revile God and divine things, Rev. xiii. 6, *βλασφημῆσαι τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ τὴν σκηνὴν αὐτοῦ, καὶ τοὺς ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ σκηνούντας*; that it means "to condemn or deny that being and life, that essential nature which any person or thing has in virtue of its relation to God" (Schott on 2 Pet. ii. 10), is an unproved and untenable assertion. With the object against which the railing is directed, *εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πν.*, Luke xii. 10; Mark iii. 29. Elsewhere with the accusative, Acts xix. 37, *τὴν θεόν*; Rom. ii. 24, *τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ*; Rev. xiii. 6, xvi. 9. — 1 Tim. vi. 1, *ἡ διδασκαλία*; Tit. ii. 5, *ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ*; Jas. ii. 7, *τὸ καλὸν ὄνομα*; 2 Pet. ii. 2, *ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας*; Rev. xvi. 11, 21, *τὸν θεόν*. Without object, Matt. ix. 3; Mark ii. 7, iii. 28; John x. 36; Acts xiii. 45, xviii. 6, xxvi. 11; 1 Tim. i. 20; 1 Pet. iv. 4; 2 Pet. ii. 12; Jude 10.

Φύω, aorist passive ἐφύην, connected with the Latin *fui*; (I.) intransitively, to become, to increase; so in Attic Greek only the 2d aorist ἔφυν, perfect πέφυκα and passive φύομαι; the active very seldom (*Il.* vi. 149; Aristotle, *Probl.* v. 27). In biblical Greek, Heb. xii. 15 from Deut. xxix. 18, *μὴ τίς ἐστιν ἐν ὑμῖν ῥίζα ἄνω φύουσα ἐν χολῇ καὶ πικρίᾳ*; Ecclus. xiv. 18, *ὡς φύλλον θάλλον ἐπὶ δένδρου δασέως τὰ μὲν καταβάλλει, ἄλλα δὲ φύει*.—(II.) Transitivity, to produce; passive, to become, to grow, Luke viii. 6, 8.

Σύμφυτος, ον, from *συμφύειν*, *συμφέσθαι*, to grow at the same time, to grow together, to grow over (Luke viii. 7, *συμφυεῖσαι αἱ ἄκανθαι*); (I.) grown at the same time, implanted, e.g. *ἐπιθυμία*, *ἀρετή*, etc.; *κακοήθεια*, 3 Macc. iii. 22.—(II.) Grown together, grown over, Rom. vi. 5, *εἰ γὰρ σύμφυτοι γεγόναμεν τῷ ὁμοιώματι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἐσόμεθα*, to be explained in accordance with vv. 4, 5. It signifies not merely *homogeneousness*, but *a being combined and united one with another*, which is brought about by baptism, ver. 4; accordingly, ver. 6, *ὁ παλαιὸς ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος συνεσταυρώθη*.—Plato, *Phaedr.* 246 A, *ξυμφύτῳ δυνάμει ὑποπτέρου ζεύγους τε καὶ ἡνιόχου*; Lucian, *de Mort.* xvi. 4, *ὥσπερ ἵπποκένταυρος τις ἦτε εἰς ἐν συμπεφυκότες ἄνθρωπος καὶ θεός*.

Νεόφυτος, ον, newly grown up; only still in biblical and patristic Greek (according to Pollux, used also by Aristophanes) = *νεογενής*, *ἀρτυγενής*, comp. *ἀρτυγέννητα βρέφη*, 1 Pet. ii. 2; 1 Tim. iii. 6, *δεῖ οὖν τὸν ἐπίσκοπον . . . εἶναι . . . μὴ νεόφυτον, ἵνα μὴ τυφωθεὶς εἰς κρίμα ἐμπέσῃ τοῦ διαβόλου*.—LXX. Job xiv. 9 (*δένδρον γήρασκον*), *ποιήσει θερισμὸν ὥσπερ νεόφυτον*; Ps. cxliv. 14, *οἱ υἱοὶ ὡς νεόφυτα ἰδρυμένα ἐν τῇ νεότητι αὐτῶν*; Isa. v. 7; Ps. cxxviii. 3.

X

Χαίρω, future in the LXX. and N. T., *χαρήσομαι*, aor. *ἐχάρην*, answering to the German "gern," *to desire*; Old High German "ger," *eager* = *to rejoice, to be pleased with*. The infinitive is often used as a term of greeting. The participle with a finite verb = *willingly, gladly*.

Χάρις, *ιτος, ῆ*, accusative usually *χάριν*, but also (and not in later Greek only) *χάριτα*, as some read in Jude 4; Acts xxv. 9, xxiv. 27. The import of this word has been in a peculiar manner determined and defined by the peculiar use of it in the N. T., and especially in the Pauline Epistles. We cannot affirm that its scriptural use seriously differs from or contradicts its meaning in the classics, for the elements of the conception expressed by it are only emphasized in a distinctive manner in Holy Scripture; but by this very means it has become quite a different word in N. T. Greek, so that we may say it depended upon Christianity to realize its full import, and to elevate it to its rightful sphere. It signifies in the N. T. what we designate *Gnade, grace*, a conception which was not expressed by *χάρις* in profane Greek, and which, indeed, the classics do not contain. It may be affirmed that this conception, to express which the Greek *χάρις* has been appropriated as a perfect synonym,—a conception in its distinctive compass quite different from the negative *to pardon, to remit*,—first appeared with, and was first introduced by, Christianity, *vid. χαρίζεσθαι*. We may, perhaps, add that no language so fully and accurately presents a synonym for it as does the Old High German "ginâda," literally, "a coming near," or "an inclining towards" (cf. the Latin *propitius*), *e.g.* "diu sunne gêt ze gnaden;" hence, *inclination, e.g.* "gnade haben zuo"—and then "a bowing in thanks," *thanks, e.g.* "genade siner dienste, die er mir emboten hat" (Nibel. 1383). The English word *grace* corresponds fully with the German *Gnade*.

Now *χάρις*—which is related to the root *χαίρειν* as *πίστις* is to *πείθειν*—signifies a kind, affectionate, pleasing nature, and inclining disposition either in person or thing. —(I.) Objectively, and for the most part physically, it denotes *personal gracefulness, a pleasing work, beauty of speech*, etc., joined with *κάλλος, κόσμος* (see Eccles. xl. 22), and contrasted with *σεμνότης*, "dignity," Plut. *Mor.* 67 E, *παρθένων χάριτες, charms*, Eur. *Tro.* 1108; *χ. Ἀττικῇ, Σωκρατικῇ*, Lucian, *Zeux.* 2; Dio Chrys. 257, *gracefulness, agreeableness*. Thus in the N. T. Luke iv. 22, *λόγοι τῆς χάριτος*; Col. iv. 6, *ὁ λόγος ὑμῶν πάντοτε ἐν χάριτι, ἁλατι ἡρυγμένος*; Eph. iv. 29, *ἵνα δῶ χάριν τοῖς ἀκούουσιν*, in contrast with *λόγος σαπρός*, unless *χάριν διδόναι* be = *to do a kindness or act of love*, and be taken in connection with the preceding *ἀγαθὸς πρὸς οἰκοδομήν*. But the reference here is not so much to the deed of kindness as to the *agreeableness* of the Christian's conversation, see Phil. iv. 6; and this is expressed in classical Greek by *χάριν φέρειν τινί*, while *χάριν διδόναι* means *to do a kindness*. Cf. Prov. x. 33, *χείλη ἀνδρῶν δικαίων*

ἀποσπάξει χάριτας.—Col. iii. 16, ἐν τῇ χάριτι ᾗδοντες . . . τῷ θεῷ, cannot be taken as an example of this use of χάρις, because of the article, which must be regarded as genuine. The word often occurs in this sense in the LXX. as = חַן, Ps. xlv. 3, ἐξεχύθη χάρις ἐν χεῖλεσίν σου; Prov. i. 9, στέφανος χαρίτων; iii. 22, iv. 9, v. 19; נְחָמָה, Esth. vi. 3, with δόξα; נְיָ, Prov. x. 33. Also in the Apocrypha, 2 Macc. xv. 13; Ecclus. xxiv. 16, vii. 19, xxvi. 13, and often.—Cf. also the various readings in some MSS. of χάρις for καύχημα, 1 Cor. ix. 16, also 1 Pet. ii. 19, 20, χάρις with κλέος.

Then (II.) subjectively it means **an inclining towards** (cf. the adverbial accusative χάριν = *on account of*, literally, *through inclination towards*, Luke vii. 47; Eph. iii. 1, etc.); **courteous or gracious disposition, friendly willingness**, both on the part of the giver and the receiver; in the former case = *kindness, favour*; in the latter = *thanks, respect, homage*; (a.) **favour, kindness, inclination towards**; the disposition as generally cherished and habitually manifested, and as shown in the bestowment of a favour or in a service of love to any one. In this last reference we find it most frequently in the classics with δῶρον, etc. (Xen., Plat., Plut.); χάριν λαμβάνειν, ἀπαιτεῖν, δοῦναι. Cf. ὀργῇ, γαστρὶ χάριν δοῦναι = *to yield to, to favour*. So in the N. T. Acts xxv. 3, αἰτούμενοι χάριν; xxiv. 27, xxv. 9, χάριν (χάριτας) καταθέσθαι τινί. In particular, of the freewill offerings of the Corinthians, 1 Cor. xvi. 3; 2 Cor. viii. 4, τὴν χάριν καὶ τὴν κοινωνίαν τῆς διακονίας τῆς εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους; vv. 6, 7, 9, ix. 8. More frequently in the N. T. of the disposition = **kindly inclination, favour, grace**. Thus in classical Greek with εὐνοία, Plat. Legg. xi. 931 A, Plut. Mor. 72 F; φιλία, Plut. Lye. 4; πραότης, Plut. Mor. 1108 B. As opposed to ἐχθρά, ὀργή, μῖσος, Dem., Plut., and others. Thuc. iii. 95, τῶν Μεσσηνίων χάριτι πεισθεῖς, *from kindness to the Messenians*. So in the N. T. of *divine and human favour in general*, Luke i. 30, ii. 40, 52; Acts ii. 47, iv. 33, vii. 46.

But the word especially denotes **God's grace and favour towards mankind or to any individual**, which, as a free act, excludes merit, and is not hindered by guilt, but forgives sin; it thus stands out in contrast with ἔργα, νόμος, ἁμαρτία. It is called **grace** as denoting the relation and conduct of God towards sinful man, ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ, Rom. v. 15; 1 Cor. xv. 10; 2 Cor. vi. 1, viii. 1; Gal. ii. 21; Eph. iii. 2; Col. i. 6; 2 Thess. i. 12; Tit. ii. 11, ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ σωτήριος; Heb. ii. 9, xii. 15; 1 Pet. iv. 10; Jude 4; 1 Pet. v. 10, ὁ θεὸς πάσης χάριτος; joined with Christ, because manifested in and through Him, 2 Tim. ii. 1, ἡ χάρις ἡ ἐν Χριστῷ; 1 Pet. i. 13, τελείως ἐλπίσατε ἐπὶ τὴν φερομένην ὑμῖν χάριν ἐν ἀποκαλύψει Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, cf. i. 10, οἱ περὶ τῆς εἰς ὑμᾶς χάριτος προφητεύσαντες; hence ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν, Χριστοῦ, Rom. xvi. 20, 24; 1 Cor. xvi. 23; 2 Cor. viii. 9, xiii. 13; Gal. i. 6, vi. 18; Phil. iv. 23; 1 Thess. v. 28; 2 Thess. iii. 18; 1 Tim. i. 14; Philem. 25; 2 Pet. iii. 18, αὐξάνετε ἐν χάριτι καὶ γνώσει τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ; Rev. xxii. 21. See the phrase used in the beginning of the Epistles, χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, 1 Cor. i. 3; Rom. i. 7, etc.; χάρις, ἔλεος, εἰρήνη κ.τ.λ., 1 Tim. i. 2; 2 Tim. i. 2 (Tit. i. 4); 2 John 3. Then for the most part used alone, ἡ χάρις, as in Rom. v. 17, οἱ τὴν περισ-

σείαν τῆς χάριτος καὶ τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς δικαιοσύνης λαμβάνοντες; ver. 20, οὐδὲ ἐπλεόνασεν ἡ ἁμαρτία, ὑπερεπερίσσευσεν ἡ χάρις.

Χάρις has been distinctively appropriated in the N. T. to designate the relation and conduct of God towards sinful man as revealed in and through Christ, especially as an act of spontaneous favour, of favour wherein no mention can be made of obligation. See Eph. ii. 7, where χάρις is mentioned as a special form of χρηστότης, ἵνα ἐνδείξηται ἐν τοῖς αἰῶσιν τοῖς ἐπερχομένοις τὸ ὑπερβάλλον πλοῦτος τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ ἐν χρηστότητι ἐφ' ἡμᾶς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. This element of spontaneousness is not prominent in the classical use of the word, though it is traceable even here, e.g. Thuc. as before, τῶν Μεσσηνίων χάριτι πεισθεῖς; and χάρις is used to express the willingness or consent of a wife. But in the N. T. this element is specially emphasized, for κατὰ χάριν is contrasted with κατὰ ὀφείλημα, Rom. iv. 4, cf. ver. 16, just as χάρισμα is set over against ὀφώνια, Rom. vi. 23, and the ἐκλογή are called ἐκλογή χάριτος, Rom. xi. 5, cf. ver. 6, εἰ δὲ χάριτι, οὐκέτι ἐξ ἔργων, ἐπεὶ ἡ χάρις οὐκέτι γίνεται χάρις· εἰ δὲ ἐξ ἔργων, οὐκέτι ἔστιν χάρις, ἐπεὶ τὸ ἔργον οὐκέτι ἔστιν ἔργον; Eph. ii. 8; Rom. iii. 24, δικαιοῦμενοι δωρεὰν τῇ αὐτοῦ χάριτι. Not only is χάρις contrasted with ὀφείλημα and ἔργα, but also with νόμος, Rom. iv. 16, vi. 14, 15, Gal. v. 3, 4, John i. 17, and this brings out to view the second element in the conception, viz. the antithesis of sin; χάρις is no more hindered by sin than it is conditioned by works. With the worthlessness of works in connection with grace we thus have the non-imputation and forgiveness of sin, i.e. ἀπολύτρωσις, and as the third element, the positive gift of δικαίωσις, leading on to ζωή, cf. Rom. v. 20, 21, vi. 1; Eph. i. 7, ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ, τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν παραπτωμάτων κατὰ τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ; Rom. iii. 24, v. 1, δικαιοθέντες οὖν ἐκ πίστεως; ver. 2, δι' οὗ καὶ τὴν προσαγωγὴν ἐσχήκαμεν εἰς τὴν χάριν ταύτην ἐν ᾗ ἐστήκαμεν; Tit. iii. 7, δικαιοθέντες τῇ ἐκεῖνου χάριτι. Thus it must be recognised that the Greek word in this application attains for the first time an application and sphere of use adequate to its real meaning; previously it was like a worn-out coin.

We find ἡ χάρις, grace, as thus contrasted with ὀφείλημα, ἔργα, νόμος, ἁμαρτία, and as the N. T. principle upon which salvation rests, in the following passages (besides the texts already cited), Acts xiii. 43, xiv. 3, 26, xv. 40, xviii. 27, xv. 11, διὰ τῆς χάριτος τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ πιστεύομεν σωθῆναι, cf. ver. 10; 2 Cor. iv. 15, xii. 9; Gal. v. 4, κατηργήθητε ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ . . . τῆς χάριτος ἐξεπέσατε; Eph. ii. 8, τῇ γὰρ χάριτί ἐστε σεσωσμένοι διὰ τῆς πίστεως; iv. 7; Phil. i. 7, συγκοινωνοὺς μου τῆς χάριτος πάντας ὑμᾶς ὄντας; Heb. iv. 16, ὁ θρόνος τῆς χάριτος; x. 29, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς χ.; xii. 15, ὑστερεῖν ἀπὸ τῆς χάριτος θεοῦ; 1 Pet. v. 12, ταύτην εἶναι ἀληθὴ χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς ἣν ἐστήκατε; Jude 4, τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν χάριτα μετατιθέντες εἰς ἀσέλγειαν κ.τ.λ. Without the article, and with reference to the conception itself, or special representations of it, grace, as experienced by the individual, or in a particular case, Rom. i. 5, δι' οὗ ἐλάβομεν χάριν καὶ ἀποστολήν; v. 15; 1 Cor. xv. 10, χάριτι δὲ θεοῦ εἰμὶ ὃ εἰμι, καὶ ἡ χάρις αὐτοῦ ἡ εἰς ἐμὲ οὐ κενὴ ἐγενήθη—οὐκ ἐγὼ ἀλλὰ ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ σὺν ἐμοί; 2 Cor. i. 12; Eph. ii. 5;

2 Thess. ii. 16 ; Heb. ii. 9, iv. 16, xiii. 9 ; Jas. iv. 6 ; 1 Pet. ii. 19, 20 (?), iii. 7, συγκληρονόμοι χάριτος ζωῆς ; iv. 10, οἰκονόμοι ποικίλης χάριτος θεοῦ ; v. 5 ; 2 Pet. iii. 18.

It cannot be said, however, that the N. T. χάρις denotes "a manifestation of grace" corresponding with the classical signification, *an act of kindness or of favour*. The distinction made between χάρις and δῶρον shows this, cf. Rom. v. 15, ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἡ δωρεὰ ἐν χάριτι ; ver. 17, οἱ τὴν περισσεύαν τῆς χάριτος καὶ τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς δικαιοσύνης λαμβάνοντες ; Eph. ii. 8, where θεοῦ τὸ δῶρον is not = χάρις, but = τῇ χάριτι ἐστε σεσωσμένοι ; iv. 7, ἐν ἑκάστῳ ἡμῶν ἐδόθη ἡ χάρις κατὰ τὸ μέτρον τῆς δωρεᾶς τοῦ Χριστοῦ. So also διδόναι χάριν, in Scripture, must not be confounded with the same expression in profane Greek, where it means, *to perform an act of kindness* ; in Scripture it signifies, *to give grace, to cause grace to be experienced* ; see Eph. iv. 7 ; 1 Pet. v. 5 ; Jas. iv. 6 ; Rom. xii. 6, ἔχοντες χαρίσματα κατὰ τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθείσαν ἡμῖν ; 1 Cor. i. 4, ἐπὶ τῇ χάριτι τοῦ θεοῦ τῇ δοθείσῃ ὑμῖν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ; 2 Cor. vi. 1, viii. 1. (Cf. Acts xi. 21.) We must also keep in mind the newly formed term χάρισμα = *gift of grace*, as used by St. Paul, and as it appears in Christian phraseology. Thus, too, we are to understand the texts in which St. Paul speaks of the grace given to him with reference to his office, as is clear from Eph. iii. 7, οὗ ἐγενόμην διάκονος κατὰ τὴν δωρεὰν τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν δοθείσάν μοι ; iii. 2, ἠκούσατε οἰκονομίαν τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς δοθείσης μοι εἰς ὑμᾶς ; ver. 8 ; Rom. xii. 3, xv. 15, i. 5 ; 1 Cor. iii. 10 ; Gal. ii. 9. — There is no warrant for the distinction made between χάρις, as literally *favor Dei immanens*, and χάρις, *per metonymiam*, as the outcome of this feeling ; χάρις is simply the *feeling manifesting itself, grace as it appears in the relation and conduct of God towards sinners*.

As to the O. T. use of the word, in anticipation of its N. T. meaning, we remark that the N. T. χάρις is not identical with the χάρις of the LXX. In the LXX. χάρις is usually the rendering adopted for the Hebrew חַן, which has almost the same comprehension and range as the Greek word. It signifies *gracefulness, agreeableness*, Ps. xlv. 3 ; Prov. i. 9, v. 19, etc. ; also, *kindness of disposition towards, grace*. It is rendered by ἔλεος, Gen. xix. 19, Num. xi. 15 ; by ἀρέσκεια, Prov. xxxi. 30 ; by ἐπιχαρις, Nah. iii. 4 ; and in other passages, with few exceptions, by χάρις in both its senses. In the sense *kindness, favour, grace*, it is used only in the two connections, חַן מֵאֱלֹהִים and חַן מִן הָאָדָם, of divine and human kindness ; Gen. vi. 8, xviii. 3, xxx. 27 ; Ex. xxxiii. 16 ; Num. xi. 11 ; Ex. iii. 21, xi. 3, xii. 36, and often. See also Luke i. 30 ; Heb. iv. 16 ; Acts vii. 46. But חַן does not, like the N. T. χάρις, signify what distinctively belongs to God's economy of redemption ; it is not, like χάρις, a specifically scriptural conception. The N. T. χάρις rather corresponds with the O. T. רַחֲמִים, which the LXX. usually translate ἔλεος (which see). But ἔλεος, though adopted into the N. T. treasury, leaves untouched an essential aspect of the scriptural or N. T. conception of grace, inasmuch as it is used to express *the divine behaviour towards wretchedness and misery, not towards sin*. It is just this aspect—the relation of *grace* to sin—which must not be overlooked ; in this the *freeness* of grace—the *spontaneous inclination* which does not lie in ἔλεος—is for the first time fully realized.

Still the LXX. would more naturally choose ἔλεος as a rendering of רַחֻם, because it was used religiously in classical Greek, which χάρις was not, except, indeed, with reference to the Graces.

It remains for us only to mention (b.) χάρις as = **thanks**, in which sense it very often occurs in profane Greek; in the N. T. Rom. vi. 17, vii. 25; 1 Cor. x. 30, xv. 57; 2 Cor. ii. 14, ix. 15; 1 Tim. i. 12; 2 Tim. i. 3; Philem. 7; Heb. xii. 28. The connection of this meaning with the elementary signification *inclination towards*, is manifest from such expressions as πέμπειν χάριν, *to pay homage, or offer thanks to*. See Lexicons.

Χαριτόω, only in Scripture and in later (post-Christian) Greek. Not in the LXX. Once Symmachus, Ps. xviii. 26, μετὰ τοῦ κεχαριτωμένου χαριτωθήσῃ (= רַחֻם יִרְחֻם; but not, as Schleusner assumes, answering to the second part of the verse יִרְחֻם); twice in Ecclus. ix. 8, ἀπόστρεψον ὀφθαλμὸν ἀπὸ γυναικὸς κεχαριτωμένης, where some read εὐμόρφου; xviii. 17, οὐκ ἰδοὺ λόγος ὑπὲρ δόμα ἀγαθόν; καὶ ἀμφοτέρα παρὰ ἀνδρὶ κεχαριτωμένῳ. Elsewhere in the N. T., Eph. i. 6, εἰς ἔπαινον δόξης τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ, ἐν ᾗ ἐχαρίτωσεν ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ ἡγαπημένῳ, where Theodoret, Theophyl., Oecum. explain it, οὓς ἐπεράστους, ἀξιεράστους, χαριέντας ἐποίησεν; Chrysostom, οὐ μόνον ἀμαρτημάτων ἀπήλλαξεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπεράστους ἐποίησεν. The other passage is Luke i. 28, χαῖρε κεχαριτωμένη, ὁ κύριος μετὰ σοῦ, cf. ver. 30, εὖρες γὰρ χάριν παρὰ τῷ θεῷ (cf. Plut. Mor. 778 C, χαρὰς γὰρ οὐδὲν οὕτως γόνιμόν ἐστιν ὡς χάρις). So also Theophyl. *in loc.*, τοῦτο γάρ ἐστι τὸ κεχαριτωσθαι, τὸ εὖρεῖν χάριν παρὰ τῷ θεῷ, τουτέστιν ἀρέσαι θεῷ; therefore somewhat like what elsewhere would be expressed by δεκτός. But this is incorrect; εὖρεῖν χάριν κ.τ.λ. is the ground of the κεχαριτωσθαι. Χαριτοῦν signifies, as Hofmann on Eph. i. 6 best remarks, **to make any one to have grace**. In Ecclus. ix. 8, the reference would be to χάρις in an objective sense, *charm*, κεχαρ. = **charming, lovely**. With reference to χάρις in its subjective sense, *favour*, on the other hand, in Ecclus. xix. 17, κεχαρ. = **gracious**. Both meanings are in the rendering of Symmachus, Ps. xviii. If there were no other choice, these two meanings only could find place in the N. T. passages, with a certain inclination towards the conception embraced in δεκτός,—a meaning which, perhaps, in Eph. i. 6 may not appear inappropriate to the preceding thought concerning adoption, but which is quite impossible in Luke i. 28. We must therefore, with Hofmann, resort to the divine χάρις, and take χαριτοῦν, = **to bestow grace upon**, as distinct from χαρίζεσθαι, as *begnaden*, *to confer grace*, differs from *begnadigen*, *to show favour to*,—a meaning which in both places suits the context, and which Gregory Thaumaturg. has in mind when he explains it as given because Mary was to bear in her womb Jesus Christ, the whole treasure of God's grace.

Χαρίζομαι, χαρίσομαι (Att. χαριοῦμαι), κεχάρισμαι.—(I.) As a deponent, **to do a person a favour, to be kind to**; Hesych., παρασχέιν, λέγονται γὰρ αἱ γυναῖκες χαρίζεσθαι, αἱ πρὸς συνουσίαν ἑαυτὰς ἐκδιδούσαι. Also ὀργῇ, ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις, ἡδοναῖς, *et al.* So—with the dative, Gal. iii. 18, τῷ δὲ Ἀβραὰμ δι' ἐπαγγελίας κεχάρισται ὁ θεός—in the

N. T. sense of *χάρις* = to be gracious to. Eph. iv. 32, Col. iii. 13, are not to be reckoned here.—Then with the accusative of the thing, to give or bestow a thing willingly, e.g. *δῶρα, δέξιν, et al.*, and with the dative of the person. Thus Luke vii. 21, *τυφλοῖς πολλοῖς ἐχαρίσατο βλέπειν*; Acts xxvii. 24, *κεχαρίσται σοι ὁ θεὸς πάντας*; Rom. viii. 32, *τὰ πάντα ἡμῖν χαρίζεται*; Phil. ii. 9, *ἐχαρίσατο αὐτῷ ὄνομα*. Also for an end proposed by the receiver, to yield to his will, e.g. Plut. C. Gracch. iv., *φῆσας τῇ μητρὶ δεηθείσῃ χαρίζεσθαι τὸν Ὀκταοῦιον, to sacrifice him to her will*. So Acts xxv. 11, *οὐδεὶς με δύναται αὐτοῖς χαρίσασθαι*; xxv. 16. The end in view must be inferred from the context, cf. Acts iii. 14, *ἰτήσασθε ἄνδρα φονέα χαρισθῆναι ὑμῖν*. With this most closely perhaps is connected the meaning of the word peculiar to the N. T., viz. to pardon, graciously to remit a person's sin; Col. ii. 13, *χαρισάμενος ἡμῖν πάντα τὰ παραπτώματα* (answering to the antithesis between *χάρις* and *ἁμαρτία*); 2 Cor. ii. 10, *ὃ δέ τι χαρίζεσθε*; xii. 13, *χαρίσασθέ μοι τὴν ἀδικίαν*. With the accusative merely, to forgive something, 2 Cor. ii. 10; with the dative only, to forgive any one, to be gracious to, Eph. iv. 32; Col. iii. 13, *χαριζόμενοι ἑαυτοῖς ἐάν τις πρὸς τινα ἔχῃ μομφήν, καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ἐχαρίσατο ὑμῖν*. Without any object, 2 Cor. ii. 7. This meaning is not found in profane Greek; the passage sometimes cited from Dion. Hal. *Ant.* v. 280, *φρονίμων μὲν ἀνθρώπων ἔργον ἐστὶ ταῖς φιλαῖς χαρίζεσθαι τὰς ἔχθρας*, cannot be taken as an instance, for *χαρ.* here signifies what we would express by the verb *to offer*. The word is not used in this sense even in the O. T. Apocrypha. A resemblance occurs first in Joseph. *Antt.* ii. 6. 8, *τῷ σὺ χαριζόμενος ἤθει, giving way to*, but even this is not quite the same. In Luke vii. 42, 43, it means simply *to give*. The word has received a higher and fuller meaning by its adoption into the sphere of N. T. ideas, clearly illustrating the influence of Christianity upon the use of *χάρις*.—(II.) Passive, especially in the aor. *ἐχαρίσθην*, and fut. *χαρισθήσομαι*, to be kindly treated, to be pleasingly dealt with; Herod. viii. 5, *τοῖσι Εὐβόεσσι ἐχάριστο, it was done to please the Euboeans*; Plat. *Phaedr.* 250 C, *ταῦτα μνήμη κεχαρίσθω, dear to memory*.—So Acts iii. 14; 1 Cor. ii. 12, *τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ χαρισθέντα ἡμῖν*; Phil. i. 29; Philem. 22.—Not in the LXX. Often in the Apocrypha, Ecclus. xii. 3; 2 Macc. iii. 31, vii. 22, iv. 32.

Χάρισμα, τό, used by St. Paul only (except in 1 Pet. iv. 10); not in profane Greek. Philo, *de Alleg.* ii. 75 B. = what is presented, what is freely given, a gift of grace; (I.) generally, the effect of God's gracious dealing, the positive blessing bestowed upon sinners through grace, Rom. v. 15, 16, *τὸ δὲ χάρισμα ἐκ πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων εἰς δικαίωμα*. Cf. ver. 15, where τὸ χάρισμα is more fully described as *ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἡ δωρεὰ ἐν χάριτι*; vi. 23, *τὰ γὰρ ὀφώνια τῆς ἁμαρτίας θάνατος· τὸ δὲ χάρισμα τοῦ θεοῦ ζωὴ αἰώνιος ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*. See xi. 29, where τὰ χαρίσματα refer to the saving operations of divine grace generally.—(II.) In a special sense, a particular gift of grace imparted to an individual, as in 2 Cor. i. 11, *τὸ εἰς ἡμᾶς χάρισμα*, the grace bestowed on the apostle, and so clearly manifest in the help given to him. In other

passages it denotes special gifts possessed by the Christian, τὸ ἐν σοὶ χάρισμα, 1 Tim. iv. 14; 2 Tim. i. 6; extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghost dwelling and working in a special manner in individuals (see χάρισμα πνευματικόν, Rom. i. 11), and manifest in the conduct and work of the individual in the church (compare the parallel διακονίαι, 1 Cor. xii. 4, 5), and in his manner of life, 1 Cor. vii. 7. Thus 1 Cor. xii. 4, διαιρέσεις χαρισμάτων εἰσὶν, τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα; xii. 9, 28, 30, 31; 1 Pet. iv. 10, ἕκαστος καθὼς ἔλαβεν χάρισμα, εἰς ἑαυτοὺς αὐτὸ διακονοῦντες ὡς καλοὶ οἰκονόμοι ποικίλης χάριτος θεοῦ. For the connection between these and the more general gifts of grace, see Rom. xii. 5, 6; Hofmann on 1 Cor. xii. 4, "*individual manifestations of the grace here treated of, appropriate to the sanctified natural life of the individual (Rom. viii. 30), and peculiar to Christianity.*"

Χαρακτήρ, ὁ, from χαράσσω, to tear, to cleave, to cut in, to engrave, etc.—(I.) Actively, something engraved or impressed, and especially an instrument for this, *e.g.* stamp. Rarely used in this sense. Stob. *Floril.* ciii. 27, ὀνόματα ἔθηκε τοῖς πράγμασι, χαρακτήρ αὐτῶν γενόμενος. Likewise χαράκτης. Oftener (II.) in a passive sense, sign, mark, token. Cf. Plut. *Mor.* 856 D, ἦν δὲ καὶ πλείονας καθαριθμείσθαι τῶν χαρακτήρων· ἀρκούσι δὲ οὗτοι κατανόησιν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τῆς προαιρέσεως καὶ τοῦ τρόπου παρασχεῖν; *de Placit. Phil.* v. 11, (πόθεν γίνονται τῶν γονέων ὁμοιώσεις καὶ τῶν προγόνων;) Οἱ Στωικοί, ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος ὅλου καὶ τῆς ψυχῆς φέρεσθαι τὰ σπέρματα καὶ τὰς ὁμοιότη-
τας ἀναπλάττεσθαι ἐκ τῶν αὐτῶν γενῶν τοὺς τύπους καὶ τοὺς χαρακτήρας, ὥσπερ ἀνὲλ ζωγράφον ἀπὸ ὁμοίων χρωμάτων εἰκόνα τοῦ βλεπομένου. Thus it very often signifies distinctive sign, trait, idiosyncrasy, distinctive type or form, *e.g.* τῆς γλώσσης, τῆς διαλέκτου (Herod., Diod., Dion.), of a writer's style or his peculiar mode of exposition, *e.g.* φιλό-
σοφος, ἱστορικός; of national peculiarities, *e.g.* Ἑλληνικός (Dion. Hal., 2 Macc. iv. 10); cf. the work of Theophrastus, ἠθικοὶ χαρακτήρες. One might be tempted to refer this meaning to the *lines of the seal*, the impress or pattern which it bears. Cf. Sext. *Empir. Log.* i. 251, αἱ διὰ τῶν δακτύλων σφραγίδες αἰεὶ πάντας ἐπ' ἀκριβὲς τοὺς χαρακτήρας ἐνα-
πομάττονται τῷ κληρῷ. But there are other examples which clearly show that χαρακτήρ—as an exception among the few nouns formed with -ήρ—must be taken passively as = impress, imprint, stamp. So Aristot. *Rep.* i. 6, χαρακτήρα ἐπιβάλλειν. . . ὁ γὰρ χαρακτήρ ἐτέθη τοῦ πόσου σημεῖον; *Id. Oecon.* ii. 20, χαρακτήρα ἐπικόπτειν; Lucian, *Hermotim.* 44, τί δὲ εἰ μὴδὲ γράμματα γράφοιμεν ἐπὶ τῶν κλήρων, ἀλλὰ τινα σημεῖα καὶ χαρακτήρας· οἷα πολλὰ Αἰγυπτίοι γράφουσιν ἀντὶ τῶν γραμμάτων, κυνοκεφάλους τινὰς ὄντας καὶ λεον-
τοκεφάλους ἀνθρώπους. Cf. Plut. *Mor.* 214 F, ἐτυπώθησαν οἱ τῶν γραμμάτων χαρακτήρες. See also, in particular, Plato, *Phaedr.* 263 B, οὐκοῦν τὸν μέλλοντα τέχνην ῥητορικὴν μετιέναι πρῶτον μὲν δεῖ ταῦτα ὁδῷ διηρεῖσθαι καὶ εἰληφέναι τινὰ χαρακτήρα ἐκατέρου τοῦ εἶδους; *Vir. Civ.* 289 B, ἡ τοῦ νομίσματος ἰδέα καὶ σφραγίδων καὶ παντὸς χαρακτήρος, where it is obviously = χάραγμα; Phil. *de plant. Noae* 332, εἶπεν αὐτὴν (*sc.* τὴν ψυχὴν) τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἀοράτου εἰκόνα, δόκιμον εἶναι νομίσας οὐσιωθεῖσαν καὶ τυπωθεῖσαν σφραγίδι

θεοῦ, ἥς ὁ χαρακτήρ ἐστὶν ἀίδιος λόγος; Clem. Rom. 1 Cor. 33, αὐτὸς ὁ δημιουργὸς καὶ δεσπότης πάντων . . . τὸν . . . ἄνθρωπον ταῖς ἰδίαις αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀμόμοις χερσὶν ἐπλασεν, τῆς ἑαυτοῦ εἰκόνης χαρακτήρα. It is thus clear that *χαρακτήρ* signifies the image impressed as corresponding with the original or pattern, and "on account of this idea of close resemblance it has for its synonyms *μίμημα, εἰκὼν, ἀπεικόνισμα*" (Delitzsch on Heb. i. 3). Cf. Lev. xiii. 28, of the mark produced by a brand, ὁ χαρακτήρ τοῦ κατακαύματος. It occurs in the N. T. only in Heb. i. 3, ὃς ὦν ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτήρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ, where the obvious endeavour to select a very expressive and significant word, as well as the meaning of ἀπαύγασμα, = *radiation*, not merely *reflection*, obliges us to explain the term not as *sign* or *outline*, but as *impress, imprint, pattern, image*. The passage in Clem. Rom. is decisive on this. *Χαρακτήρ* is chosen instead of *χάραγμα*, because this latter word was used in a narrower sense, and rarely denoted the peculiar characteristics of an individual or a people; indeed, it was inappropriate, because it must always prominently suggest the passive bearing of the subject spoken of. *Χάραγμα* occurs in Acts xvii. 29; Rev. xiii. 16, 17, xiv. 9, 11, xv. 2, xvi. 2, xix. 20, xx. 4 = *impression, mark, symbol*.

Χρίω, to rub over, to anoint; LXX. = *משח*, which is used of the symbolical anointing with holy oil, whereby men ordained of God to special service in His economy of grace, priests, prophets, and kings, were not only set apart and consecrated, but gifted and endowed for that holy service which demanded powers above and beyond those naturally belonging to man; cf. Ex. xxix. 7, xl. 13.—1 Kings xix. 16 is the only place where mention of it is made in connection with a prophet, and we may conclude that this was only an anointing practised by the prophets in the transmission of the prophetic call, because in the case of an immediate divine call, the very nature of the office required the reality implied by the symbol, viz. a being gifted with the Spirit of God.—1 Sam. x. 1, xv. 1, *et al.*; Ps. lxxxix. 21.—Oil is regarded as the emblem of salvation (Isa. lxi. 3; Ps. xlv. 8), of saving power, of the Spirit of God, see 1 Sam. xvi. 13, x. 1, 9, 10; Isa. xi. 1; see Acts x. 38, ἔχρισεν αὐτὸν ὁ θεὸς πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ δυνάμει. The Hebrew *משח* is used especially of the anointing of the high priest (which corresponds with the expression, "outpouring of the Holy Ghost"), but *משח* is used of the anointing of kings; see *Χριστός*. In the N. T. *χρίειν* only occurs in a sense akin to the O. T. anointing, and as denoting a consecration and endowment for sacred service, Acts x. 38; Luke iv. 18, ἔχρισέ με εὐαγγελίσασθαι; Heb. i. 9, ἔχρισέν σε . . . ὁ θεός σου ἔλαιον ἀγαλλιάσεως παρὰ τοὺς μετόχους σου (Ps. xlv. 8, cf. Isa. lxi. 3). Absolutely, Acts iv. 27, ἐπὶ τὸν ἅγιον παῖδά σου Ἰησοῦν, ὃν ἔχρισας. These passages concern the anointing of Jesus to His calling and rank (the latter in Acts iv. 27, Heb. i. 9). Besides this reference to Christ as *the Anointed*, it is used, 2 Cor. i. 21, of the call of the apostle and his companions (ver. 19, comp. the absence of the *σὺν ὑμῖν* with *χρίσας ἡμᾶς*).

Χρίσμα, τό, the anointing; LXX. = *משחה*, Ex. xxx. 25, xl. 9; Lev. xxi. 10; for

they called the specially prepared anointing oil *χρίσμα ἅγιον* (see *χρίω*). In 1 John ii. 20, 27 (where alone the word occurs in the N. T.), it signifies an anointing which had been experienced, a communication and reception of the Spirit (comp. John xvi. 13 with the connection in 1 John); and it is not merely a figurative name for the Spirit. This is clear from the expression *χρίσμα ἔχετε, ἀλάβετε*, and the word seems chosen in order to give prominence on the one hand to what the readers had experienced, and on the other by referring to O. T. practice, and especially to Christ, to remind them of their calling and rank (see 1 Pet. ii. 5, 9). The LXX. use the word also with the signification anointing in Ex. xxix. 7, *λήψη τοῦ ἐλαίου τοῦ χρίσματος καὶ ἐπιχεῖς αὐτό*; comp. the Hebrew *הִשָּׁחֵט הַזֶּה*.

Χριστός, ἡ, ὁ, anointed, e.g. *τὸ χριστόν*, Lev. xxi. 10, the anointing. For the most part ὁ *Χριστός*, the anointed, Heb. *מָשִׁחַ*, a term applied to every one anointed with the holy oil, primarily to the high priest, Lev. iv. 3, 5, 16, vi. 15. LXX. iv. 3, ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς ὁ κεχρισμένος; iv. 5, ὁ ἱερεὺς ὁ χριστός; in other places, to the king; in the LXX. almost always = ὁ χριστός, and generally *מֶלֶךְ מָשִׁחַ*, or with suffixes of God, except Dan. ix. 25; 2 Sam. i. 21. So 1 Sam. ii. 10, 35, xii. 3, 5, xvi. 6, xix. 22, xxiv. 6, 7, 11, xxvi. 9, 11, 16, 23; 2 Sam. i. 14, 16, xix. 22, xxii. 51, xxiii. 1; Ps. ii. 2, xx. 7, xxviii. 8, xviii. 51, lxxxix. 39, 52, cxxxii. 10, 17; Lam. iv. 20; 2 Chron. vi. 42.—In Isa. xlv. 1 of Cyrus, because he was the instrument of redemption (Fürst); the plural occurs in Ps. cv. 15; 1 Chron. xvi. 22; of Israel as a nation, or of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, Ps. cv. 8–12, cf. Ps. lxxxiv. 10; Hab. iii. 13. On the ground of Dan. ix. 25, Ps. ii. 2, it is used in the Targums to designate the expected Saviour as the Anointed of God to be the King and Redeemer of His people (see βασιλεύς, βασιλεία), cf. Luke xxiii. 2, λέγοντα ἐαυτὸν Χριστόν βασιλέα εἶναι, with ver. 37, εἰ σὺ εἶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδ., σῶσον σεαυτόν; ver. 39, οὐχὶ σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστός; σῶσον σεαυτόν; ii. 11, ἐτέχθη σωτὴρ ὃς ἐστὶν Χριστὸς κύριος κ.τ.λ., see κύριος, Acts ii. 36; Mark xv. 32, ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ βασιλεὺς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ; Acts iv. 26, 27. As we have already observed (under βασιλεύς, βασιλεία), the full meaning of the term must be explained by its connection with that word, βασιλεὺς denoting the king's relation to the people, and the sphere of his dominion, ὁ Χριστός, carrying back this relationship to the divine ordainment and endowment, and including a reference to the divine promise of such a deliverer, and to the βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, wherein God's saving purposes are realized. In the mouth of Jesus as an appellative, Mark xii. 35, xiii. 21; Matt. xxiv. 5 (without the article, Mark ix. 41); of Himself, Matt. xxiii. 10, xxiv. 5.

As an appellative and with the article, ὁ Χριστός occurs chiefly in the Gospels; without the article and as a proper noun, and standing alone, we find it in the Gospels only in Mark ix. 41, ἐν ὀνόματι ὅτι Χριστοῦ ἐστέ, cf. Acts xxiv. 24; elsewhere only in the connection Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, cf. Matt. i. 16, Ἰησοῦς ὁ λεγόμενος Χριστός. In the Pauline Epistles, on the contrary, and in the first Petrine Epistle, Χριστός is used as a proper name, Rom. v. 8,

vi. 4, 8, viii. 10, 34, ix. 1, and often; 1 Pet. i. 11, 19, ii. 21, iii. 16, 18; next, this with the article, Rom. vii. 4, viii. 11, cf. ver. 10, ix. 3, 5; without any fixed rule as to its use, see 1 Cor. vi. 15, xi. 3, *et al.* In these Epistles ὁ Χριστός is not used as an appellative; see 1 Pet. i. 11, τὰ εἰς Χριστὸν παθήματα; iv. 13, τὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ παθήματα, as compared with Acts xvii. 3, ὅτι τὸν Χριστὸν ἔδει παθεῖν; xxvi. 23, εἰ παθητὸς ὁ Χριστός, where it is clearly an appellative. It is used as an appellative in 1 and 2 John and in the Revelation, see 1 John ii. 22, v. 1, 6; Rev. xi. 15, xii. 10. As a proper name perhaps, on the contrary, in 2 John 9; Rev. xx. 4, 6. As an appellative always when Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστός or ὁ Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς occurs, as in Acts xvii. 3, xviii. 5, 28. No significance can be attached to the change in the order of the words, as Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, or Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς.

Ἀντίχριστος, ὁ, opponent of Christ, according to 1 John ii. 22, ὁ ἀρνούμενος ὅτι Ἰησοῦς οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ Χριστός . . . ὁ ἀρνούμενος τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὸν υἱόν. See iv. 3, where τὸ τοῦ ἀντιχρίστου (cf. Matt. xxi. 21; 1 Cor. x. 24; 2 Pet. ii. 22; Jas. iv. 14) is the antichristian nature which μὴ ὁμολογεῖ τὸν Ἰησοῦν. It is not therefore like ἀντίθεος, *one who usurps the place of Christ, a false Christ*. Still it must be borne in mind, as Huther remarks, that "in noun-compounds formed with ἀντι in the way of contrast, the substantive denotes a subject, whether person or thing, represented by the ἀντι as opposing a subject of the same kind;" thus ἀντιφιλόσοφος signifies a "*philosopher who opposes other philosophers*;" ἀντίβιος, "*force arrayed against force*," and not merely what hinders or opposes force. Thus it is especially wherever persons are named; and this meets the objection of E. Haupt on 1 John ii. 22, who compares the adj. ἀντίθυρος, *what is opposite the door*, and therefore would find in ἀντίχριστος only the element of *hostility to Christ*. Thus ἀντίχριστος is that which sets itself in the place of Christ, which appears as Christ in opposition to Christ, as distinct from ψευδόχριστος, Matt. xxiv. 24, Mark xiii. 22, which means rather a false hypocritical representation of Christ rather than an opponent of Him. Ὁ ἀντίχρ. in 1 John ii. 18 should certainly be taken as denoting a person, if the much disputed article were genuine, but this is very doubtful, and Tisch. and Lachm. reject it; and if a person, the explanatory reference of the words, ἠκούσατε ὅτι ἀντίχριστος ἔρχεται, would not be 2 Thess. ii. 3 sqq. merely, but within the range of the Johannine writings, John v. 43, εἰς ἄλλον ἔλθω ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τῷ ἰδίῳ, ἐκεῖνον λήμψεσθε. Still in this case the ὁ ἀντίχρ. of 1 John ii. 22 and 2 John 7 would be difficult of explanation. We must not, however, conclude from this and from νῦν ἀντίχριστοι πολλοὶ γεγόνασιν, ii. 18, that John did not expect the appearance of a personal antichrist κατ. ἐξ., for the neuter τὸ τοῦ ἀντιχρίστου, δ ἀκηκόατε ὅτι ἔρχεται, καὶ νῦν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐστὶν ἤδη, certainly shows that he did. The article in ii. 22 is obviously analogous with the preceding ὁ ψεύστης in a general sense; but Huther's explanation, that this means antichrist itself appearing in these persons, is too far-fetched. The many antichrists, *i.e.* all who appear as such in St. John's sense, must be regarded not only as πρόδρομοι of the actual antichrist, but as attempts to realize it.

Χριστιανός, ό, a name given to the disciples (or followers, see μαθητής) of Jesus Christ, and first adopted at Antioch. It does not occur in the N. T. as a name used by Christians themselves, but only as a nickname or term of reproach, Acts xi. 26, xxvi. 28; 1 Pet. iv. 16. Not to be likened to 1 Cor. i. 21; see χρίω. Comp. Weiss, *Neutest. Theol.* p. 150.

Ψ

Ψυχή, ή, from ψύχω, to breathe (according to some, e.g. Nägelsbach, *nachhom. Theol.* ii. 380, to be derived from ψύω, πτύω, like ὕψος, ὕπατος, and others; Curtius [as before, pp. 257, 437, 632], on the contrary, derives the word from a Sanscrit root *spHu*, to blow, and refers πτύω to another root); = breathing, breath of animal life. In universal usage, from Homer downwards, ψυχή signifies life in the distinctiveness of individual existence, especially of man, and occasionally, but only *ex analogia*, of brutes, which in Homer is taken as shut up in the body and as disappearing at death, but as continuing in its distinctiveness in Hades, though with loss of personality and its capabilities, for which the body seems to have been thought necessary. For examples, see Lexicons. Hence ψυχή is generally = the life of the individual, cf. ψυχῆς ὄλεθρος, *Il.* xxii. 325; ψυχὴν, ψυχὰς τινων ἐξελέσθαι, ἀφελέσθαι, and others; *Od.* xxii. 444, *Il.* xxii. 257, and so even down to the latest Greek, ψυχὴν ἀφιέναι, *Eur. Or.* 1171; ψυχὴν διδόναι, ἀποδιδόναι, *Herod.* iii. 130. 2, arising from ψ. Ἄϊδι διδόναι, *Il.* v. 654; ὁ περὶ τῆς ψυχῆς πρὸς τοὺς πολεμίους ἀγών, *Xen. Mem.* iii. 12. 1; τὴν αὐτοῦ ψυχὴν ἀρνούμενος, *Luc. philopseud.* 1; ἡ ἀρετὴ μᾶλλον ἢ ἡ φυγὴ σώζει τὰς ψυχὰς, *Xen. Cyr.* iv. 1. 5.—The anthropological conception of ψυχή was developed in connection with eschatological views. The popular view, which developed itself from Homer downwards, is given in Plato, *Phaed.* 70 A, τὰ περὶ τῆς ψυχῆς πολλὴν ἀπιστίαν παρέχει ἀνθρώποις, μή, ἐπειδὴν ἀπαλλαγῇ τοῦ σώματος, οὐδαμῶ ἔτι ἦ, ἀλλ' ἐκείνη τῇ ἡμέρᾳ διαφθείρηται τε καὶ ἀπολλύηται, ἦ ἂν ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἀποθάνῃ, εὐθὺς ἀπαλλαττομένη τοῦ σώματος καὶ ἐκβαίνουσα, ὥσπερ πνεῦμα ἡ καπνὸς διασκεδασθεῖσα, οἴχηται διαπτομένη καὶ οὐδὲν ἔτι οὐδαμῶ ἦ. Cf. *Xen. Cyrop.* lxxxvii. 3, ὡς ἡ ψυχή, ἕως μὲν ἂν ἐν θνητῷ σώματι ἦ, ζῇ· ὅταν δὲ τούτου ἀπαλλαγῇ, τέθνηκεν. The results of philosophic inquiry, on the other hand, appear in Plat. *Phaedr.* 245 E, 246 A, πᾶν γὰρ σῶμα, ᾧ μὲν ἔξωθεν τὸ κινεῖσθαι, ἄψυχον, ᾧ δὲ ἐνδοθεν αὐτῷ ἐξ αὐτοῦ, ἔμψυχον, ὡς ταύτης οὐσης φύσεως ψυχῆς· εἰδ' ἔστι τοῦτο οὕτως ἔχον, μὴ ἄλλο τι εἶναι τὸ αὐτὸ αὐτὸ κινεῖν ἢ ψυχὴν, ἐξ ἀνάγκης ἀγένητόν τε καὶ ἀθάνατον ψυχὴ ἂν εἴη, and in *Xen. Mem.* iv. 3. 14, ἀνθρώπου ψυχῇ, εἴ περ τι καὶ ἄλλο τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων, τοῦ θεοῦ μετέχει, cf. i. 4. 13, οὐ τοίνυν μόνον ἤρκεσε τῷ θεῷ τοῦ σώματος ἐπιμεληθῆναι ἀλλ', ὅπερ μέγιστόν ἐστι, καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν κρατίστην τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐνέφυσε. It is now the soul (no longer, as in Homer, the organs of the body) which is the seat of will, disposition, desires, passions (see καρδιά), and ψυχή combined with σῶμα serves to denote the constituent parts of humanity; cf. *Xen. Anab.* iii. 2. 20, περὶ τὰς ἐαυτῶν ψυχὰς καὶ τὰ σώματα ἀμαρτάνουσι. Hence the expression, ὅλη τῇ ψυχῇ φροντίζειν τινός, with all one's heart to care for any one, *Xen.*

Mem. iii. 11. 10, ἐκ τῆς ψυχῆς, *from the heart, willingly*, and others, see Lexicons. Mention is made of two souls, the one ἀγαθή, βελτίων, κρατίστη, and the other κακή, πονηρά, etc.; *vid.* Passow, *s.v.* Thus ψυχή came to denote the morally endowed individuality of man which continues after death,—which corresponds with the pantheistic theory that the soul (Aristotle, *de anima*, i. 5) is part of the ὅλον, which, borne upon the winds, enters the breathing man, and that the body is a prison-house wherein the soul is incarcerated on account of its former sins, etc. (See Nägelsbach, *nachhomer. Theol.* 403; and generally, compare Nägelsbach, *Homer. Theol.* ii. 380 sqq.; Grote Meyer, *Homers Grundansicht von der Seele*, etc., Warendorf 1853, 4; Passow, *Lex. s.v.*

As to the use of the word in Scripture, first in the O. T. it corresponds with נֶפֶשׁ, primarily likewise = life, breath, the life which exists in every living thing, therefore life in distinct individuality, Gen. xxxv. 18, נֶפֶשׁ בְּנֵי מִתָּה; Lev. xxiv. 18, מִנְּפֶשֶׁת נֶפֶשׁ; and even without the genitive of the subject it denotes the living individual as such, a distinctiveness of life, an individual life, an individual, cf. Lev. xxiv. 18; Num. xxxv. 11, נֶפֶשׁ בְּנֵי מִתָּה; Lev. iv. 2, v. 1, *et al.*, both of men and of beasts; in full, נֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה, Gen. i. 20, 21, 24, 30, ii. 7. Cf. especially ii. 7, נֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה לְהָאָדָם, with ver. 19, וְכָל אֲשֶׁר יִקְרָא לוֹ הָאָדָם נֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה הֵוא שֵׁמוֹ. Accordingly, mention can be made of God's נֶפֶשׁ, Jer. li. 14, נֶפֶשׁ יְהוָה צְבִיאוֹת בְּנִימִשׁ; Amos vi. 8 (cf. Judg. x. 16; Ezek. xxiii. 18; Jer. xv. 1; Lev. xxvi. 11, 15, 30, 43; 1 Sam. ii. 35; Isa. i. 14; Prov. vi. 16; Jer. v. 9, 29, ix. 9). The נֶפֶשׁ, according to what has been above said, is the proper subject of the life in the individual, but it is not the principle of life itself, it is the subject of life which bears in it the life-principle, i.e. the רֹחַ, πνεῦμα, and as such it is the outward manifestation of the life-principle, so that רֹחַ and נֶפֶשׁ might be used together as of kindred signification, Ps. xxxi. 6; comp. xvi. 10; 2 Sam. iv. 9, *et al.*, cf. Gen. i. 30, אֲשֶׁר-בְּנֵי חַיָּה, with vi. 10, כָּל-בָּשָׂר אֲשֶׁר בּוֹ רֹחַ חַיָּים, where, indeed, as in Job xii. 10, אֲשֶׁר בִּידוֹ נֶפֶשׁ כָּל-חַי וְרוּחַ כָּל-בָּשָׂר-חַיָּה, the words רֹחַ and נֶפֶשׁ correspond to the designations בָּשָׂר and חַי (in Gen. i. 30, cf. חַיֵּת הָאָרֶץ); still cf. Lev. xvii. 11, נֶפֶשׁ הַבֶּשָׂר; ver. 14, בָּשָׂר כָּל-בָּשָׂר, and Num. xvi. 22, xxvii. 16, אֲלֹהֵי הָרַחֲמִים לְכָל-בָּשָׂר. There is, however, this distinction between them: נֶפֶשׁ of itself serves to denote the individual, but רֹחַ does not, because even when individualized it signifies only the principle, not the form, of life, cf. Ezek. ii. 2, iii. 24, xxxvii. 5, 8, by means of which נֶפֶשׁ becomes this; and the distinction is expressed in stricter language, ψυχὴ ζῶσα, πνεῦμα ζωοποιούν, 1 Cor. xv. 45. נֶפֶשׁ represents the individual life; hence it is used in Gen. xvi. 45, Ex. i. 5, when the numbers of persons are given; and of the deceased, in Rev. vi. 9, ψυχὰι τῶν ἐσφαγμένων; Rev. xx. 4, τῶν πεπελεκισμένων; cf. the interchangeable expressions in Deut. xxvii. 25, נֶפֶשׁ רֵם וְנֶפֶשׁ, and Jer. ii. 34, רֵם נֶפֶשׁ וְנֶפֶשׁ. In this sense we find that πνεῦμα also is used, Heb. xii. 23, πνεύματα δικαίων τετελειωμένων, to denote the individual to whom the πνεῦμα belongs, but not in the same manner as נֶפֶשׁ, because נֶפֶשׁ exists only where there is an individual life with a material organization; and it is only with reference to this that ψυχή is used even in Rev. vi. 9, cf. ver. 10, τὸ αἷμα ὑμῶν; Lev. xvii. 11, נֶפֶשׁ כָּל-בָּשָׂר בָּדָם וְרוּחַ, נֶפֶשׁ

Comp. ver. 10, $\text{שֶׁנֶּפֶשׁ הָאָדָמָה לֹא הִיא הַנְּשָׁמָה}$, see $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$. Cf. Roos, *psychol. scr.*: "... ubi animae humanae, quatenus שֶׁנֶּפֶשׁ est, aliquid tribuitur, non potest tota vis sententiae intelligi, nisi animam corpore vestitam tibi repraesentes, sed quae de illa tanquam spiritu dicuntur plene intelligi possunt nulla corporis habita ratione." So also Oehler, *sent. N. T. de rebus p. mort. fut.* p. 13 sqq. שֶׁנֶּפֶשׁ of itself does not constitute personality but only when it is the שֶׁנֶּפֶשׁ of a human being, cf. 1 Chron. v. 21 (the usage of the word seems thus to have become by degrees more limited, cf. Gen. xvi. 45; Ex. i. 5). Applied to man as well as brutes, that which distinguishes any one individual life from others must be formed or moulded in it, and the human personality derived from the spirit (see $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$) must find its expression in the שֶׁנֶּפֶשׁ or $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$. Consequently the שֶׁנֶּפֶשׁ or $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ of man is the subject of that personal life whose principle is רוּחַ or $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$. When mention is made of the distinctive individuality of the human soul, $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ as well as $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ may be used to denote the substratum of personal life, see $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$; and hence arises the frequent similarity of the two words when the distinction between them does not appear.

In the N. T. $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ denotes life in the distinctness of individual existence, Rev. viii. 9, $\tau\acute{\alpha}$ ἔχοντα $\psi\upsilon\chi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$; xvi. 3, $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha$ $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ ζωῆς ἀπέθανεν. It is elsewhere used of man alone, and, indeed, primarily of the life belonging to the individual, Matt. ii. 20, $\zeta\eta\tau\omicron\upsilon\sigma\upsilon\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ τὴν $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ ν τοῦ παιδίου; Rom. xi. 3, $\zeta\eta\tau\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\upsilon$ τὴν $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ ν μου; Luke xii. 20, τὴν $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ ν σου ἀπαιτοῦσιν; Acts xx. 10, ἡ $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ ἐστίν; Matt. xx. 28, δοῦναι τὴν $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ ν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν, comp. Mark x. 45; John x. 11, τὴν $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ ν τιθέναι ὑπὲρ τινος, to lay down or give up one's life for any one, cf. vv. 15, 17, xiii. 37, 38, xv. 13; 1 John iii. 16; Acts xv. 26, σὺν ἀνθρώποις παραδεδώκοσιν τὰς $\psi\upsilon\chi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ αὐτῶν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματος κ.τ.λ.; Rev. xii. 11, οὐκ ἠγάπησαν τὴν $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ ν αὐτῶν ἄχρι θανάτου; 1 Thess. ii. 8, μεταδοῦναι ὑμῖν . . . καὶ τὰς ἑαυτῶν $\psi\upsilon\chi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$; Rom. xvi. 4, οἵτινες ὑπὲρ τῆς $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ ς μου τὸν ἑαυτῶν τράχηλον ὑπέθηκαν; Acts xx. 24, οὐδενὸς λόγου ποιοῦμαι τὴν $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ ν τιμίαν ἐμαυτῷ; xxvii. 10, θεωρῶ ὅτι μετὰ πολλῆς ζημίας τῶν $\psi\upsilon\chi\omega$ ν ἡμῶν μέλλειν ἔσεσθαι τὸν πλοῦν; ver. 22, ἀποβολὴ $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ ς οὐδεμία ἔσται ἐξ ὑμῶν. The expressions $\piαραδιδόναι$ τὸ $\piνεῦμα$, John xix. 30, cf. Matt. xxvii. 50, Luke xxiii. 46, Acts vii. 59, and τὴν $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ ν, Acts xv. 26, cf. John x. 11, are not quite identical, for the latter estimates the life as simply a single individual life, and we cannot say, e.g., τὸ $\piνεῦμα$ τιθέναι ὑπὲρ τινος, John x. 11; τὸ $\piνεῦμα$ δοῦναι λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν, Matt. xx. 28, cf. 2 Cor. xii. 15, ἐγὼ δὲ ἥδιστα δαπανήσω καὶ ἐκδαπανηθήσομαι ὑπὲρ τῶν $\psi\upsilon\chi\omega$ ν ὑμῶν. Still $\piνεῦμα$ and $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ may be used synonymously in many cases, and especially when the emotional life is referred to, cf. Matt. xi. 29, εὐρήσετε ἀνάπαυσιν ταῖς $\psi\upsilon\chi\alphaῖς$ ὑμῶν (cf. Jer. vi. 16, where LXX. נְיָנָם = ἀγνισμός), with 1 Cor. xvi. 18, ἀνέπαυσαν τὸ ἐμὸν $\piνεῦμα$ καὶ τὸ ὑμῶν; Acts xiv. 22, ἐπιστηρίζοντες τὰς $\psi\upsilon\chi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ τῶν μαθητῶν (see $\sigmaτηρίζειν$ τὰς καρδίας, 1 Thess. iii. 13; Jas. v. 8). See the parallelism in Luke i. 47, μεγαλύνει ἡ $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ μου τὸν κύριον, καὶ ἠγαλλίασεν τὸ $\piνεῦμά$ μου ἐπὶ κ.τ.λ.; yet both expressions are not identical, for in Matt. xxvi. 38, Mark xiv. 34, instead of $\piερίλυπός$ ἐστὶν ἡ $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ μου ἕως θανάτου, it could hardly have been said τὸ $\piνεῦμά$ μου, while in John xii. 27,

ἡ ψυχή μου τετάρακται, as compared with xiii. 21, ἐταράχθη τῷ πνεύματι. Cf. Acts xv. 24, ἐτάραξαν ὑμᾶς λόγοις ἀνασκευάζοντες τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν; Isa. xix. 3, ταραχθήσεται τὸ πνεῦμα τῶν Αἰγυπτίων ἐν αὐτοῖς. We find ψυχή and πνεῦμα side by side in Heb. iv 12, ἄχρι μερισμοῦ ψυχῆς τε καὶ πνεύματος, because the actual abnormal relation subsisting between the soul and its divine life-principle is here brought out to view, but elsewhere the soul is simply regarded as the receptacle and bearer of the divine life-principle, e.g. 1 Pet. ii. 11, ἀπέχεσθε τῶν σαρκικῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν, αἵτινες στρατεύονται κατὰ τῆς ψυχῆς, and comp. with this the contrast between σάρξ and πνεῦμα. From this relationship between ψυχή and πνεῦμα, as opposed to the σάρξ, according to which, on the one hand, the ψυχή contains the πνεῦμα, and brings it into outward manifestation (see Phil. i. 27, στήκετε ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι, μιᾷ ψυχῇ συναθλοῦντες τῇ πίστει τοῦ εὐαγγ.), and on the other there is also to some extent a contrast between πνεῦμα and ψυχή, no inconsiderable part of the usage has arisen, and especially as it concerns the question whether there be a twofold or a threefold nature; see ψυχικός. Thus, on the one hand, in 1 Thess. v. 23, ὁλόκληρον (unhurt, in all its parts) ὑμῶν τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἡ ψυχή καὶ τὸ σῶμα . . . τηρηθείη; πνεῦμα is the *divine life-principle* (Rom. viii. 10); ἡ ψυχή, the *individual life* in which the πνεῦμα is manifested; and σῶμα, the *material organism* vivified by the ψυχή. In Matt. x. 28, on the other hand, σῶμα and ψυχή only are named side by side, but never properly σῶμα and πνεῦμα, though σάρξ and πνεῦμα. Only in 1 Cor. v. 3, ἀπὸν τῷ σώματι, παρὼν δὲ τῷ πνεύματι. The proper antithesis to πνεῦμα is σάρξ. So also ψυχή denotes life in the body (σῶμα), Matt. vi. 25, μὴ μεριμνᾶτε τῇ ψυχῇ ὑμῶν τί φάγητε, μηδὲ τῷ σώματι κ.τ.λ.; Luke xii. 22, 23, cf. xii. 19, ἐρῶ τῇ ψυχῇ μου· ψυχή, . . . ἀναπαύου, φάγε, πίε, εὐφραίνου; comp. ver. 20, τὴν ψυχὴν σου ἀπαιτοῦσιν ἀπὸ σου. Ψυχή seems to be used in a fuller and deeper sense as contrasted with σῶμα in Matt. x. 28, μὴ φοβεῖσθε ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποκτεινόντων τὸ σῶμα, τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν μὴ δυναμένων ἀποκτείνειν, σῶμα being the material organism vivified by the ψυχή, and ψυχή being the subject of life, the *ego* present in the σῶμα; cf. Matt. xvi. 25, ὃς ἐὰν θέλῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ σῶσαι, ἀπολέσει αὐτήν, etc., x. 39; Mark viii. 35; Luke ix. 24, xiv. 26, μισεῖν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχὴν, comp. Matt. xvi. 24, ἀπαρνησάσθω ἑαυτόν; John xii. 25. Cf. Matt. xvi. 26, τί ὠφεληθήσεται ἄνθρωπος, ἐὰν . . . τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ζημιωθῇ; Mark viii. 36 with Luke ix. 25, ἑαυτὸν ἀπολέσας ἢ ζημιωθείς. In this sense ψυχή becomes a more emphatic designation of the *man himself*, of the subject or *ego*, see John x. 24, ἕως πότε τὴν ψυχὴν ὑμῶν αἴρεις; Matt. xii. 18, εἰς ὃν εὐδόκησαν ἡ ψυχή μου; Heb. x. 38, οὐκ εὐδοκεῖ ἡ ψυχή μου; 3 John 2, εὐδοουταί σου ἡ ψυχή; Luke xxi. 19, ἐν τῇ ὑπομονῇ ὑμῶν κτήσασθε τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν; 1 Pet. i. 22, τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν ἡγουμένους ἐν τῇ ὑπακοῇ τῆς ἀληθείας εἰς κ.τ.λ.; iv. 19, παρατιθέσθωσαν τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν ἐν ἀγαθοποιαῖς; Rev. xviii. 14, ἡ ὁπώρα σου τῆς ἐπιθυμίας τῆς ψυχῆς, just as it serves generally as a designation of the individual, see Acts ii. 41, 43, iii. 23, xxvii. 22, 37; Rom. xiii. 1; 1 Pet. iii. 20; 2 Pet. ii. 8, 14. In Eph. vi. 6, ποιοῦντες τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκ ψυχῆς; Col. iii. 23, ὃ ἐὰν ποιῇτε, ἐκ ψυχῆς ἐργάζεσθε, ἐκ ψυχῆς corresponds with the preceding ἐν

ἀπλότῃ καρδίας, and requires that the entire subject, the whole man, should without reserve exert himself. So also Matt. xxii. 37; Mark xii. 30, 33; Luke x. 27. Thus *ψυχή* is the proper subject of life, whose salvation or preservation is the thing at stake in the presence of death; and accordingly we read, Acts ii. 27, οὐκ ἐγκαταλείψεις τὴν ψυχὴν μου εἰς ᾄδου; ver. 31; Rom. ii. 9, θλίψις καὶ στενοχωρία, ἐπὶ πᾶσαν ψυχὴν ἀνθρώπου τοῦ κατεργαζομένου τὸ κακόν; 2 Cor. i. 23, μάρτυρα τὸν θεὸν ἐπικαλοῦμαι ἐπὶ τὴν ἐμὴν ψυχὴν; Heb. vi. 19, x. 39, xiii. 17; Jas. i. 21, v. 20; 1 Pet. i. 9, ii. 25. — The word also occurs in Mark iii. 4; Luke ii. 35, vi. 9, xvii. 33; Matt. xvi. 26; Mark viii. 37; Acts xiv. 2, iv. 32; Phil. ii. 30; Heb. xii. 3.

Ψυχικός, ἡ, όν, occurs first in Aristotle, and signifies what pertains to the soul or life, *i.e.* living, *e.g.* Plut. *Mor.* 1138 D, ψυχικὴ ἀρμονία τεσσάρων στοιχείων. Then, in a special sense, what pertains to the soul as the one constituent of human nature, *what springs from it*, etc., *e.g.* Plut. *Mor.* 1096 E, ἡ γὰρ ἀπλῶς ἀποκαλυφάμενους ἔδει σαρκοποιεῖν τὸν ἄνθρωπον ὅλον, ὥσπερ ἔνιοι ποιοῦσι, τὴν ψυχικὴν οὐσίαν ἀναιροῦντες; *De plac. phil.* i. 8, Θαλῆς, Πυθαγόρας, Πλάτων, οἱ Στωικοί, δαίμονας ὑπάρχειν οὐσίας ψυχικάς· εἶναι δὲ καὶ ἥρωας τὰς κεχωρισμένας ψυχὰς τῶν σωμάτων. In this sense, as we have here ψυχικὴ οὐσία, we must understand the antithesis in *Mor.* 1084 E, τὸ πνεῦμα . . . ἐκ φυτικοῦ ψυχικὸν γενόμενον (where others, but without warrant it would seem, read φυσιχοῦ instead of φυτικοῦ). Hence arises the commonest use of the word as the antithesis of σωματικός (Aristotle, Plut., Polyb., and others), *e.g.* ψυχικὴ τόλμα, σωματικὴ ῥώμη, Polyb. vi. 5. 7; ψυχικά πάθη, Galen.; ψυχικαὶ . . . σωματικαὶ ἡδοναί, Aristotle, *Eth.* iii. 10. So 4 Macc. i. 32, τῶν δὲ ἐπιθυμιῶν αἱ μὲν εἰσι ψυχικαί, αἱ δὲ σωματικαί· καὶ τούτων ἀμφοτέρων ὁ λογισμὸς ἐπικρατεῖν φαίνεται. Here ψυχικῶς probably means *pertaining to the heart*, 2 Macc. iv. 37, xiv. 24 (see *καρδία*). These are the only places where the word occurs in O. T. Greek. The application and perhaps therefore the meaning of the word in the N. T. is somewhat different. Here it stands in contrast, not with σῶμα, σωματικός, but only with πνεῦμα, πνευματικός; and not with the πνεῦμα of man in a general sense, but with the spirit as possessed by the renewed man. In accordance with this it is that *man as such* is called ψυχὴ ζῶσα, 1 Cor. xv. 45, and what belongs to him, *i.e.* his body, is called a σῶμα ψυχικόν (ver. 44), a body belonging to the soul, which is ἐκ γῆς χοϊκός. In contrast with this, Christ, the last Adam, is called πνεῦμα ζωοποιόν, ἄνθρωπος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, vv. 45, 47; and the σῶμα is called πνευματικόν in the case of those who belong to the same sphere of life with Him, οἱ ἐπουράνιοι, ver. 48, who with Him are ἐν πνεύμα, vi. 17; for “*as we bear the image of the earthly, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly*,” ver. 49. The representation here given, and the language used, must be explained by the recognised difference between the human πνεῦμα in and for itself, and the renewing or renewed πνεῦμα; see πνεῦμα, ψυχή. On account of this difference, arising from sin and regeneration,—a difference which must be obvious to the Christian view upon the recognition of regenerating grace,—man in and for himself, as

ψυχὴ ζῶσα, and therefore ψυχικός, is different from man as πνευματικός,—from man as ruled by the Spirit as the renewing and renewed life-principle; and as ψυχικός, man is a stranger to τὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ θεοῦ, so that the διδακτοὶ ἀνθρωπίνης σοφίας λόγοι are contrasted with the διδακτοὶ πνεύματος, 1 Cor. ii. 13, 14, ψυχικὸς ἄνθρωπος οὐ δύναται γινῶναι κ.τ.λ. It is clear that ψυχικός does not designate the man simply as σαρκικός or ἁμαρτωλός, nor can be interchanged with these, but signifies man as he is by nature; and because man by nature is σαρκικός and ἁμαρτωλός, he is in his natural state a stranger to what is τοῦ πν., and thus ψυχικός comes to denote *man as he now is*,—man as become sinful, estranging himself and estranged from the divine life-principle. It cannot be more fitly rendered than as Luther rendered it, viz. the *natural man*. It is a word which may be taken physiologically, but it has also an ethical import.

How fully in keeping this view was with Christian ideas, though foreign to those of profane Greek, is evident from Jude 19, οὗτοί εἰσιν . . . ψυχικοί, πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες, i.e. *they are none other than what they are by nature*; it is not said that they have no πνεῦμα, so far as πνεῦμα is a constituent part of human nature,—this would have been expressed by μὴ πνεῦμα ἔχοντες; but they are not in possession of the Spirit which they might have possessed (against Beck, *bibl. Psychol.* p. 53). Πνεῦμα, in antithesis with ψυχικός, signifies the Holy Spirit of redemption. It is distinct from the πνεῦμα so far as this belongs to man by nature, and is necessary to his condition as ψυχὴ ζῶσα. — Again, in Jas. iii. 15, the three predicates, ἐπίγειος, ψυχικός, δαιμονιώδης, applied to *the wisdom which cometh not from above*, express a progressive enhancement resting upon an inner sequence; ἐπίγειος as the fit antithesis of ἀνωθεν,—because ἐπίγειος therefore ψυχικός (see 1 Cor. xv. 48), therefore also *destitute of the Spirit*; and because thus destitute of the Spirit, actually opposed to the Spirit of God, i.e. δαιμονιώδης.

Thus Christianity has enriched the meaning of this word, adding to its physiological sense an ethical significance.

*Α ψυχος, *ον*, lifeless, often in Plato contrasted with ἑμψυχος; and in Plut. *Them.* xi., as contrasted with ζῶα; Wisd. xiii. 18, xiv. 29, of idols. — 1 Cor. xiv. 7, τὰ ἄψυχα φωνὴν διδόντα; ver. 9, οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς κ.τ.λ. The opposite term, ἑμφ., does not occur in biblical Greek. Elsewhere in profane Greek it means *without character, spiritless, cowardly*.

Σύμψυχος, *ον*; not in profane Greek except Anton. *Polemon.* ii. 54 (about A.D. 117); it occurs first in Phil. ii. 2, and afterwards in patristic Greek, as also συμψυχέω, συμψυχία. In Phil. ii. 2, τὴν αὐτὴν ἀγάπην ἔχοντες, σύμψυχοι, τὸ ἐν φρονούντες, cf. i. 27, μιᾷ ψυχῇ συναθλοῦντες; Acts iv. 32; 1 Sam. xviii. 1, ἡ ψυχὴ Ἰωναθὰν συνεδέθη τῇ ψυχῇ Δαυὶδ, καὶ ἠγάπησεν αὐτὸν Ἰωναθὰν κατὰ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ. It signifies *community of life in love*.

Ἰσόψυχος, actuated by the same motives, of like character, like-minded; Aesch.

Ag. 1479; Eust. 831. 52, ἰσοφύχως ἐμάχοντο; Phil. ii. 20, οὐδένα γὰρ ἔχω ἰσόφυχον ὅστις γνησίως τὰ περὶ ὑμῶν μεριμνήσει.

Δίψυχος, except in Jas. i. 8, iv. 8, occurs only in Philo and post-Christian Greek. Cf. Eumath. xi. 437, περὶ τὴν παρθένον διψυχεῖ, ἀπιστεῖ τῇ σεμνότητι; Ignat. *ad Her.* 7, μὴ γίνου δίψυχος ἐν προσευχῇ σου· μακάριος γὰρ ὁ μὴ διστάσας. Πιστεύω γὰρ κ.τ.λ.; Clem. Rom. 1, *ad Cor.* xi., οἱ δίψυχοι καὶ οἱ διστάζοντες περὶ τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ δυνάμεως; c. xxiii., τὰς χάριτας αὐτοῦ ἀποδίδοι τοῖς προσερχομένοις αὐτῷ ἀπλῇ διανοίᾳ. Διὸ μὴ διψυχῶμεν κ.τ.λ. . . . ταλαίπωροί εἰσιν οἱ δίψυχοι, οἱ διστάζοντες τὴν ψυχὴν. Therefore = doubting. So Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 1, διὰ τοὺς διψύχους, τοὺς διαλογιζομένους ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις, εἰ ἄρα ἔστι ταῦτα ἢ οὐκ ἔστιν. In St. James, in a more general sense, an unstable disposition; and in i. 8, of the doubter or waverer (διακρινόμενος), ἀνὴρ δίψυχος, ἀκατάστατος ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτοῦ; iv. 8, of the hypocrite, καθαρῖσατε χεῖρας ἁμαρτωλοί, καὶ ἀγρίσατε καρδίας δίψυχοι. Cf. Matt. xxiv. 51, διχοτομήσει αὐτὸν καὶ τὸ μέρος αὐτοῦ μετὰ τῶν ὑποκριτῶν θήσει.

Ψύχω, perf. pass. ἔφυγμαι, aor. in Aristoph. ἐψύγην, and accordingly fut. ψυγήσομαι, Matt. xxiv. 12, for which some mss. read ψυχρήσομαι. — (I.) To breathe, to blow, to breathe out, to let stream forth, Jer. ii. 6; 2 Kings xix. 24. — (II.) To cool, to make cool, in contrast with θερμαίνειν; oftener in Plato, Plut. Cf. ψυχρός, cold. Passive, to wax cold, to go out or become extinct, Herod., Plato. So Matt. xxiv. 12, ψυγήσεται ἡ ἀγάπη, cf. Song viii. 6, 7.

Ἀναψύχω, to make cool, to refresh; e.g. Xen. *Hell.* vii. 1. 19, ἀνεψύχθησαν οἱ σύμμαχοι; Hom. *Il.* v. 795, ἔλκος, to cool and dress a wound; Eur. *Hell.* 1100, πόνων τινά, to provide refreshment for a person. So in 2 Tim. i. 16. In later Greek, intransitively, to refresh oneself, to come to oneself. So LXX. = נִיחַ, Judg. xv. 19, ἐπέστρεψε τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀνέψυξε, שָׁנַן. Niphal, 2 Sam. xvi. 14, ἀνέψυξαν ἐκεῖ. יָבַב, Hiphil, Ps. xxxix. 14. Cf. 2 Macc. iv. 46, iii. 11. Cf. ἀναψυχή, refreshment, Plat., Eur.; Hos. xii. 8; Jer. xlix. 30.

Ἀνάψυξις, ἡ, recreation, refreshment; seldom, and only in later Greek; LXX. Ex. viii. 15, ἰδὼν δὲ Φαραὼ ὅτι γέγονεν ἀνάψυξις. In the N. T. Acts iii. 19, ὅπως ἂν ἔλθωσιν καιροὶ ἀναψύξεως ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ κυρίου, cf. Isa. lvii. 15, 16.

Ἦ

Ἦδιν, ἡ, older form ὠδίν; usually in the plural; pains of labour, distress, woe, 1 Thess. v. 3; Isa. xxxvii. 3. Of any severe pain resembling a woman's pangs; also affliction, grief, ὠδίνες ψυχῆς; cf. Hom. *Od.* ix. 415, ὠδίνων ὀδύνησιν; Isa. xiii. 8, ὠδίνες αὐτοὺς ἔξουσιν ὡς γυναικὸς τικτούσης; Jer. viii. 21, xiii. 21; Job xxi. 17; Isa. xxvi. 17; Ex. xv. 14, *et al.*; αἱ ὠδίνες τοῦ θανάτου, Acts ii. 24, as in Ps. xviii. 5, cf. ver. 6, ὠδίνες ἄδου . . . παγίδες θανάτου; cxvi. 3, περιέσχον με ὠδίνες θανάτου, κίνδυνοι ἄδου εὐρὸς

με, θλίψιν καὶ ὀδύνην εὖρον. The rendering of the LXX. is not correct, because לְבָבִי, as the context shows, is to be referred to לְבָבִי, *cords* or *snares*, not to לְבָבִי, *pangs*. On the other hand, in Matt. xxiv. 8, ταῦτα ἀρχὴ ὀδίνων; Mark xiii. 8, ταῦτα ἀρχὴ ὀδίνων, ὀδίνες clearly answers to לְבָבִי, cf. Mic. iv. 9; Isa. xxvi. 17; Jer. iv. 31; see לֵב, Ps. xlviii. 6; Jer. vi. 24; Ex. xv. 14. Possibly the expression is connected with the Jewish doctrine of the מַשִּׁיחַ הַבְּלִי, the distresses and misery which were to precede the coming of the Messiah, so far as this doctrine has any sanction in Scripture. But the doctrine itself, as connected, according to Jalk. Sim. xc. 1, 2, with Isa. liii. 4, 5, derives no sanction from this expression, nor is it received on account of it. See the exposition of it in my treatise on Matt. xxiv. 25, p. 244 sqq.

Ωρα, ἡ, according to Curtius (p. 319), properly, *season, time of blossoming*; ὥραιος, *blossoming*; ἄωρος, *unseasonable*; Goth., *jér*; German, *Jahr*; Bohemian, *jaro, spring*. It denotes (I.) originally *the season of the year*, ὥρα ἔτους, then ὥραι τῆς ἡμέρας, and merely ὥρα, *time of the day*, in accordance with such expressions as ὥρα πολλή, Mark vi. 35. In Mark xi. 11, ὀψίας ἤδη οὕσης τῆς ὥρας. Afterwards, when reckoning by hours was practised, *the hour*. The Johannine ἐσχάτη ὥρα, 1 John ii. 18, probably is a concrete expression for the *ἔσχατον τῶν ἡμερῶν, τῶν χρόνων, καιρὸς ἔσχατος*, Heb. i. 2; 1 Pet. i. 20, 5; 2 Tim. iii. 1 (see *ἔσχατος*); thus expressed in order to denote the pressing shortness of the time (cf. 1 Cor. vii. 29), Heb. מְהֵרָה הַיָּמִים, an expression denoting the time which immediately precedes Christ's coming, and in the N. T. the time then present, which was looked upon as the time of His coming; see αἰών, *ἔσχατος*. It is erroneous to associate this with ἡ ἐσχάτη ἡμέρα, which does not belong to the present.

Ωρα signifies (II.) *the right time, the time fixed, the time determined upon or demanded, the fit time*. Thus ἡ ὥρα τῆς κρίσεως, Rev. xiv. 7; τοῦ θερίσαι, ver. 15; τοῦ πειρασμοῦ, iii. 10; ἔρχεται ὥρα, ὅτε κ.τ.λ., ἐν ᾗ, ἴνα, Matt. xxvi. 45; John iv. 21, 23, and often. (It cannot as a rule be proved that herein God's appointed time is set forth in contrast with men's opinions; in John iv. 23, for instance, the time is not that fixed by God, but that willed by Him.) In particular, ἡ ὥρα τινός, *the time of any one*, means either *the time which one claims for himself and employs*, Luke xxii. 53, αὕτη ὑμῶν ἐστὶν ἡ ὥρα καὶ ἡ ἐξουσία τοῦ σκοτόυς, or *the time which lays claim to any one*, John xvi. 21, ἦλθεν ἡ ὥρα αὐτῆς, and thus *Christ's hour* is spoken of, John vii. 30, viii. 20, xiii. 1, i.e. *the time of His sufferings and death*; see Matt. xxvi. 18, ὁ καιρὸς μου ἐγγύς ἐστιν. On the contrary, John ii. 4, οὐπω ἤκει ἡ ὥρα μου, as in Luke xxii. 53, cf. John vii. 6, ὁ καιρὸς ὁ ἐμὸς οὐπω πάρεστιν, ὁ δὲ καιρὸς ὁ ὑμέτερος πάντοτε ἐστὶν ἔτοιμος. For the thing meant, the relation of Christ's miraculous working to His word in John ii. 4, comp. John vii. 6, 8 with ver. 14. Ωρα is rarely used in this manner in profane Greek, Plut. Them. 21, ἠύχοντο μὴ ὥραν θεμιστοκλέους γενέσθαι.

ΟΤ ΔΤΝΑΤΑΙ ΔΤΘΗΝΑΙ Η ΓΡΑΦΗ.

SUPPLEMENT.

SUPPLEMENT.

Ἀγαλλιόμαι, a deponent verb which appears exceptionally in an active form Luke i. 47 and (as Lachm. Tischendorf read) in Rev. xix. 7; usually in the aor. middle ἡγαλλιάσμεν, also in John v. 35 in the passive ἡγαλλιάθην (in the Rec. text and B, cf. Treg. ἀγαλλιασθῆναι), but here only. Cf. Krüger, § 38, 13, 1 sqq. This word with its derivatives ἀγαλλίαςις and ἀγαλλίαμα occurs only in biblical Greek, and thence passes into patristic Greek. It was probably formed by the LXX. themselves. At least it does not seem to have belonged to the conversational language of the Hellenistic either earlier or later, for we find no trace of it in Josephus or Philo, and its occasional occurrence early in the Apocrypha is sufficiently explained by the usage of the LXX. It was either derived from ἀγάλλομαι, perhaps by kinship in sound with the Hebrew לָצַח, which it resembles also in meaning (cf. ἀκροβυστία, βατταλογεῖν), or formed from לָצַח with a leaning to ἀγάλλομαι (so Buttmann, *Gramm. des neutest. Sprachgebr.* p. 45). In the LXX. it serves usually as the rendering of the verbs לָצַח and פָּרַח, and sometimes but very seldom as = לָקַח in Hithp. לָקַח, לָקַח; and, moreover, it occurs, as its derivatives also, only in the Psalms and a few places in the prophets, save in the Cod. Alex., Prov. xi. 10, and 2 Kings i. 20. Thus it is clearly a word belonging to sacred song, whence it afterwards passed into the language of the Apocrypha, the versions of Aquila, Symm., Theod., and into N. T. Greek,—an example of the influence of the language of the Psalms upon these.

Ἀγαλλιᾶσθαι denotes essentially joy of a religious kind, spiritual joy, and indeed, exactly as לָצַח and פָּרַח, a jubilant blessed exultation, a being carried away in sacred rapture, which last word in its primary meaning and history best perhaps answers to it; primarily = to carry away, to carry hence, to snatch away, and by Luther and after him used only of spiritual experiences both of rapture, ecstasy, and of a higher joy which quite carries away and transports the soul; cf. the German *Wörterb.* of Grimm and Weigand. The necessity for forming a new word is all the more obvious because, on the one hand, none of the usual phrases of profane Greek were adequate fully to express joy in God, the God of salvation (Isa. lxi. 10); and, on the other hand, the only analogous phenomena of Bacchanalian and Corybantic mirth utterly forbade comparison.

It occurs in the LXX. as=לָּב, usually in immediate connection or in parallel members with εὐφραίνεσθαι, פָּרַעַן, Ps. ii. 11, ix. 15, xiii. 5, 6, xiv. 7, xvi. 9, xxi. 1, xxxi. 8, xxxii. 11, xxxiv. 9, xlvii. 12, li. 10, lii. 7, lxxxix. 17, xcvi. 11, xcvi. 1, 9, cxviii. 24, cxlix. 2; Isa. xxv. 9, xxxv. 1, 2, xlix. 13, lxi. 10, lxv. 19. As=פָּרַעַן, Ps. v. 12, xx. 6, xxxiii. 1, xxxv. 27, li. 16, lix. 17, lxiii. 8, lxvii. 5, lxxi. 23, lxxxi. 2, lxxxiv. 3, lxxxix. 13, xc. 14, xcii. 5, xcv. 1, xcvi. 12, xcvi. 8, cxviii. 9, 16, cxlv. 7, cxlix. 5; Isa. lxv. 14. It appears (I.) usually *intransitively*, followed by ἐπὶ with the dative, Ps. ix. 15, xiii. 6, xxi. 1, xxxi. 8, and often; Tobit xiii. 13; Ecclus. xxx. 3; Luke i. 47, ἡγαλλίασεν τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπὶ τῷ θεῷ τῷ σωτῆρί μου. Followed by ἐπὶ with the accus., Ps. cxix. 162, lxxxiv. 3. With ἐν, in the LXX. only in Ps. xcii. 5, ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις τῶν χειρῶν σου ἀγαλλιᾶσθαι, and John v. 35, ἠβελήσατε ἀγαλλιασθῆναι ἐν τῷ φωτὶ αὐτοῦ. But 3 Macc. ii. 17, ἵνα μὴ καυχῶνται οἱ παράνομοι ἐν θυμῷ αὐτῶν μηδὲ ἀγαλλιάσωνται ἐν ὑπερηφανίᾳ γλώσσης αὐτῶν, is as little to be explained from this (as Wahl does) as is 1 Pet. i. 6, 8, ἐν ᾧ (sc. καιρῷ ἐσχάτῳ) ἀγαλλιᾶσθε. In like manner ἐν κυρίῳ, Ps. xxxiii. 1, is not the object of the exultation, but rather denotes the sphere of life from which the exultation is to sound. More appropriately might we further compare Ps. lxxxix. 17, ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου. In that case the object is connected by the dative alone, Ps. lxxxix. 13, cxlv. 7, whereas in Ps. xcv. 1 τῷ θεῷ is the *dat. comm.*; but in Luke x. 21 the dative refers to the subject, and in 1 Pet. i. 8 it supplies an adverb. With Luke x. 21, ἡγαλλίασας τῷ πνεύματι, cf. i. 47, ἡγαλλ. τὸ πν. μου. Soph. Ant. 1232, πτύσας προσώπῳ. Plat. Euthydem. 275 E, πάνυ μειδιάσας τῷ προσώπῳ. Xen. Cyrop. 4. 3. 18, προνοεῖν τῇ ἀνθρωπίνῃ γνώμῃ, ταῖς χερσὶν ὀπλοφορεῖν, therefore the dative of the instrument (Kühner, § 425, 3; cf. Bernhardt, Synt. p. 101). For 1 Pet. i. 8, ἀγαλλιᾶσθε χαρᾷ ἀνεκκλήτῳ καὶ δεδοξασμένῳ, cf. Ps. cxviii. 16, ἀγαλλιάσει ἀγαλλιάσονται, where the conception contained in the verb, which elsewhere is sometimes added as the product of the action in the acc. (νίκην νικᾶν, μάχην μάχεσθαι), is here added in the dative as producing or closely defining the action, like θανάτῳ ἀποθνήσκειν. Plat. Phil. 21. 6, ταῖς μεγίσταις ἡδοναῖς χαίροις ἄν. Soph. Oed. R. 65, ὕπνῳ γ' εὐδοντα, in deep sleep. Cf. Kühner, § 410, 2, 4: Bernhardt, p. 107. In the N. T. we find the object linked on by ὅτι, Matt. v. 12, by ἵνα, John viii. 56, Ἀβραὰμ ἡγαλλίασας ἵνα ἴδῃ τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ἐμήν, that he was to see, therefore not=ὅτι. Lastly, we find it expressed by participles, Acts xvi. 34, ἡγαλλιάτο πεπιστευκῶς τῷ θεῷ. 1 Pet. i. 8, ἀγαλλιᾶσθε κομιζόμενοι τὸ τέλος τῆς πίστεως. Without object or special limitation, Acts ii. 26 (from Ps. xvi. 9); 1 Pet. iv. 13; Rev. xix. 7. Besides εὐφραίνεσθαι we find it with the synonyms τέρπεσθαι, Ps. xxxiv. 9; ἀλαλάζειν, Ps. lxxxii. 2, xcv. 1; μεγαλύνεσθαι, Ps. xx. 6 (cf. μεγαλύνειν, Luke i. 46); χαίρειν, Matt. v. 12; 1 Pet. iv. 13 (cf. i. 8); Rev. xix. 7 (cf. John viii. 56).

(II.) *Transitively*, ἀγ. τί, joyously to praise, only as=פָּרַעַן, Ps. li. 16, lix. 17, where the Hebrew verb itself is also unusually joined with the accusative. In the Apocrypha, Tobit xiii. 7 (ἡ ψυχὴ μου), ἀγαλλιάσεται τὴν μεγαλωσύνην αὐτοῦ, as parallel with ὑψοῦν.

whence this construction may have arisen, whereas in Ps. lxxxix. 17, ἀγαλλιᾶσθαι answers to the passive ὑψοῦσθαι. The original in Ps. li. 16, lix. 17, forbids the assumption that ἀγαλλ. here is joined with an accusative merely as in the case of intrans. verbs of emotion, e.g. αἰσχύνεσθαι, χαίρειν, and others.

Ἀγαλλίασις, ἡ, rapture, exultation, rejoicing, in the LXX. = לִּשְׂשׂוֹן , Ps. xlv. 16, lxn. 13 ; = שִׂמְחָה , Ps. xxx. 6, xlii. 5, cvii. 22, cxviii. 15, xlvii. 2, ἀλαλάξατε τῷ θεῷ ἐν φωνῇ ἀγαλλιᾶσεως. cxxvi. 2, 5, 6 ; = שִׂמְחָה , Ps. lxiii. 6, c. 2 ; = שִׂמְחָה , Ps. xlv. 8, li. 10, 14, civ. 43. The word only occurs in the Psalms, and always denotes joy in God's redemptive work ; see especially Ps. cxxvi., and cxviii. 15, φωνὴ ἀγαλλιᾶσεως καὶ σωτηρίας ἐν σκηναῖς δικαίων. Often joined with εὐφροσύνη, αἴνεσις, χαρά, and in antithesis with κλαυσμός, Ps. xxx. 6. In the N. T. Luke i. 14, χαρά σοι καὶ ἀγαλλίασις. Acts ii. 26 ; Jude 24 ; Heb. i. 9, of the joy of salvation, an element which, however, is in the background in Luke i. 44, ἐσκίρτησεν τὸ βρέφος ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει. In the Apocrypha, Tobit xiii. 1, προσευχὴ εἰς ἀγαλλίασιν, a prayer of thanksgiving and praise. There also occurs in the LXX. the passive ἀγαλλίαμα, τό, in a few places in Isaiah (Isa. xvi. 10, xxii. 13, xxxv. 10, li. 3, 11, lx. 15, lxi. 11, lxn. 18), and three times in the Psalms, Ps. xxxii. 7, xlviii. 3, cxix. 111 ; for various corresponding Hebrew synonyms, with the same meaning as ἀγαλλίασις, but weakened and generalized in the Apocrypha, Ecclus. i. 11, vi. 31, xv. 6, στέφανος ἀγαλλιάματος. Further, in Ecclus. xxx. 22, xxxi. 28 ; Judg. xii. 14 ; Bar. iv. 34. Add. to Esth. iv. 2, κόσμος ἀγαλλιάματος, festive attire.

Ἀγαπάω is used in the LXX. for the Hebrew אָהַב in the entire range of its reference, with one or two characteristic exceptions. This Hebrew word embraces the significations of all the three Greek synonyms. Very often is it used in a sense in which the Greek did not speak of love, namely, to denote the love enjoined towards God and His will, and of the love affirmed of God Himself (Deut. vii. 13, x. 15, 18, xxiii. 6 ; 2 Sam. xii. 24 ; Ps. lxxviii. 68, lxxxvii. 2, cxlvi. 8 ; Isa. xliii. 4, xlviii. 14, lxiii. 9), this last in particular being in the view of a Greek a representation quite unrealizable (see ἀγάπη). Apart from a few passages where it is rendered only according to the sense of the context (Micah iii. 2, ζητεῖν ; Prov. xviii. 21 = κρατεῖν, xvii. 20 = χαίρειν), אָהַב is, as a rule, rendered by ἀγαπᾶν, except where it stands for lustful love (sixteen times in all), in which case ἐρᾶν, ἐραστής is used (see above), and where it denotes a sensual inclination or a natural affection (ten times), and then it is rendered by φιλεῖν and its compounds. Gen. xxvii. 4, 9, 14, xxxvii. 3 ; Isa. lvi. 10 ; Eccles. iii. 8 ; cf. 2 Chron. xxvi. 10, φιλογεωργός, $\text{אָהַב$ אֶרֶץ —and in two places where mention is made of an illicit inclination, 1 Kings xi. 1, φιλογύναιος, and Prov. xvii. 20, φιλαμαρτήμων. In two places only does φιλεῖν occur as perfectly synonymous with ἀγαπάω, Prov. viii. 17, xix. 3. Thus on the one hand the sphere of ἀγαπάω in relation to the Hebrew word is narrowed, and on the other hand in relation to profane usage it is widened, so as to embrace a highly important range, for the sphere of the religious life with its distinctive

forms of love, divine and human, is now included, a sphere which essentially determines the conception in the N. T. In Jude 1, ἐν θεῷ is hardly, with Hofmann, to be explained as = *by God*, and ἡγαπημένοι = *received into love*, nor is this the meaning in 1 Thess. i. 4; 2 Thess. ii. 13; Col. iii. 12. The example adduced by Hofmann for this rendering of ἐν, Plato, *Legg.* 886 E, is inapplicable, because κατηγορεῖν ἐν τινι = *to accuse before one*, can hardly be called a similar construction. What is meant seemingly is the passage in Ast, *lex. Plat.*, namely *Legg.* xi. 916 B, διαδικαζέσθω ἐν τισι τῶν ἰατρῶν, "let it be decided before some physicians," who were chosen as judges for the case in question. Still even this passage cannot be regarded as a parallel for ἀγαπᾶσθαι or ἡγαπημένος εἶναι ἐν τινι. We can in no way interpret ἐν θεῷ as another form of expression for παρὰ θ. or ὑπὸ θεοῦ; on the contrary, ἡγαπημένος must be regarded as a self-contained conception. Considering the parallelism with the following Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ τετηρημένοις, it is, moreover, not in keeping herewith to take it as an expression of the relation of the author to his readers. Ἐν θεῷ ἡγαπ. and Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ τετ. are both epithets of the κλητοῖς. Ἐν θεῷ ἡγ. does not designate the called as those who are the objects of God's love, but as those with whom the "being beloved," the "having experienced love," has become an abiding feature (cf. Rom. ix. 25), a condition belonging to them in *their* relation to God the Father (against Huther; cf. the expressions ἐν κυρίῳ, ἐν Χριστῷ); as such are they also Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ τετηρημένοις with reference to the second coming of Christ. For this latter, cf. 1 Pet. i. 5 sqq.

Ἀγάπη. The peculiarity of the N. T. ἀγάπη does not consist only in the fact that the sphere embraced by love and claimed for its exercise is larger than that of profane life, answering to the non-comprehensive use of ἀγαπάω in the LXX. It really denotes a love practically unknown outside the range of Scripture, a love possessing a character all its own, to express which terms in ordinary use must have been looked upon as quite inadequate; cf. the use of ἀπαπάω. Think only of love commanded, of love freely choosing its object, of love in certain circumstances putting itself in opposition to passion or feeling! As already has been remarked under ἀγαπάω, the Greek did not know such love as the mould of the divinely related life, and did not speak of love in a religious or ethico-religious sense, not at least in any exact way. To attribute love at all to the Deity was utterly impossible to the Greek. Cf. Arist. *Eth. Eud.* 4. 3, γελοῖον γὰρ εἶ τις ἐγκαλοῖ τῷ θεῷ ὅτι οὐχ ὁμοίως τῷ ἀντιφιλεῖσθαι ὡς φιλεῖται, ἢ τῷ ἄρχοντι καὶ ἀρχομένῳ. φιλεῖσθαι γὰρ, οὐ φιλεῖν τοῦ ἄρχοντος, ἢ φιλεῖν ἄλλον τρόπον. *Magn. Mor.* 2. 11, ἔστι ὡς οἴονται φιλία καὶ πρὸς θεὸν καὶ τὰ ἄψυχα, οὐκ ὀρθῶς. τὴν γὰρ φιλίαν ἐνταυθὰ φαμεν εἶναι οὐ ἔστι τὸ ἀντιφιλεῖσθαι, ἢ δὲ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν φιλία οὔτε ἀντιφιλεῖσθαι δέχεται οὔθ' ὅλως τὸ φιλεῖν ἄτοπον γὰρ ἂν εἴη εἶ τις φιλίᾳ φιλεῖν τὸν Δία. Hence it is that expressions such as 1 John iii. 16, iv. 9, 10, Gal. v. 22 (καρπὸς τοῦ πνεύματος) receive their special weight. Ἀγάπη denotes a love which is a characteristic, not of humanity, but of divinity, which in

its nature, degree, and power has nothing like it outside the sphere of Scripture, and which cannot in any way be fully thought of save as bestowed upon us by God, manifested in Christ, and required of Christians. That love to Christ is meant in 2 Cor. v. 14 (Hofmann) cannot be proved by the apostle's words in ver. 15, ἵνα ζῶσω, and not ἵνα ζῶμεν, because he is here speaking of what follows as the effect of Christ's love upon those of whom the apostle's description is true. Neither can it be proved by affirming "that ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Χριστοῦ cannot signify the love which Christ manifested by His death, but as in Rom. viii. 35 compared with ver. 39, the love which Christ has now;" for this latter, which includes the former, is also meant; compare ver. 15, καὶ ἐγερθέντι. As little force is there in the argument that ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Χριστοῦ (ver. 14) furnishes a determining principle for the conduct described in ver. 15 sqq. in the same way as ὁ φόβος τοῦ κυρίου does for vv. 11, 12. The conduct described in vv. 14, 15 is to be regarded as springing from the fear of God, as is clear from the close connection of ver. 14 with ver. 13 (γάρ), and is really the further application and carrying out of the ἀνθρώπους πείθωμεν, ver. 11, and σωφρονοῦμεν, ver. 13. But that the ἐγνωκέναι κατὰ σάρκα Χριστόν, as the description of the apostle's former life when he persecuted Christ, requires the subjective interpretation of the genitive in ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ Χριστοῦ, is clearly incorrect when we consider that these two statements do not stand in antithesis to each other; the antithesis is between κρίναντας κ.τ.λ., ver. 15, and εἰδέναι τινὰ κατὰ σάρκα, ver. 16. This latter statement coheres with his ἐγνωκέναι κατὰ σάρκα Χριστόν, in the place of which that knowledge now has come which leads him to the judgment of ver. 15. As to 1 John v. 3, 4, it must be remembered that the Johannine πιστεύειν differs only psychologically and not practically from the Pauline πίστις, and is presupposed in love to God; and thus the difference between the Johannine and the Pauline view is really reduced to the insertion of an intermediate term.

Ἄγγελος in Rev. ii., iii. is (as the following genitive shows) transferred from those who are κατ. ἐξ. ἄγγελοι to men, in order to make prominent the importance of their position, to give greater weight to the following epistles, and to deepen their impression; we should not hesitate to translate the word *angel* as is fittest also in Mal. ii. 7, iii. 1. Grimm (*Lex. Graecolat. in libr. N. T.*), von Hofmann, Wieseler would interpret 1 Tim. iii. 16, ὧφθη ἀγγέλοις, in like manner of men, ἀγγέλοις, poetically = ἀποστόλοις; but we should remember that ἀπόστολος, as the rarer and weightier word in the N. T., is chosen to designate the messengers of salvation, instead of the more ordinary and therefore certainly more prosaic ἄγγελος. To take the expression "angel" as a poetic name for the apostles is certainly not in keeping with the apostolic and N. T. phraseology, nor with their carefully defined position.

Ἅγιος. The difficulty of bringing out clearly not one or two sides only of the conception, but the conception itself in all its fulness and entire range, and the multitude

of ephemeral dissertations which have not yet led to a conclusive result, demand a fuller investigation of the subject. See especially the following treatises:—that of Achelis in *Stud. u. Krit.* 1847, i. p. 187 sqq., in connection with the deductions of Menken in his *Versuch einer Anleit.* etc., 3rd ed. 1833, chap. i. § 9. Menken's predecessor again is his teacher Collenbusch, cf. *Erklärung bibl. Wahrheiten*, by Sam. Collenbusch, sometime physician in Barmen, ii. 2, p. 97 sqq. (Elberfeld 1812). Then Caspari, "Jesaian. Stud. II. der Heilige Israels," in the *Zeitschr. f. luth. Theol. u. Kirche*, 1844, part 3, p. 92 sqq.; Diestel, "Heiligkeit Gottes," in *Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol.* 1859, p. 3 sqq.; Oehler, the article "Heiligkeit Gottes," in Herzog's *Realencykl.*, 1st ed. xix. 618 sqq., also his *Theol. d. A. T.* i. 160 sqq., 272 sqq. Beck, *Christl. Lehrwissenschaft.* i. 161 sqq., 543 sqq. Hofmann, *Schriftbeweis*, 2nd ed. i. 81 sqq. Herm. Schultz, *Alttest. Theol.*, 2nd ed. 1878, p. 514 sqq. To these we add the two latest inquiries, that of Count Baudissin, *Stud. z. semit. Religionsgesch.*, Heft 2, Leipzig 1878, pp. 3–142, which contains a tolerably complete survey of the more recent literature of the subject, and Delitzsch, art. "Heiligkeit," in Herzog u. Plitt, *Realencykl.*, 2nd ed. v. 714 sqq.

Etymologically the primary signification of קָדַשׁ cannot with certainty be traced. While Oehler (following Delitzsch, *Jesurun*, p. 155, *Psalmen*, ed. 1, i. 589, 187; Fürst, *Handwörterb.* ii. 300) puts it as the most probable view "that the verbal stem קָדַשׁ, which is akin to חָדַשׁ as קָצַב to קָצַח, קָצַח to קָצַר, קָצַר to קָצַר, and so forth, is to be traced to the root קָדַשׁ, from which we have קָדַשׁ also, having for its primary meaning *enituit*, to break forth shining,"—this etymology is by Baudissin designated feeble (p. 20), as with the whole theory of prefix-prepositions, and has also recently been surrendered by Delitzsch in favour of a derivation first suggested by Fleischer (in Delitzsch, *Psalmen*, ed. 1, p. 588 sq.) from a root *kad*, appearing in קָדַר, קָדַח, קָדַם, and so forth, with the primary meaning *to cut, to separate*, and thus we have for קָדַשׁ the root meaning of *being divided or separated*. The supposed affinity between חָדַשׁ and קָדַשׁ is not interfered with by this; according to Hofmann, both denote "a being different," חָדַשׁ, *new*, in contrast with that which has been, and קָדַשׁ, *holy*, in contrast with what is common. Baudissin, on the contrary, takes the transference of meaning from *to cut, to separate, to be new*, thus, "the new, as pure, has not yet come into contact with anything, and is described as *intact, cut off, or separated*." Other explanations might be suggested, but a decision as to the meaning of קָדַשׁ cannot be arrived at in this way. In order to attain a sure result we must consult linguistic usage, for "etymology throws light indeed upon the word to be explained, but rarely discloses its import in actual use" (Wellhausen, *Pharisäer u. Sadducäer*, p. 51).

Here we come face to face with two noteworthy facts, first the קָדַשׁ appears as the antithesis of חָלַל, 1 Sam. xxi. 5, 6; Ezek. xlviii. 14, 15, xlii. 20. And again, this antithesis we find conjoined with the manifestly synonymous one of טָהוֹר and טָמֵא in Lev. x. 10; Ezek. xxii. 26, xlv. 23. Still the first two passages quoted clearly show that the two antitheses are not properly alike. Baudissin rightly calls attention to the

fact that קדש and טמא never appear in immediate contrast with each other. Accordingly, with 1 Sam. xxi. 5, 6, Ezek. xlvi. 14, 15, xlii. 20, before us, we cannot maintain the view that pure is the root conception contained in קדש. What is holy is pure, and demands purity,—cf. טמא מקדש, Lev. xx. 3; Num. xix. 20; Ezek. v. 11; קדש, Ps. lxxix. 1; שם קדש, Ezek. xliii. 7, 8, and also the combination קדש וטהרה, Lev. xxix. 37; Heb. ix. 13, τοὺς κεκοινωμένους ἀγιάζει πρὸς καθαρότητα, and the mention of a purifying, not sanctifying, of the sanctuary in Heb. ix. 22, 23,—there is no holiness without purity, but holy is not in and for itself = pure. קלל and not טמא is the proper word to designate profanation, טמא only produces profanation. Now חל denotes generally what is common, κοινόν, accessible to every one, Deut. xx. 6; Jer. xxxi. 5; 1 Sam. xxi. 5, 6. It is only when used in antithesis with קדש that the κοινόν becomes βέβηλον. חל is equivalent to to expose or abandon what hitherto possessed a certain protection, or some special esteem or advantage, surrounded and guarded to a certain extent by fences, what was withdrawn from common use or general contact, what, in a word, did not stand on a par with other things. Thus, for example, of the vineyard when the time of gathering of grapes is come, Jer. xxxi. 5; Deut. xx. 6, xxviii. 30; cf. Lev. xix. 23 sqq.; also מלכות, Lam. ii. 2; בריח, Ps. lxxxix. 35, lv. 21; Mal. ii. 1. חל is almost synonymous to נאץ, בזה, and other words = to despise (Ps. lxxxix. 32; Lev. xxi. 12, 15; Num. xviii. 32, and often), but always, as Acts xxi. 28, κεκοίνωκεν τὸν ἅγιον τόπον τοῦτον, clearly shows, with the underlying notion of a removal of previously existing guards, a leaving out of reckoning, or a setting aside of some distinction belonging to the object, putting it on a par with other things. Cf. Ps. lxxxix. 32; Jer. xvi. 18; Ezek. xxii. 8; Zeph. iii. 4; Ezek. xx. 16, 24, and especially the employment of the word to denote God's rejection of that which He had before chosen and sanctified, Isa. xliii. 9; Ps. lxxxix. 35; Isa. xliii. 28; Ezek. xxviii. 16, and often. If, now, we take passages such as Gen. ii. 3, Lev. xx. 26, 1 Chron. xxiii. 13, Jer. xii. 3, and from the N. T. 2 Cor. vi. 17, cf. vii. 1, it is beyond a doubt manifest that there lies at the basis of the conception of holiness the idea of a contrast with what is general or common, and therefore of distinction and separation, or the being set apart. Not more, however, than this. Holiness is a relative conception; but that the conceptions of holiness and separation are not absolutely synonymous is clear from 1 Chron. xxiii. 13, יְבָרַךְ אֱהוּן לְהַקְדִּישׁוֹ. There is still another element which more accurately qualifies the contrast, distinction, or relationship.

The concept קדש—and this is the second of the two facts referred to above—receives its peculiar colour, definiteness, and fulness by the circumstance that it is applied only to God and to what is God's. Besides God Himself, it is predicated only of such things and persons as stand in the relation of specially belonging to God, be it that God has specially appropriated them, or that they have been specially set apart to Him by men. קדש is accordingly in linguistic usage a religious concept. And thus we arrive at the third observation, that it is a purely Israelitish conception, belonging therefore to the

economy of redemption. The question next arises, in what sense is a difference and separateness attributed by this predicate to God and to what is His? It has been assumed, with the admission that there may be a further relation (Baudissin, p. 78), that the word may have been in the first instance used of what had been or should be appropriated or dedicated to God, and thus would arise the signification, *separated for God, dedicated to God*. קדש would accordingly be a relative conception from below to above, denoting the special relation to God, perhaps = *belonging to God* (Diestel, Baudissin). Delitzsch also adopts the view that always, even when the conception is applied to men or things, the relative conception of *devoted to God, belonging to God*, is traceable. But in this way the transference of the word to God Himself can be explained only by a very dubious circumlocution. The fact is, we do not deal with the merely relational idea in this sense in the case of men and things, as Delitzsch himself perceives on Ex. xix. 6, נוי קדש, the antithesis of which he finds in Isa. i. 4, נוי חטא. Baudissin also finds himself in one point led to a far-reaching admission, since he grants with regard to the holiness demanded of the people of God, that here at least the conception attains its special import (= *perfectly pure*), *primarily in its application to God*, and that only thence is it transferred to men.

But in a far wider range it must be granted that the conception has received its obvious and distinctive definiteness and fulness from its primary application to God, even if we persist in regarding the linguistic usage as having sprung from its application to what is dedicated to God. For if holiness be really a purely religious conception, from the very nature of the religious life it follows that the sense in which it is attributed or is predicated of God must influence and dominate over the entire range of its use; mention can be made of holiness in men or things only on the ground of their connection with God, and in necessary association with divine holiness. Hence it follows that in our conception of holiness must be centred all that is distinctive of the God of Israel, of the God of revelation; compare, for example, only the Isaianic designation of God as אֱלֹהֵי כָל־הָאָרֶץ, קדש יִשְׂרָאֵל, Isa. liv. 5. Now this very fact, recognised especially by Delitzsch, that the true definiteness of the conception arises from its application to God, leads on to the further question whether after all from the first the word was predicated alike of God and of that which is God's? The only trace we have of the use of the word beyond the range of Israel, in קדשה, קדש of the Hierodulae as devoted to the divinity (Astarte), does not interfere with this supposition, especially if the assumption of Delitzsch is right, that the word is predicated of Astarte herself, and to her in the first place, afterwards to those consecrated to her. For this view another consideration may perhaps be decisive. קדש is certainly in the first instance a relational conception, but *the fundamental idea is not a relationship to God, but, on the contrary, a relationship to all else, a relationship therefore to the world; it has to do with a relationship not from below upwards, but from above downwards*. So obvious is this in the antithesis, so crucial for determining the conception between קדש and חל, that it can hardly be mistaken. It is just *this contrast*

to all that is otherwise that explains why קדש—perhaps on this very account—is a purely religious concept used only of God and of that which is God's. Thus all the difficulties disappear which arise from the transference of the conception from what *is consecrated to God, to God Himself*. The representation (not belonging anywhere to a later development) that what is consecrated to God participates in the divine holiness, is obviously true; for by its transference to God, or by His choice of it, the thing enters upon and partakes of God's relation to the world and to all that is otherwise. And from the fact that holiness belongs only to God and what is God's, we may advance a step farther and affirm that *holiness is predicated of other subjects besides God, only in a derived manner*, as is clear from, e.g., Deut. xxviii. 9, 10, "Jehovah shall establish thee as a holy people to Himself, as He hath sworn unto thee . . . and all people of the earth shall see that Thou art called by the name of Jehovah;" cf. Ps. xlvi. 5; Num. xvii. 2, 3; Lev. xxvii. 14 sqq., xxi. 6, 7; Ps. cxiv. 1, 2. Their belonging to God places them like God in contrast with the world, each in its degree; so that we can understand the apparent weakening of the conception, according to the subject or the aspect of the relation to which it is applied. Thus it becomes conceivable and probable that, as Delitzsch says, the entire course of development of the Scripture concept of *holiness* is governed by the conception of *the holiness of God*.

If, therefore, the fundamental idea be distinction and separation from the world, the further question arises, What is the positive import of this seemingly merely negative idea? We say seemingly negative, for reflective thinking may indeed form purely negative concepts, but the spiritual impulse which moulds language never can. What we seek is the correct knowledge of that central element wherein the distinction and separation of God and what is His from the world essentially consists. That it is *exaltation above the world* (Baudissin), is not shown by the circumstance that "glorious" and "exalted" are conjoined with "holiness," Isa. lxiv. 10, lxiii. 15; Jer. xvii. 12; Ezek. xx. 40; Dan. xi. 45; Ex. xxviii. 2; as also with exhortations to praise the holy name of Jehovah, as Baudissin supposes, for it is not that Jehovah's name is holy because it is praiseworthy, it is worthy of praise because it is holy, Ps. xcix. 3, 5, ciii. 1, etc. As little can it be urged in favour of this view that Ezekiel uses holiness synonymously with greatness, power, glory. A closer examination of the passages cited in proof of this shows that this is not so; their gist is that God will again sanctify His name, which Israel had profaned, by Israel's redemption. It is not that Israel's salvation will be regarded absolutely as the proof of God's power, least of all in Ezek. xx. 42 compared with ver. 39; still less is it admissible (in view of ver. 39) that the profanation of Jehovah's name consisted in the occasion which Israel gave for doubting God's power. This profanation lay in the perversion of the knowledge of Jehovah; Israel's fate gave occasion for the nations to misapprehend Jehovah and to doubt His power, or through Israel's misconduct the God whom they professed to serve was misunderstood, Ezek. xx. 39. What the nations knew or were to know of God is indeed His power. By asserting His

power, Jehovah would again sanctify before them His profaned name; but it is not said that holiness and power, sway, or world-dominion coincide. On the contrary, we see in Ezek. xxviii. 22, that in affirming the divine holiness, we speak not only of God's power, but of something more. There Jehovah sanctifies Himself by judgment upon Sidon; the judgment requires a manifestation of power, but it is not = manifestation of power, it is the assertion of a *moral* relationship, of a morally guided will; the assumption that in the places quoted in Ezekiel the concepts "holy" and "exalted, great, mighty" are synonymous, arises from mistaking or overlooking the different relations wherein the divine holiness is manifested, namely, *in the sight of* the nations *upon* Israel through covenant faithfulness, or *before* the nations by judgment upon them. Thus holiness is a purely Israelitish conception; what is to the nations a manifestation of power, is to Israel from their peculiar point of view an affirmation of divine holiness. Hence it undoubtedly appears that holiness gives expression to an element in Israel's knowledge of God essentially different from His exaltation. Maintaining that holiness denotes a relation of God to the world known or revealed only in Israel, we must further perceive that it concerns a moral element in this relation.

It is not enough to enhance the incomparable exaltation of God to an inviolableness which keeps His majesty aloof from every defamation, or to identify God's holiness with the distance between Him and the creature, with the consuming majesty of His essence (H. Schultz). This leaves unexplained the holiness which is the principle of that divine self-affirmation which brings salvation, and which is the all-embracing demand of the law. We also run the risk of putting into the O. T. a dualistic view of the world wherein the creature as such stands in contrast with the Creator. Strong as is the emphasis laid even in the O. T. upon the difference between the creature as such and God, the creature's weakness and insignificance are never traced to God's holiness; cf. the statements of Isa. xl. 11 sqq., xlv. 9, lxiv. 8. What man feels in sight of God's holiness is something different, see Isa. vi.

In opposition to this is the view put forth first by Collenbusch, and further argued by Menken, that God is the Holy One, as the God of promise in His "preventive self-abasing kindness (Collenbusch, p. 102), announced to Israel alone, but fulfilled in the gospel." "The gospel is the source of our knowledge of God's holiness. Our knowledge of God's righteousness springs from the law." "Throughout the world God is known as God, as the Almighty Creator and Lord of heaven and earth. God's power, wisdom, and goodness may be recognised in all the world from the works of creation, Ps. civ. 24; God's holiness cannot at all be known from the works of creation, but from the promises alone" (p. 97 sq.). Here for the first time is obtained and declared the twofold truth that holiness is a conception peculiar to Israel, and belongs to the economy of redemption; although beyond a doubt to identify it with grace would be unwarrantable. Thus much must be admitted concerning the views thus far named, especially that of H. Schultz, the separateness of God from all else finding expression in the conception of holiness raises

a certain contrast, and it is just this contrasted relation that quite vanishes in Collenbusch and Menken.

Hofmann's view, that God is holy "as the absolutely distinct, self-contained, self-existing One in contrast with the world to which He does not belong," enhances *elevation* above the world, or contrast with it to a negation of every relation to the world; though clearly the intention is to win a basis for God's saving relation to the world in the free, divine, self-determining of His essence. The conception so formed would bear too much the impress of a philosophico-religious speculation, and could not have its origin or value within the sphere of the religious life, whether growing naturally or begotten by revelation.

Delitzsch does not do justice to the fact that קדוש is a relative conception, when he proceeds to argue that, applied to God, it must affirm what God is in Himself, that it therefore denotes the *summa omnisque labis expers in Deo puritas* (Quenstedt), as it always, when the word is more than a merely relational conception, combines in linguistic consciousness with the root signification *sejunctus* the idea *sejunctus ab omni vitio*, therefore *labis expers*. It was obvious to the consciousness of Israel that God is in Himself what He appears to the world, and that the holiness which was recognised with reference to Israel belonged essentially and in itself to Him. Thus, however, it is not affirmed that the element of relationship in the conception of holiness disappears, as Delitzsch himself changes "physical and mainly ethical freedom from fault" (as that which holiness is to be taken to mean wherever Scripture designates God as the Holy One) into "absolute antithesis to all evil." Nowhere in Holy Scripture is קדוש anything but a relational conception, and it is just the relation to the world which everywhere is to be made prominent. Indeed, it well-nigh seems as if anxiety about a definition which should retain its import even apart from sin, had led on to that view with which Delitzsch recognises the definition of Diestel, "Normality of life." According to Weiss (*Neut. Test. Theol.* 3d ed. § 45, d. a. 6), who combines the views of Baudissin and Delitzsch, holiness is "the majesty of God, exalted above all creature impurity, whether physical or moral;" but thus the considerations we have urged are not satisfied. If, then, we are right in saying, in the first place, that holiness is a *relative* conception, denoting the relation of God and of all that is His to the world, and, secondly, that it is specifically an *Israelitish* conception, having to do with the economy of redemption, the full unfolding of its import is not far to seek. Denoting the separateness of God from everything else, it expresses an antithesis between God and the world. If קדוש, as we found it in Scripture, be an Israelitish conception,—by which we do not deny that it occurs outside the range of Israel, but mean only that we must not explain the O. T. concept from outside,—we must describe this antithesis as it appears to the consciousness of Israel. For Israel, then, this contrast is between God and the sinful world, or between **God and sin** and all connected therewith. History and prophecy, the law and the religious life, centre in this antithesis. However we may view the development of

consciousness concerning this antithesis, this cannot be denied. We have simply to do with the distinctive or manifold forms in which this antithesis presents itself in the history, institutions, and consciousness of the elect nation, the nation concerned in the development of redemption. Such are the main features of the O. T. conception of holiness as it reappears in the N. T. also, its limitation to Israel disappearing there. It is observable that ἅγιος, with its derivatives, appears but seldom in the Apocrypha. We find it predicated of God in 3 Macc. v. 13, vi. 1, viii. 10, ὁ ἅγιος θεός; vi. 29, τὸν ἅγιον σωτήρα θεὸν αὐτῶν εὐλόγουν. As a substantival without any addition, Ecclus. xxiii. 9; Baruch iv. 22, 37, v. 5; Tobit xii. 12, 15 (as in the O. T., only in Isa. xl. 25; Job vi. 10; Hab. iii. 3). Ecclus. xlviii. 20, ὁ ἅγιος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ (cf. Luke xi. 13, ὁ πατήρ ὁ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ). Without the article (as in Isa. xl. 25), Ecclus. iv. 14, xliii. 10, xlvii. 8; Tobit xiii. 9.—ἅγιος ἐν ἁγίοις, 3 Macc. ii. 2, 21. Combined with τὸ ὄνομα, Ecclus. xlvii. 10; Wisd. x. 20; Tobit iii. 11, viii. 5.—τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγ., Sus. 44.—τὸ ἅγ. σου πν., Wisd. ix. 16. Peculiar to the Apocrypha, further, is the substantival ἅγιος of men, and indeed of the priests, Ecclus. vii. 31, xlv. 24; of Moses and Aaron, Wisd. xi. 1, 6; of God's chosen servants, Ecclus. xlii. 17, xlv. 2 (cf. 2 Pet. i. 21); of Israel, Tobit viii. 15 (cf. the combination with ἔθνος, Wisd. xvii. 2; Ecclus. xlix. 12; λαός, 2 Macc. xv. 24; 3 Macc. ii. 6). Only seldom thus in the O. T., see below. Of the pious, Wisd. v. 5, xviii. 9,—as perhaps in Ps. xvi. 3, xxxiv. 10. Such are the most important examples of apocryphal usage.—τὸ ἅγιον in Heb. ix. 1, as in the LXX. Num. iii. 38, Ex. xxviii. 30, xxxix. 1, 1 Kings viii. 10, denotes the sanctuary, i.e. the temple, for which elsewhere in the N. T., as before in the Apocrypha, ἱερόν is used, a word avoided in the LXX., which could not have been employed in Heb. ix. 1. See under ἱερός. Besides the singular (which denotes, according to the connection, a part only of the temple, either the Holy place, as in Ex. xxvi. 33, or the Most Holy, as in Lev. xvi. 16, xvii. 20, 23, 27; Ezek. xli. 23), the plural is employed, τὰ ἅγια, as a name of the temple; in the historical books, however, only seldom (Lev. xxi. 12; Num. iii. 29), whereas in the prophetic books, especially in Isaiah and Ezekiel, almost always. So also in Heb. viii. 2, ix. 8, 12, 24, 25, x. 19, xiii. 11, where we are nowhere obliged (as the connection requires in Ezek. xli. 21) to take it to denote the Holy of holies (against Bleek, de Wette, Lünemann, Delitzsch). What is spoken of is not any distinctive part of the sanctuary, but the sanctuary itself as the place of God's presence. See especially ix. 18, and Hofmann *in loc.* On the other hand, in ix. 2, 3, it signifies (as τὸ ἅγιον in Ex. xxvi. 33) the Holy place, in distinction from the Most Holy.—In Matt. vii. 8, μὴ δώτε τὸ ἅγιον τοῖς κυσίν, it signifies holy meats, usually τὰ ἅγια, Lev. xxii. 2, 3, 4, and often.

Ἀγιότης. Von Hofmann says more appropriately, “ἀπλότης would at once have appeared inappropriate as an attribute of God. Moreover, with the reading ἀγιότητι we have the weaker word εἰλικρ. following in the second place.” Still it is easier to

understand the supplanting of the rarer word ἀγιότης by ἀπλότης than *vice versa*. In contrast with what follows, οὐκ ἐν σοφίᾳ σαρκ., and as a synonym of εἰλικρ., ἀγιότης must have appeared strange, whereas the Pauline ἀπλότης would almost spontaneously occur as much more readily blending with εἰλικρ., and as suited to the contrast. Weighty, therefore, as are the witnesses for ἀπλ., especially that of the Peshito, the preference must be given to the reading of A B C and others, ἀγιότης.

Ἀγιαζώ. As ἅγιος stands contrasted with κοινός, ἀγιαζειν when its object is something κοινός, cannot be accomplished without an ἀφορίζειν, *i.e.* without a withdrawal from fellowship with the world. Still this does not exhaust the meaning, either with reference to the relation implied in ἀγιαζειν towards God, or towards the world, and all that is other than itself. This holds good of passages such as Jer. xii. 3; Lev. xx. 26; cf. 1 Chron. xxiii. 13, יְהוָה יִהְיֶה לָנוּ בְּרִיךְ. Hence it is erroneous to explain ἀγιαζειν by ἀφορίζειν, as is done in patristic Greek.

Ἀγιασμός. For the active meaning, cf. Chrys. *Or.* 1 *de pseudoproph.*, τὸ μνημονεύσαι αὐτοὺς (*i.e.* τοὺς ἡγουμένους) ἀγιασμός ἐστι ψυχῆς. Basil, *Hom. in Ps.* xiv., τὸν ἀγιασμὸν κατορθώσας ἄξιός ἐστι τῆς ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ ὄρει κατασκηνώσεως.—In the 2nd edition of this work the active signification was regarded as prevailing in the N. T., and this has been defended by Hofmann, especially on 1 Pet. i. 2, for all those passages in which ἀγιασμός is not, as in Ecclus. xvii. 8, vii. 31, employed to render שְׁרָף. But the fatal objection of Huther (on 1 Pet. i. 2) must be regarded as conclusive against this view. The passive signification can in no passage be rejected except in 1 Pet. i. 2 and 2 Thess. ii. 13. But even in these it cannot really be called in question. Ἀγιασμός is not, like ἀγιότης and ἀγιοσύνη, the attribute *holiness*, but the *state of being sanctified, sanctification*, not as a process, but as the result of a process (strictly speaking, the process fulfilled is the object of it); and this meets the objection of Hofmann, that, taking it passively, ἀγιασμός πνεύματος can only mean the holiness of man's spirit or God's. What is meant is really the sanctification wrought by the Spirit, and therefore called after Him, which in 2 Thess. ii. 13, εἴλατο ὑμᾶς ὁ θεὸς εἰς σωτηρίαν ἐν ἀγιασμῷ πνεύματος, as well as in 1 Pet. i. 2, ἐκλεκτοὶ ἐν ἀγιασμῷ πνεύματος, is represented as the embodiment and result of divine election. This signification is unquestionable, not only in Rom. vi. 19, παραστήσατε τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν δοῦλα τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ εἰς ἀγιασμόν, and consequently in ver. 22, δουλωθέντες δὲ τῷ θεῷ ἔχετε τὸν καρπὸν ὑμῶν εἰς ἀγιασμόν, but particularly also by its contrast with ἀκαθαρσία, 1 Thess. iv. 7, οὐκ ἐκάλεσεν ὑμᾶς ὁ θεὸς ἐπὶ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ, ἀλλ' ἐν ἀγιασμῷ (where the change of prepositions is to be noted; ἀγιασμός accompanies and characterizes the calling), and accordingly vv. 3, 4 likewise, τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ, ὁ ἀγιασμός ὑμῶν, ἀπέχεσθαι ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ τῆς πορνείας, εἰδέναι ἕκαστον ὑμῶν τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σκεῦος κτᾶσθαι ἐν ἀγιασμῷ καὶ τιμῇ. Cf. Oecumenius on 1 Thess. iii. 13, τοῦτο ἀληθῶς ἀγιασμός, τὸ παντὸς ῥύπου καθαρὸν εἶναι. In like manner with 1 Thess. iv. 3, 4, 7, Clemens Rom. uses the word; see *ad Cor.* i. 35. 2, ὡς μακάρια καὶ θαυμαστὰ τὰ δῶρα τοῦ

θεοῦ ζωὴ ἐν ἀθανασίᾳ, λαμπρότης ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ ἀλήθεια ἐν παρρησίᾳ, πίστις ἐν πεποιθῇσει, ἐγκράτεια ἐν ἁγιασμῷ. *Ibid.* c. 30. 1, ποιήσωμεν τὰ τοῦ ἁγιασμοῦ πάντα, φεύγοντες καταλαλίας; cf. Eph. v. 3, καθὼς πρέπει ἁγίοις. In like manner, in Heb. xii. 14, εἰρήνην διώκετε μετὰ πάντων καὶ τὸν ἁγιασμόν, οὗ χωρὶς οὐδεὶς ὄφεται τὸν κύριον (cf. Matt. v. 8), and 1 Tim. ii. 15, μένειν ἐν πίστει καὶ ἀγάπῃ καὶ ἁγιασμῷ μετὰ σωφροσύνης, the meaning is not a mode of conduct, but a state produced, as also Chrysostom, Theophylact, Theodoret on Heb. xii. 14 explain it, though they interpret it wrongly on account of σωφροσύνη in the limited sense of *chastity, continency*. In 1 Cor. i. 30, Χριστὸς ἐγενήθη σοφία ἡμῖν ἀπὸ θεοῦ δικαιοσύνη τε καὶ ἁγιασμός καὶ ἀπολύτρωσις, stress is to be laid not only upon its combination with ἀπολύτρωσις (Hofm.), but with the much narrower δικαιοσύνη, and we must keep in mind Eph. iv. 24, Luke i. 75, as well as 1 Cor. v. 11, Heb. x. 10. Isa. viii. 14, ἔσται σοι εἰς ἁγίασμα, where the older editions read ἁγιασμόν, is not a parallel, for here the word is synonymous with *sanctuary*. In patristic Greek, ἁγιασμός often is used (as in the LXX. in the Apocrypha = *sanctuary*) of the Lord's Supper, of the water of baptism, and of consecration, either as divinely appointed or as objects of holy reverence, answering to the use of ἁγιασμός to denote the *Trisagion* in the Liturgy. Cf. Suiceri *Thesaurus*.

Ἀγορεύω, to speak in the assembly of the people, then generally to speak, to talk. Nowhere in biblical Greek, not even in Jer. xxxvii. 12 (Trommius), where the reading is ἀγοράσαι. Hence

Προσαγορεύω, (a) to address, to greet; in the LXX. only in Deut. xii. 7, οὐ προσαγορεύσεις εἰρηνικὰ αὐτοῖς = עֲשֵׂה שָׁלוֹם, compare Thuc. vi. 16, δυστυχοῦντες οὐ προσαγορευόμεθα. (b) To designate, to give a name to, with two accusatives, Wisd. xiv. 22; 1 Macc. xiv. 40; 2 Macc. i. 36; 2 Macc. iv. 7, x. 9, xiv. 37, κατὰ τὴν εὐνοίαν πατὴρ τῶν Ἰουδαίων προσαγορευόμενος. So in the N. T. Heb. v. 10, προσαγορευθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀρχιεὺς κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ, not = *greeted* (Delitzsch, v. Hofmann, and by Lünemann held as admissible), in which case προσαγορευθῆναι would need an addition; cf. Herodotus, ii. 8, 9, ἡσπᾶσαντο φιλίως συστρατιώτας προσαγορεύσαντες; Plut. *Pomp.* 13. And thus also the criticism that Heb. v. 10 cannot be understood of the address in Ps. cx. falls to the ground; cf. Bengel, προσηγορία, *appellatio sacerdotis non solum secuta est consummationem Jesu, sed antecessit etiam passionem, tempore psalmi cx. 4.*

Κατηγορέω, to speak openly against, to impeach, to accuse, mainly in a forensic sense. Not in the LXX. With the genitive of the person, Matt. xii. 10; Mark iii. 2; Luke vi. 7, xi. 34 (Rec.), xxiii. 2, 10; John v. 45 (viii. 6, Rec.); Acts xxv. 5; Rev. xii. 10. — τινός τι, Mark xv. 3, 4; cf. Acts xxviii. 19, and the passive in Acts xxii. 30, κατηγορεῖσθαί τι, of which we have no example in profane Greek, for τί is not the nominative, as Wendt assumes by inference from Thuc. i. 95. 2, ἀδικία πολλή

κατηγορεῖτο αὐτοῦ, which is rather to be compared with the impersonal *κατηγορεῖται τινος*, "the accusation against one is withdrawn," Xen. *Hell.* v. 2. 35. The passive in Acts xxii. 30 stands as in Xen. *Hell.* iii. 5. 25, *κατηγορουμένου αὐτοῦ*; 2 Macc. x. 13, *κατηγορούμενος ὑπὸ τῶν φίλων*. In like manner Matt. xxvii. 12; Acts xxv. 16. Compare the construction elsewhere unknown, *κατηγ. τινά*, Rev. xii. 10, where the Rec. text has the genitive. With two genitives, Acts xxiv. 8, xxv. 11, cf. Dem. 21. 5; Isoc. 27 C,—a still rarer construction, so that some, *e.g.* Grimm, suppose an attraction of the relative; *τινὸς περὶ τινος*, Acts xxiv. 13; *κατὰ τινος* (Xen. *Anab.* i. 7. 9), and with the genitive of the thing, Luke xiii. 14; *πρὸς τινα*, to any one, Plat. *Eutyphr.* 2 C; John v. 45; *ἐνώπιόν τινος*, Rev. xii. 10. Absolutely = *to perform the work of an accuser*, Rom. ii. 15; Acts xxiv. 2. For an *accusatio extra forum* (Bretschneider, Grimm) we cannot cite either 1 Macc. vii. 6, 25, 2 Macc. iv. 47, nor John v. 45, Rev. xii. 10, but only Rom. ii. 15.

Κατήγορος, ὁ, the accuser, Acts xxiii. 30, 35, xxiv. 8, xxv. 16, 18 (John viii. 10, Rec.); 2 Macc. iv. 5. Once in the LXX. Prov. xviii. 17 = כִּי־יָבִי־אֶת־שִׁנְאָתוֹ, he who first brings his own complaint, with the remarkable combination *ἐαυτοῦ κατήγορος*, he who accuses in his own behalf. Rev. xii. 10, Rec., instead of *κατήγῳρ*, of the devil.

Κατηγορία, ἡ, accusation, incrimination, *τινὸς* against a person, Luke vi. 7, Rec., where Tisch. Treg. read *κατηγορεῖν. κατὰ τινος*, John xviii. 29; 1 Tim. v. 19. With the genitive of the thing, Titus i. 6, *μὴ ἐν κατηγορίᾳ ἀσωτίας*, not indeed in order to judicial punishment, but certainly for public condemnation.

Κατήγῳρ, ὁ, Rev. xii. 10, Lachm. Tisch., instead of *κατήγορος*, not found in classical Greek. The form answers to the rabbinical קַטְגֹּרִי, Targ. Job xxxiii. 23 = **accuser**, then used as an appellation to designate **Satan**, as in Job i. 6 sqq., ii. 1 sqq.; Zech. iii. 1, 2; 1 Chron. xxi. 1. Cf. Oehler, *Theol. des A. T.* § 200. It describes Satan as the opponent of God's people, who resists God's grace in His people collectively and in the righteous individually, and who appears before God against them continually, especially in times of great danger, and finally when the question is concerning their participation in the *αἰὼν μέλλον*. For quotations at length, see Schöttgen, *Hor. Hebr. et Talm.* on Rev. xii. 10, p. 1121 sqq. See **διάβολος**.

Πανήγυρις, εως, ἡ (the *υ* is traced to the influence of the Aeolic dialect, cf. Curtius, 714), a general and indeed festive assembly of the people, Thuc. i. 25. 3; Xen. *Hier.* i. 11, *αἱ κοιναὶ π.*, the assemblies of the people at the Olympic, Isthmian, Nemean games; an assembly of the people of a festively-religious character, Pindar, *Ol.* ix. 145, *Ζηνὸς ἀμφὶ πανάγυριν*. Xen. *Hell.* vi. 4. 30, *τὴν πανήγυριν τῷ θεῷ καὶ ἀγῶνας διατιθέναι*, where processions (Herod. ii. 58, *π. καὶ πομπαὶ καὶ προσαγωγαί*) and sacrifices (Herod. vii. 111. 2, *θυσίας Ἀθηναίων καὶ πανηγυρίας*) were combined with games and markets (compare Church festivals and wakes). Afterwards the word was

weakened by being used of any large gathering, and for festive pleasures in general, but not so often, and its original force remained to such an extent that, *e.g.*, Clem. Alex. *Strom.* vi. p. 309, ed. Sylb., says of the life of a Christian, ἅπας δὲ βίος αὐτοῦ πανήγυρις ἁγία. αὐτίκα θυσίαι μὲν αὐτῷ, εὐχαί τε καὶ αἶνοι κ.τ.λ. As to the synonym ἐορτή, which likewise stood originally for religious feasts, it differs thus,—all the people take part in the πανήγυρις, and in it the national religious life finds its festive expression, but this reference disappears in ἐορτή.

Now it is singular and very significant that, in spite of the distinctively religious character of Israel's nationality and life, the LXX. use this word very seldom, and only, so to speak, when compelled, just as in the case of ἀγαλλιᾶσθαι, obviously because heathen customs were too closely associated with πανήγυρις. Though ὕμν should properly be rendered by πανήγυρις (the synonymous ἡ being = ἐορτή), it is usually like ἡ rendered by ἐορτή (apart from the combination ὕμν ἡ, where through a wrong derivation it is = μαρτύριον). Only three times is it = πανήγυρις, Ezek. xlv. 11; Hos. ix. 5, ii. 11, where the accumulation of synonyms necessitated the choice of the word, as also Amos ix. 21, where it is = ἡ. Πανηγυρίζειν also occurs in Isa. lxvi. 10, εὐφράνθητι ἅμα Ἱερουσαλήμ καὶ πανηγυρίσατε πάντες οἱ ἐνοικοῦντες ἐν αὐτῇ (= ἡ, elsewhere ἀγαλλιᾶσθαι), where evidently the πάντες κ.τ.λ. led to the employment of the word.

Equally manifest is the reason why the word is chosen in the only N. T. text where it occurs, Heb. xii. 22, 23, προσεληλύθατε . . . μυριάσιν ἀγγέλων πανηγύρει καὶ ἐκκλησίᾳ πρωτοτόκων κ.τ.λ., where Origen, Theophyl., Luther, *et al.*, take it as in apposition with μυρ., this latter being a designation of the angel-hosts, or (Bengel, Lachm., de Wette, *et al.*) of the ἀγγ. παν. and the ἐκκλ. πρ. combined. This last is by no means possible, for προσεληλυθῆναι μυριάσιν as a privilege of the N. T. community expresses no suitable thought. It is not even true that μυριάδες by itself denotes hosts of angels in biblical Greek, the connection must indicate what myriads are meant. Myriads of angels are certainly meant in Deut. xxxiii. 2, Dan. vii. 10, and Jude 14,—the only passages coming into view here,—because they are the myriads “who surround God's throne,” whereas in Judith xvi. 3, ἦλθεν Ἀσσοῦρ ἐν μυριάσι δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ, the hosts of Assyria are meant; cf. Ecclus. xlvii. 6; Gen. xxiv. 60; Ps. xci. 7. Now in Heb. xii. 22 the connection requires some qualifying word with μυρ., and therefore ἀγγέλων must belong to μυρ. and not to παν. The word following μυρ. ἀγγ. is not connected with καί; we have πανηγύρει καὶ ἐκκλ. πρ., but this is in order to avoid the separation of the conceptions by καὶ παν. καὶ ἐκκλ. The reason why the writer was not content with simply saying καὶ ἐκκλησίᾳ may easily be seen, for the O. T. Church, Israel, was an ἐκκλησία, and indeed an ἐκκλησία πρωτοτόκων (Ex. iv. 22; Jer. xxxi. 9), but not an ἐκκλησία which had the character of a πανήγυρις, a festive community; cf. vv. 20, 21, iv. 1 sqq. Therefore Alberti, *Observat. philol.*, rightly says, *elegans hic est oppositio ad terrorem Sinaiticum.*

Προάγω, (I.) transitive, to lead forward or out; ἔξω, Acts xvi. 30; to bring forth for legal proceedings or judgment, Acts xii. 6; ἐπί τινος, to bring forth before one, Acts xxv. 26. For this use of the word, Raphel, *Annot. philol.* on Acts xii. 6, cites from the classics, Arr. *exp. Cyr.* iv. 14. 3; Polyb. i. 7. 12, εἰς τὴν ἀγοράν; and Krebs, *Observat. e Joseph.*, cites *Bell. Jud.* i. 27. 2, εἰς τὴν δίκην. *Antiq.* xvi. 11. 6, προαγαγὼν εἰς ἐκκλησίαν . . . τοὺς ἐν αἰτίᾳ γενομένους. *Vit.* 11, εἰς τὸ πλῆθος. For the reading of the codices A B in Acts xii. 6, προσαγαγεῖν, cf. Polyb. xviii. 29. 8, προσάγειν τὸν κήρυκα . . . εἰς μέσον τὸ στάδιον.—(II.) Intransitive, to go before, (a) of place, as opposed to ἀκολουθεῖν, Mark xi. 9 (cf. Matt. xxi. 9; 1 Tim. v. 24); Mark vi. 45; Luke xviii. 39; 1 Tim. v. 24, ἀμαρτίαι προδηλοί . . . προάγουσαι εἰς κρίσιν, i.e. sins which judgment does not bring to light, but which call for judgment; for the thing meant see Gen. iv. 10.—2 John 9, πᾶς ὁ προάγων καὶ μὴ μένων ἐν τῇ διδαχῇ τοῦ Χριστοῦ θεὸν οὐκ ἔχει, where Rec. reads παραβαίνων. Here προάγ. is used in a sense not found in the classics, and yet as answering to the transitive προάγειν = to lead astray, to mislead, an intransitive προάγειν like this, as the synonym for παραβαίνειν, stands in fit contrast to περιπατεῖν ἐν τῇ ἐντολῇ, ver. 6, and as predicated of the πλᾶνοι, ver. 7. The explanation which makes it “a going forward” in the development of doctrine, a false advance (Düsterdieck), cannot therefore be maintained. Τινά, to go before one, Matt. ii. 9, xiv. 22, xxi. 9; Lachm., Tisch., xxvi. 32, xxviii. 7; Mark x. 32, xiv. 28, xvi. 7; in a comparative sense, Matt. xxi. 31 (against Meyer).—(b) Of time, Heb. vii. 18, ἀθέτησις προαγωγῆς ἐντολῆς; 1 Tim. i. 18, κατὰ τὰς προαγούσας ἐπὶ σέ προφητείας, where ἐπὶ σέ cannot be taken with προαγ., but belongs to προφ. The assumption that with the meaning “earlier” we must have the aorist participle and not the present (Beck) is a mistake, cf. Plat. *Legg.* iv. 719 A, ὁ προάγων λόγος. Joseph. *Ant.* xix. 6. 2, ὅπερ ἐν ταῖς προαγούσαις γραφαῖς παρέδομεν.—Not in the LXX. Sometimes in the Apocrypha, but oftener transitive than intransitive; the latter only in 1 Macc. x. 77; 2 Macc. x. 27; Judith x. 22.

Συνάγω is in the LXX. = שָׂבַע and גָּבַר, which only occasionally are otherwise rendered; also with ἐκκλησιάζειν, ἐξεκκλησιάζειν = לְהִקָּרֵב, only now and then for words such as אָבָא, אֲבִי, אָבִי, אָבִי, אָבִי, and others; only rarely as a *term. techn.* like συναγωγή, not where it is = שָׂבַע and גָּבַר, but only where it is = לְהִקָּרֵב, e.g. Num. i. 18, viii. 10, x. 7, seldom elsewhere as in Isa. xxxv. 10, where it is = פָּרַח. It is much less a *term. techn.* than the substantive, and συναγ. συναγωγὴν occurs much more rarely than ἐκκλησιάζειν, ἐξεκκλησιάζειν συναγωγὴν, and συνάγειν ἐκκλησίαν never occurs.—Συναγωγὴ occurs constantly for קָהָל, which (not reckoning some mistaken places) is otherwise rendered only twice, viz. Num. xvi. 46 by παρεμβολή, and Jer. vi. 18 by ποιμνίον, the result of a misunderstanding of the passage, as if the ἔθνη were here meant. For לְהִקָּרֵב, συναγωγὴ alternates with ἐκκλησία in a manner more fully explained under ἐκκλησία.—Cf. Philo, *quod omnis probus liber*, § 12, ed. Mang. ii. 458, εἰς ἱεροὺς ἀφικνούμενοι τόπους οἱ καλοῦνται συναγωγαί. With this signification it recurs only three times in Josephus

(according to Schürer, *Neutest. Zeitgesch.* p. 469), *Ant.* xix. 6. 3; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 14. 4, 5; vii. 3. 3. To designate the Christian Church or its gathering for worship *συναγωγή* occurs in ecclesiastical Greek but very seldom; here, as a rule, it is used of the Jews, their assemblies and places of meeting, or of Judaism in contrast with *ἐκκλησία*. See a thorough and interesting exposition of the usage of the early centuries by Harnack in Hilgenfeld, *Zeitsch. f. wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1876, 1, p. 104 sqq.

Ἀποσυνάγωγος. For this word see Ruetschi, art. "Bann bei den Hebr." in Herzog and Plitt, *Realencyklop.* ii. 81 sqq. Riehm, art. "Bann" in his *Handwörterb. des bibl. Alterthums*; Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm. s.vv.* אַתְּמַשׁ, אַרְח, אַרְד. Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr. et Talm.* John ix. 22. J. A. Danzli, *ritus excommunicationis ad illustrationem* Matt. xviii. 18, in Meuschen, *N. T. ex Talmude illustr.* p. 116 sqq. Winer, *Realwörterb.*—Ἐπισυναγωγή in 2 Macc. ii. 7 stands contrasted with the dispersion, cf. i. 27, ἐπισυναγάγε τὴν διασπορὰν ἡμῶν, and accordingly = *a bringing together* (see Heb. x. 25), or *a bringing together again*, cf. 2 Macc. ii. 18, ἐλπίζομεν ἐπὶ τῷ θεῷ ὅτι ταχέως ἡμᾶς ἐλεήσει καὶ ἐπισυνάξει ἐκ τῆς ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανὸν εἰς τὸν ἅγιον τόπον.

Ἀγών, ὦνος, ὁ, place of assembly, then the assembly itself, specially at the games, and hence a designation for the games themselves, in particular the four *ἀγῶνες ἱεροί*, the Nemean, Pythian, Isthmian, and Olympic games, whence not a few figurative expressions are derived, e.g. βαλεῖν ἔξω ἀγῶνος, to transgress the limit or *overshoot the goal*; ἔξω τοῦ ἀγῶνος, *wide of the mark, not having to do with*, and it finally denotes any struggle and contest in the field or at law. Thus it is used of dangers, and efforts which involve the overcoming of difficulties, as in Soph. *Trach.* 158 of the labours of Hercules. As the figure is foreign to O. T. ideas, it need not surprise us that the word with its derivatives hardly ever occurs in the LXX., only in Isa. vii. 13, ἀγών, and in Dan. vi. 15, ἀγωνίζομαι, both places indicating the difference between the Hebrew and Greek view. Isa. vii. 13, μὴ μικρὸν ὑμῖν ἀγῶνα παρέχειν ἀνθρώποις καὶ πῶς κυρίῳ παρέχετε ἀγῶνα; = מִיָּדָי, *to make weary*; Dan. vi. 15, ἡγωνίσαστο τοῦ ἐξελεῖσθαι αὐτὸν καὶ ἕως ἐσπέρας ἦν ἀγωνιζόμενος ἐξελεῖσθαι αὐτόν = לָבַי, *to bear upon the heart (anxiety)*, and in the second clause = עָרַץ, Hithpael, *to endeavour*. In the Apocrypha, on the contrary, it occurs with several derivatives, and in Josephus and Philo, see Grimm on Wisd. iv. 2. See especially in the Apocrypha, Wisd. iv. 2, where the Greek figure preponderates, ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι στεφανηφοροῦσα πομπεύει τὸν τῶν ἀμιάντων ἄθλων ἀγῶνα νικήσασα of ἀτεκνία μετὰ ἀρετῆς or of ἀρετῆς. Cf. 4 Macc. xii. 15, ἀγωνιστῆς τῆς ἀρετῆς. The figure best carried out in 4 Macc. xvii. 11 sqq., where ἀγών, as continually in this book, is used of martyr sufferings. Ἀγών, however, and ἀγωνίζεσθαι, in the N. T. sense as denoting the life-task of man, or of the Christian, do not occur in the Apocrypha except Wisd. iv. 2; for Ecclus. iv. 28, ἕως τοῦ θανάτου ἀγωνίσαι περὶ τῆς ἀληθείας, does not signify *pietatis officiis satisfacere* (Wahl), but to contend for truth and right against their perversion, cf. vv. 25, 26. Elsewhere ἀγών stands for *strife in war*, 2 Macc. iv. 43, x. 28, and often; once ἀγών

θανάτου, the anguish of the death struggle. Add. to Esth. 4, ἐν ἀγῶνι θαν. κατειλημμένη, cf. θάνατος αὐτῶν ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς αὐτῶν. In Wisd. x. 12, of the wrestling of Jacob at Jabbok. In the N. T. the word stands for the life-task of the Christian, to maintain and confirm his faith amid all hindrances, in temptation and attack, 1 Tim. vi. 12, ἀγωνίζου τὸν καλὸν ἀγῶνα τῆς πίστεως (where ἐπιλάβου τῆς ζωῆς αἰ. carries on the figure, eternal life being the prize which we should strive after). 2 Tim. iv. 7, τὸν καλὸν ἀγῶνα ἠγωνίσμαι τὸν δρόμον τετέλεκα, τὴν πίστιν τετήρηκα, on which Hofmann rightly says, that all three propositions denote practically the same thing; the second retains the figure, giving prominence to one particular kind of contest, while the third plainly declares what had been figuratively affirmed, clearly expressing how entirely the apostle had done with life. This life-task, this preserving and confirming of faith in every temptation and attack, is expressed in Heb. xii. 1, δι' ὑπομονῆς τρέχουμεν τὸν προκείμενον ἡμῖν ἀγῶνα; cf. ver. 2, xi. 39, 40, x. 36 sqq., προκείμενος being the usual word in the classics applied to the contest prescribed by the announcement of the given orders and of the prize named, as the task to be accomplished; it refers to any task denoted by ἀγών, Herod. ix. 60. 1, ἀγῶνος μεγίστου προκειμένου ἐλευθέρην εἶναι ἢ δεδουλωμένην τὴν Ἑλλάδα; vii. 11. 3, ποιεῖν ἢ παθεῖν προκέεται ἀγών. Plato, *Phaedr.* 247 B, πόνος τε καὶ ἀγὼν ἔσχατος ψυχῇ πρόκειται; *Erip.* 975 A. Eurip. *Or.* 847, ψυχῆς ἀγῶνα τὸν προκείμενον περὶ δώσων, ἐν ᾧ ζῆν ἢ θανεῖν ὑμᾶς χρεών. In a special sense, Phil. i. 30, τὸν αὐτὸν ἀγῶνα ἔχοντες οἶον εἶδετε ἐν ἐμοί, of conflict and suffering for the gospel against the ἀντικείμενοι; cf. ver. 25 sqq.; 1 Thess. ii. 2, λαλῆσαι τὸ εὐαγγ. τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν πολλῷ ἀγῶνι; cf. Acts xvii. 5 sq.—Col. ii. 1, ἡλίκον ἀγῶνα ἔχω ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν . . . ἵνα παρακληθῶσιν αἱ καρδίαι, where it signifies the anxiety and trouble which the apostle inwardly experienced in the accomplishment of his life-task as named in i. 28; there is no ground for taking it specially or exclusively of wrestling in prayer.

Ἀγωνία ἡ, (I.) combat, more abstract and eclectic than ἀγών, giving prominence to the pain and labour of the conflict. Hence (II.) fear, the emotion of the wrestler before the fight begins; cf. Aristotle, *Probl.* ii. 31, ἀγ. φόβος τις ἐστὶ πρὸς ἀρχὴν ἔργου. Not the same as φόβος, but rather trembling excitement and anxiety about the issue; cf. Hermann, *Fragm. lex. gr.* 329, ἀγωνία δέ, φόβος ἀποτυχίας φοβούμενοι γὰρ ἀποτυχεῖν ἀγωνιῶμεν. Dem. *pro. cor.* 236 combines ἐν φόβῳ καὶ πολλῇ ἀγωνίᾳ, so that the latter is clearly the stronger word, as Aristotle also makes it. In later Greek this signification is more frequent. Diod. Sic. joins it with ἀπορία. Often in Josephus with δέος. In the N. T. Luke xxii. 44, γενόμενος ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ ἐκτενέστερον προσήχετο; cf. Matt. xxvi. 37, ἤρξατο λυπεῖσθαι καὶ ἀδημονεῖν; ver. 38; John xii. 27. It denotes not the fear which shrinks and would flee, but the fear that trembles as to the issue, spurring on to the uttermost; hence also Aristotle, *Rhet.* i. 9, excludes φοβεῖσθαι from ἀγωνία, περὶ ᾧ ἀγωνιῶσι μὴ φοβούμενοι· περὶ γὰρ τῶν πρὸς δόξαν φερόντων ἀγαθῶν τοῦτο πάσχουσιν. Luther rightly adds, "because He was wrestling with death."

Ἀγωνίζομαι, to contend for victory in the public games, 1 Cor. ix. 25 (οἱ ἐν σταδίῳ τρέχοντες), then generally to fight, to wrestle, John xviii. 36, with ἵνα μή following. Of the task of faith in preserving amid temptation and opposition, 1 Tim. vi. 12, 2 Tim. iv. 7, see ἀγών. To take pains, to wrestle as in a prize contest, straining every nerve to the uttermost towards the goal, Luke xiii. 24, ἀγωνίζεσθε εἰσελθεῖν . . . ὅτι πολλοὶ ζητήσουσιν εἰσελθεῖν καὶ οὐκ ἰσχύσουσιν. Cf. 1 Cor. ix. 25; Phil. iii. 12 sqq.; Heb. iv. 1.—Of special pains and toil, Col. i. 29, εἰς ὃ καὶ κοπιῶ ἀγωνιζόμενος κ.τ.λ., see under ἀγών. 1 Tim. iv. 10, εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ κοπιῶμεν καὶ ἀγωνιζόμεθα, where, however, Tisch. ed. 7, perhaps rightly, as supported by the old versions, reads ὀνειδιζόμεθα; see Huther and Hofmann *in loc.* Col. iv. 12, ἀγωνιζόμενος ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐν ταῖς προσευχαῖς, where the choice of the preposition ὑπὲρ seems to be determined by the following προσευχή; cf. Rom. xv. 30, συναγωνίσασθαι ἐν ταῖς προσευχαῖς ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ. The expression implies hindrances in the development of the Christian life; cf. under συναγωνίζομαι.

Ἀνταγωνίζομαι, to fight against a person, to be in conflict with him, *τινί*. In the N. T. Heb. xii. 4, πρὸς τὴν ἁμαρτίαν. Cf. 4 Macc. iii. 5, τῶν παθῶν ὁ λογισμὸς ἐστὶν ἀνταγωνιστής.

Ἐπαγωνίζομαι, only in later Greek, to fight for or in reference to something, with the dative of that which gives the occasion, Jude 3, τῇ πίστει, for the faith. According to the connection the dative may sometimes be the opponent, Plut. *Fab.* 23, τῷ Ἀννίβᾳ, or the repetition in Plut. *Cim.* 13, ταῖς νίκαις, to victories to add new conflicts. This explanation seems more in keeping with the varied use of the word than that following the analogy of ἐπιμαχεῖν, to assist in fight.

Καταγωνίζομαι, likewise found only in later Greek, in Plut., Polyb., Josephus, and others, to throw down, to subdue, Heb. xi. 33, βασιλείας.

Συναγωνίζομαι, to fight in company with, to assist in fight, to help to fight, Rom. xv. 30. The word is chosen with reference to the opposers from whom the apostle desired to be delivered, ver. 31, not like ἀγωνίζ, Col. iv. 12. Neither here nor in Col. iv. 12 are we to imagine a position such as that in Gen. xxxii., a wrestling with God.

Φιλάδελφος, *ον*, loving one's brother or sister; (a) in the classics only literally of brothers and sisters; cf. Plut. *Sal.* xxvii. 5 of Cleobis and Biton, φιλαδέλφους καὶ φιλομήτορας διαφερόντως ἄνδρας. The same combination in Josephus and 4 Macc. xiv., xv., where the word often occurs. In profane Greek also compare Plut. *Luc.* xliii. 3 (where the superlative occurs), Diod. Sic. iii. 56. Of the love of two sisters, Plut. *quaest. Rom.* 17 (p. 267 E). For the import of the conception, cf. Xen. *Mem.* ii. 3. 17, χρηστός τε καὶ φιλάδελφος; 14, τὸν ἀδελφὸν εὖ ποιεῖν. Soph. *Ant.* 527, φιλάδελφα δάκρυ λειβομένη; cf. 523, οὗτοι συνέχθην ἀλλὰ συμφιλεῖν ἔφυν.—(b) With a wider reference, love of one's fellow-countrymen, it is predicated of the prophet Jeremiah praying for his people, 2 Macc. xv. 14, ὁ φιλάδελφος οὗτος ἐστὶν ὁ πολλὰ προσευχόμενος περὶ τοῦ λαοῦ . . . Ἱερεμίας κ.τ.λ.

—(c) In the strictly Christian sense of ἀδελφός, 1 Pet. iii. 8, τὸ δὲ τέλος πάντες ὁμόφρονες, συμπαθεῖς, φιλάδελφοι, εὐσπλαγχοι, ταπεινόφρονες, where as compared with the preceding terms it is the more comprehensive word (cf. Xen. *Mem.* ii. 3. 17), from which those which follow are distinct; φιλάδ. sums up the bearing of Christians to each other; the epithets which follow describe what their behaviour should be to those without, vv. 9, 13.

Φιλὰδελφία, ἡ, (I.) in profane Greek (Plut., Luc.) brotherly love, of the love of brothers and sisters, literally, to each other. Often, like ἀδελφότης and φιλάδελφος in Josephus, in Macc. of the bearing of the seven brethren martyred by Antiochus, cf. chap. xiii., οὕτω δὲ τοίνυν καθεστῶσης συμπαθῶς τῆς φιλαδελφίας οἱ ἐπὶ τὰ ἀδελφοὶ συμπαθέστερον ἔσχον πρὸς ἀλλήλους.—(II.) In the N. T. of the love of Christians one to another growing out of a common spiritual life, Rom. xii. 10; 1 Thess. iv. 9; Heb. xiii. 1; 1 Pet. i. 22; 2 Pet. i. 7. The idea which culminates in this use of φιλαδελφία as to relation and bearing of Christians to each other, expressed in the N. T. import of ἀδελφός and its derivatives, is a valuable contribution to the moulding anew of ethics by Christianity.

Ψευδάδελφος, ὁ, false brother, in the distinctively N. T. sense of ἀδελφός, a word which from the nature of the case must be foreign to profane Greek. In Gal. ii. 4, διὰ δὲ τοὺς παρεισάκτους ψευδαδέλφους, οἵτινες παρεισῆλθον κατασκοπεῖν τὴν ἐλευθερίαν ἡμῶν κ.τ.λ., it denotes those who had become members of the Christian Church, sharers in its fellowship of life and love, but were *not so really*, that is, *inwardly*, and therefore had no right to be ἀδελφοί (παρεῖσακτοι, παρεισῆλθον). They had the companionship of the ἀδελφοί, but real kinship of spiritual life was wanting. So 2 Cor. xi. 26. By claiming the name *brethren*, they began the weakening of the new conception thus expressed.

ἤδης. The comparison of the word ἤδης with the German Hölle is a mistake. There is indeed a connection between Höhle and Hölle, but not that here assumed. Both words spring from the same stem *helan* = *celare*; there is not, therefore, the least intimation in either of a cleft or empty space. Delitzsch therefore rightly (in his *Isaiah*, 3rd ed. p. 82 sq.) abides by the signification *sinking, lowering, depth*, for ἤδης, so that in Greek ἄβυσσος and not ἤδης answers to its meaning. See ἄβυσσος. But the German Hölle is both etymologically and by linguistic usage closely akin to the Greek ἤδης, since it primarily denoted the person and then the abode of the goddess of Death, Hel, and consequently the place of the dead; not till later the place of the damned. Ulfilas renders ἤδης by *halja*, whereas for γέεννα he has no Gothic word, but adopts the Greek *gaiainna*. Not till after the 10th century did the present signification of the word Hölle = *place of the damned*, become gradually fixed; and not till after the 14th century did this become the only meaning of the word. It has retained its original meaning in the words of the Creed, *He descended into hell, nidar steig zi hellin*. Still in the 16th century (e.g. in Fischart, Luther) it is written *Helle*, which is etymologically right, and it

did not pass into the form *Hölle* (like *zwelf* into *zwölf*) until the 17th century. To this day the form *Helle* appears in *Helweg*, as certain highways are designated in Westphalia and Neiderhesse (Thuringia),—*Höllenweg*, *Höllepfad* also appear,—those, namely, which run west = *way to Hell*, *way to the dead* (hardly, as Grimm explains it, *way of funerals*); cf. in the later Edda, *Gylfaginning* 49, *den Helweg reiten* = *to ride to Hell*; compare further the designation of the Milky Way as *Helweg*. See Grimm, *Deutsche Mythol.* 4th ed. 667 sqq., 3, 106, 338; Simrock, *Deutsche Mythol.* 3rd ed. 203; Heine in Grimm's *Deutsch. Wb.*; Weygand, *Deutsch. Wb.*, under "*Hölle*."

Ἀίδιος, *on*, everlasting, eternal, continual, like the synonym αἰώνιος, which see; from αἶ. But while αἰώνιος, answering to its substantive, negatives the end either of a space of time or of unmeasured time, and is used chiefly where something future is spoken of, αἰδῖος excludes interruption, and lays stress upon permanence and unchangeableness, especially with reference to the past or the present; cf. Xen. *Cyr.* vii. 5. 73, νόμος γὰρ ἐν πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις αἰδῖος ἐστίν, ὅταν πολεμουμένων πόλεις ἀλφ κ.τ.λ.; Sturz, *est consuetudine gentium perpetua lex*. Plato, *Deff.* 411 A, αἰδῖον τὸ κατὰ πάντα χρόνον καὶ πρότερον ὃν καὶ νῦν μὴ διεφθαρμένον. Often in Aristotle and by philosophers since; in Aristotle mainly with the idea of necessity ἀνάγκη; cf. *Ethic. Nicom.* vi. 3, τὸ γὰρ ἐξ ἀνάγκης ὄντα ἅπλως πάντα αἰδῖα, τὰ δὲ αἰδῖα ἀγέννητα καὶ ἀφθαρτα. *De gener. et corr.* ii. 11, εἰ ἐστὶν ἐξ ἀνάγκης αἰδῖον ἐστὶ καὶ εἰ αἰδῖον, ἐξ ἀνάγκης. It does not occur in the LXX., in the Apocrypha only in *Wisd.* vii. 26, of wisdom, ἀπαύγασμα γὰρ ἐστὶ φωτὸς αἰδίου. In ii. 23 some MSS. read, ὁ θεὸς ἔκτισε τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐπ' ἀφθαρσίᾳ καὶ εἰκόνα τῆς ἰδίας αἰδιότητος, instead of the more correct ἰδιότητος, which the author (with his liking for combining words of the same root) chose in lieu of the ὁμοιότητος of *Gen.* i. 26; see Grimm.—The word occurs twice in the N. T. *Rom.* i. 20, ἡ αἰδῖος αὐτοῦ δύναμις καθοράται, with which Hofmann compares *Jas.* i. 17. Cf. Plutarch, *convival. disp.* viii. 1. 3 (718 A), Πλάτωνος ἀκούων πατέρα καὶ ποιητὴν τοῦ τε κόσμου καὶ τῶν ἄλλων γεννητῶν τὸν ἀγέννητον καὶ αἰδῖον θεὸν ὀνομάζοντος. Cf. in patristic Greek, Athan. *contra Ar.* or. 3 (in Steph. *Thes. s.v.*), ἀρνοῦνται τὴν αἰδιότητα καὶ θεότητα τοῦ Λόγου.—Jude 6, εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας δεσμοῖς αἰδίοις ὑπὸ ζόφου τετήρηκεν.

Αἰδώς, οὗς ἡ, modesty, shame, reverence; synon. and often combined with σωφροσύνη, from which it differs in that αἰδώς expresses the negative side of that modesty and shame in the sight of wrong-doing, or transgression of propriety, which σωφροσύνη involves; Xen. *Cyrop.* viii. 1. 31, τοὺς μὲν αἰδουμένους τὰ ἐν τῷ φανερῷ αἰσχροῦ φεύοντας, τοὺς δὲ σώφρονας καὶ ἐν τῷ ἀφανεί. Aristotle, *Rhet.* i. 9; cf. Nägelsbach, *Homer. Theol.* vi. 7 (p. 323), *Nachhomer. Theol.* v. 2. 23; 1. 14. Hence also the synonyms αἰσχύνη, δέος; αἰδώς is said to be shame in presence of the deed, αἰσχύνη shame after it; so Joh. Damasc., *De fid. orthod.* ii. 15, αἰδὼς φόβος ἐπὶ προσδοκίᾳ ψόγου, αἰσχύνη δὲ φόβος ἐπὶ αἰσχροῦ πεπραγμένῳ. But this does not answer to the use of αἰσχύνεσθαι, and is right only so far as αἰδώς is in no case predicated of him who violates his duty; it includes a paying

homage or *deference* to that which is commanded; and, *e.g.*, Hesiod employs it religiously of *reverence* before the gods, a meaning, however, in which it does not subsequently occur; but the element of rendering homage (σέβεσθαι) or deference to what is superior—πρὸς ἡλικίαν, πρὸς ἀρετήν, πρὸς ἐμπειρίαν, πρὸς εὐδοξίαν—is retained. Cf. Ammon in Steph. Thes. It differs from δέος, as *to keep back from* differs from *to withdraw from*. It is characteristic that this word, comparatively frequent in profane Greek, occurs only exceptionally in the Bible. It does not occur in the LXX. In the Apocrypha only in 3 Macc. i. 19 = *shame*, iv. 5 = *modesty*; αἰδεῖσθαι, Judith ix. 3; 2 Macc. iv. 34. In the N. T. it occurs only once, and this in those pastoral Epistles which approach nearest to the usage of profane Greek, and just in the sense of profane usage, 1 Tim. ii. 9, γυναῖκες . . . μετὰ αἰδοῦς καὶ σωφροσύνης κοσμεῖν ἑαυτάς. In Heb. xii. 28 we must, with Lachm., Tisch., Treg., Westc., read λατρεύειν τῷ θεῷ μετὰ εὐλαβείας καὶ δέους, instead of the Rec. μετὰ αἰδοῦς καὶ εὐλαβείας. The rareness of the word is to be explained as in the like case of σωφροσύνη, σῶφρων, σωφρονεῖν. The fear of God as the principle and motive of action takes the place of that which as shame in the presence of wrong, or as reverence or respect in the presence of right (2 Macc. iv. 35, αἰδεσθεῖς τὸ δίκαιον), nevertheless gives prominence to the outward manifestation only.

Ἀναίδεια, ἡ, *recklessness, audacity, shamelessness*, often in Homer and in prose. In biblical Greek only in Ecclus. xxv. 22, ὁσγὴ καὶ ἀναίδεια καὶ αἰσχύνῃ μεγάλη γυνὴ ἐὰν ἐπιχορηγῇ τῷ ἀνδρὶ αὐτῆς, and Luke xi. 8, διὰ τὴν ἀναίδειαν αὐτοῦ, of the *recklessness, disregard of considerations*, of the man making the request. That it is not always equivalent to *shamelessness, impudence*, is clear from Xen. Mem. iv. 3. 14, ἐάν τις τὸν ἥλιον ἀναιδῶς ἐγχειρῇ θεᾶσθαι, τὴν ὄψιν ἀφαιρεῖται. With Luke xi. 8 cf. perhaps in quite a different sense, στόμα ἀναιδές, Ecclus. xl. 3. The adj. ἀναιδής, one who knows no restraint, no deference, who is *reckless, impudent*, occurs often in the LXX. and Apocrypha, *e.g.* ἀναιδής προσώπων, Deut. xxviii. 50; Dan. viii. 23; Eccles. viii. 1. Ἀν. πρόσωπον, Prov. vii. 13, xxv. 14. Ἀν. ὀφθαλμός, 1 Kings ii. 31; Ecclus. xxvi. 11. Ἀν. στόμα, Ecclus. xl. 3.

Αἷμα as the material basis of individual life, of the ψυχή, combined with σάρξ, which mediates the possession of human nature in general (cf. John vi. 53–56), serves in post-biblical Hebrew (אִישׁ בָּשָׂר) as the general phrase to denote *man*, so far as the material side in him is concerned, as distinct from θεός and πνεῦμα; cf. Lightfoot, *Horae Heb. ad Matt.* xvi. 17, *infinita frequentia hanc formulam adhibent scriptores Judaici, eaque homines Deo opponunt*. Wünsche, *Neue Beiträge zur Erläut. der Evv. aus Talmud u. Midrash* on Matt. xvi. 17. Levy, *Neuhebr. Wörterb.* under בָּשָׂר. Cf. Ecclus. xiv. 18, ὡς φύλλον θάλλον, οὕτως γενεὰ σαρκὸς καὶ αἵματος· ἡ μὲν τελευτᾷ ἐτέσσα δὲ γεννᾶται; xviii. 18, πονηρὸς ἐνθυμήσεται σάρκα καὶ αἵματα. Matt. xvi. 17, σ. κ. αἷμα οὐκ ἀπεκάλυφέν σοι ἀλλ' ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, where stress is laid upon the contrast between “flesh and blood” and the sublimity of God (ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρ.); cf. Isa

xl. 13, xli. 22 sqq.; Jer. xxiii. 18; 1 Cor. ii. 10; whereas in Gal. i. 16, οὐ προσανεθέμην σαρκὶ καὶ αἵμ., the idea is morally qualified,—for the apostle does not mean *others* (cf. v. 17) before whom he might have laid the matter, he means *himself*;—the full contrast, both natural and moral, comes out in 1 Cor. xv. 50, σ. κ. αἷμα βασιλείαν θεοῦ κληρονομήσαι οὐ δύνανται. Instead of the usual order, αἷμα stands first in Heb. ii. 14, ἐπεὶ οὖν παιδία κεκοινώνηκεν αἵματος καὶ σαρκός, where the Rec. σαρκ. κ. αἷμ. is but little supported, and Eph. vi. 12, οὐκ ἔστιν ἡμῖν ἡ πάλη πρὸς αἷμα κ. σάρκα. The reason of this transposition is perhaps in order that the concept of sin associated with the term σάρξ in Paul's writings and the Hebrews, which is not treated of in these places, might be excluded; but not, as Delitzsch on Heb. ii. 14 assumes, because αἷμα is the more inward and important element, the immediate vehicle of the soul.

Αἱρέω, to take, to grasp, to seize. In biblical Greek, instead of the future αἰρήσω, there occurs far oftener in the compounds the form ἐλῶ, middle ἐλοῦμαι, see ἀφαιρέω. Instead of the 2 aor. middle εἰλόμην, we find the Alexandrine form εἰλάμην, 2 Thess. ii. 13, Lachm. Tisch., often in the compounds, e.g. ἀφειλάμην, διεειλάμην; cf. Sturz, *de. dial. Macedon. et Alex.* p. 60 sq.; Lobeck, *Phryg.* 183; Buttmann, *Neutest. Gram.* 96. 1; Winer, § 13. 1a; Kühner, § 226. 2, 4. Frequent as the word is in classical Greek, it is as rare in biblical, and here only in the middle as = *to take for oneself, to seize for oneself, to choose for oneself, to decide regarding something*, as almost synonymous, like ἐκλέγεσθαι with θέλειν, βούλεσθαι, εὐδοκεῖν, except that in αἱρεῖσθαι there is an emphasizing of the subject, but in ἐκλέγεσθαι a reference to the object, and in θέλειν, βούλ. εὐδοκ. the affection of the subject stands in the foreground. (Hofmann, on the contrary, on 2 Thess. ii. 13, says ἐκλέγεσθαι emphasizes the relation in which the chosen stands to the chooser, αἶρ. the position in which the chosen now stands, inferred from the qualifying statements there added.) In the LXX. = רָחַב, which is usually rendered ἐκλέγεσθαι, and often by αἱρετίζειν. Once = רָחַב, Isa. xxxviii. 17; twice = רָחַב in the Hiphil, Deut. xxvi. 17, 18. With the signification *to choose*, in 2 Thess. ii. 13, of the divine election realized in history, εἵλατο ἡμᾶς ὁ θεός; cf. Deut. xxvi. 18. In this sense with an accusative, Jer. viii. 3, εἵλαντο τὸν θάνατον ἢ τὴν ζωὴν, for which in classical Greek we oftener find μάλλον ἢ, as in Heb. xi. 25, μάλλον ἐλόμενος συγκακουχεῖσθαι . . . ἢ κ.τ.λ., or πρό, ἀντί.—Job xxxiv. 8, κρίσιν. Isa. xxxviii. 17, εἵλου μου τὴν ψυχὴν ἵνα μὴ ἀπόληται. Deut. xxvi. 17, τὸν θεὸν εἵλου σήμερον εἶναί σου θεόν; ver. 18, κύριος εἵλετο σήμερον γενέσθαι σε αὐτῷ λαὸν περιούσιον. Often in the classics, μάλλον αἱρεῖσθαι, and without μάλλον, = *to prefer*; so Phil. i. 22, τί αἱρήσομαι οὐ γνωρίζω, where the primary and stronger signification *to choose* is clearly inappropriate. Weakened = *to will*, 2 Sam. xv. 15; 2 Macc. xi. 25. Of derivatives, in the LXX. and Apoc., besides αἵρεσις and αἱρετίζω, αἱρετός, Ecclus. xx. 25, with following ἢ, therefore = *to be preferred*; in other places, but not comparatively, Jer. ix. 17, 2 Macc. vii. 14, in the passive; Sus. 23, with a potential signification; Ecclus. xi. 31, evidently as a rendering of

נִבְחַר, for which in Prov. xvi. 16, xxii. 1, we find αἰερώτερος. In the N. T., αὐθαίρετος, 2 Cor. viii. 3, 17, *self-chosen, voluntarily*, often in Xen., Dem., Thuc., Polyb. (also equivalent to *self-incurred* or *imposed*, e.g. κίνδυνος). Adverbially, 2 Macc. vi. 19; 3 Macc. vi. 6, vii. 10.—ἐξαιρετός, Gen. xlviii. 22; Theodot., Ex. xix. 5, where the LXX. read περιούσιος. Ἐξαιρέω = בָּחַר only in Deut. xxxi. 11; elsewhere = *to rescue, to save*. In Wisd. viii. 4 there occurs the ἄπ. λεγ. αἰρετής, *electric*, or as Sturz, 144, explains, *quae delectatur*.

Αἴρεσις, ἡ, the seizing, grasping, striving after something. In the first sense, often = *conquest*, in the second also (a) = *choice*, as in Lev. xxii. 18, 21 = נִבְחַר. 1 Macc. viii. 30; Gen. xlix. 5. Thus in many combinations, e.g. αἴρεσιν δοῦναι, προβάλλειν, διακρίνειν, often in Attic as well as later Greek; Plato, *Deff.* 413 B, δοκιμασία ὁρθή. The explanation which follows there is noteworthy, εὐνοια αἴρεσις, and with this we may compare Dem. *pro cor.* xviii. 166 (283), ἣν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς εἴχετε πρὸς ἡμᾶς αἴρεσιν. Thus in Polyb. often. Connected with this is the signification *desire, effort, study*, also *intention, ratio quam quis tenet*, and the transfer is easy to the use of the word (b) in the schools, of philosophic "tendencies." Thus, however, is it used only in later Greek; we find no indications of it in Plato or Aristotle. On the other hand, compare, e.g., Diog. Laert. i. 19, τοῦ δὲ ἡθικοῦ (*sc. μέρους τῆς φιλοσοφίας*) γεγόνασιν αἰρέσεις δέκα· Ἀκαδημαϊκή, Κυρηναϊκή Ἠλειακή κ.τ.λ. The word is in this sense applied to "tendencies" within Israel, Acts v. 17, αἴρεσις τῶν Σαδδουκαίων; xv. 5, τῶν Φαρισαίων; xxvi. 5; and used of Christians, Acts xxiv. 5, τῆς τῶν Ναζωραίων αἰρέσεως; cf. ver. 14, κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν ἣν λέγουσιν αἴρεσιν οὕτως λατρεύω (cf. Diog. Laert. i. 20, αἴρεσιν λέγομεν τὴν λόγῳ τινι ἀκολουθοῦσαν); xxviii. 22. Corresponding with the appearance or relationship of these tendencies, αἴρεσις becomes (c) *synon.* with σχίσμα, διχαστασία, 1 Cor. xi. 19, Gal. v. 20, 2 Pet. ii. 1, only stronger than these, inasmuch as it denotes a tendency established or self-contained pursuing its own way independently, separating itself from others. Upon the peculiar relation in which such tendencies in the sphere of Christianity stand to the Christian community, and not directly upon the use of the word of the philosophic schools, does that application of the word in ecclesiastical Greek depend, which makes it the name for tendencies and teachings in opposition to the Church; cf. Suiceri *Thes. s.v.* It is more a separate tendency, inasmuch as it includes a combating of the common faith; cf. Theodoret on 1 Cor. xi. 19, αἰρέσεις τὰς φιλονεικίας λέγει, οὐ τὰς τῶν δογμάτων διαφοράς.

Αἰρετικός, ἡ, ὄν, (I) *pertaining to choice, capable of choice* (in an active sense), Plato, *Deff.* 412 A, σωφροσύνη . . . ἕξις καθ' ἣν ὁ ἔχων αἰρετικός ἐστι καὶ εὐλαβητικός ὦν χρή. It does not seem to occur thus elsewhere in profane Greek. Frequently, on the other hand, (II.) in ecclesiastical Greek with the signification *heretical*, cf. Suicer, *Thes. s.v.* So in the N. T. Titus iii. 10, αἰρετικὸν ἄνθρωπον μετὰ μίαν καὶ δευτέραν νοθεσίαν παραιτοῦ, in a sense which does not as yet go beyond that of αἴρεσις in 1 Cor. xi. 19; Gal. v. 20; 2 Pet. ii. 1. For the thing meant, cf. Rom. xvi. 17, but not

2 John 10, 11, where clearly one still belonging to the fellowship is meant whom the fellowship had eventually to exclude.

Αἰρετίζω, an Alexandrine word, Sturz, p. 144, frequently in the LXX. and ecclesiastical Greek, from αἰρετός, see under αἰρέω, involving probably a strengthening of the verbal concept; cf. Kühner, § 328, 4, = to make an αἰρετός, therefore = to choose, to elect. In the LXX. for the most part = בחר, also for בָּחַר, Ps. cxxxii. 13, 14; יִבְחַר, Num. xiv. 8; and likewise in some places where a more special expression occurs in the Hebrew which the LXX. generalize; thus Gen. xxx. 20 = לָבַח, Mal. iii. 17 = לָבַח. In Hos. iv. 17 it has nothing answering to it in the Hebrew text. Elsewhere, Judg. v. 8, Ps. cxix. 30, 173, and Gen. xxx. 20, as well as in the Apocrypha, it stands always of the divine election, with ἐκλέγεσθαι, 1 Chron. xxviii. 4; Ps. cxxxii. 13; with ἐλεῖν, Zech. i. 17. With the accusative, Ezek. xx. 5; Hag. ii. 23; Zech. i. 17, ii. 16; Mal. iii. 17; Num. xiv. 8; Ps. cxxxii. 13, 14. Elsewhere with ἐν following, answering to the Hebrew בְּחַר, 1 Chron. xxviii. 4, xxix. 1; 2 Chron. xxix. 12; see under εὐδοκεῖν. The same construction occurs once (1 Macc. ii. 19) in the Apocrypha, where in 1 Esdr. iv. 19, 1 Macc. ix. 30, 2 Macc. xi. 24, the accusative, or as in Judith xi. 1, 1 Esdr. viii. 10, the infinitive follows. It is always in the middle in Psalms and 1 Macc. In the N. T. the word occurs only as parallel with εὐδοκεῖν, Matt. xii. 18, ὁ παῖς μου ὃν ἡρέτισα = בֶּן בְּרָכָה, Isa. xlii. 1, where the LXX. has ἀντιλήψομαι αὐτοῦ.

Ἀφαιρέω, very often in the LXX., especially as = רָחַק, Kal and Hiphil; רָחַק, Hiphil, and other words. The future ἀφαιρήσω does not occur in biblical Greek except in Rev. xxii. 19, Received text; often, on the contrary, in the LXX. the otherwise unusual form ἀφελῶ, which is now generally adopted as the true reading in Rev. xxii. 19; cf. Luke xii. 18, καθελῶ. Upon this see Hermann on Eurip. *Hel.* 1279, and Buttmann, *Ausführl. Griech. Sprachl.* ii. 100, where the examples are collected (for the form of the aorist ἀφειλάμην, Isa. xxxviii. 15, 1 Sam. xxx. 18, Job xxiv. 10, see under αἰρέω); = to take away, as opposed to προστιθέναι, Deut. iv. 2, xii. 32; to ἐπιτιθέναι, Rev. xxii. 19. In the classics construed with τινός τι, as in the N. T. Luke x. 42, ἡτις οὐκ ἀφαιρεθήσεται αὐτῆς (for which Received text and Tisch. ed. 7 read ἀπ' αὐτῆς, while Lachmann brackets the preposition). So also Matt. xxvi. 51 (Mark xiv. 47), ἀφείλεν αὐτοῦ τὸ ὠτίον (Mark, ὠτάριον). On the contrary, in Luke i. 25, ἀφελῖν τὸ ὄνειδος μου, the genitive is not, as in Gen. xxxii. 23, ἀφείλεν ὁ θεός μου τὸ ὄνειδος, dependent on the verb, but on the noun, as in Luke xxii. 50, ἀφείλεν τὸ οὖς αὐτοῦ τὸ δεξιόν (Tisch., but the Received text, αὐτοῦ τὸ οὖς); Rom. xi. 27, τὰς ἀμαρτίας αὐτῶν. Instead of the construction τινός τι, τι ἀπό τινος occurs far oftener in the LXX., e.g. Ex. v. 8, 11; Deut. xii. 32; Josh. v. 9; 1 Sam. xvii. 26; sometimes also ἔκ τινος, Judg. xxi. 6; 1 Chron. xi. 23. We find both combinations indeed in classical Greek, but the frequency of the former in the LXX. is clearly owing to the influence of the Hebrew. We must not confound with it Rev. xxii. 19, ἀφελεῖ ὁ θεὸς τὸ μέρος αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ ζύλου τῆς

ζωῆς καὶ ἐκ τῆς πόλεως τῆς ἀγίας; cf. Num. xii. 17; Isa. xxii. 19. With τὰς ἀμαρτίας and its synonyms as object, it denotes the removal of the μῖασμα of guilt (cf. above τὸ ὄνειδος), Heb. x. 4, where it is said of the sacrifices, ἀδύνατον αἷμα ταύρων καὶ τράγων ἀφαιρεῖν ἀμαρτίας; cf. Jer. xi. 15; Isa. i. 16, λούσασθε, καθαροὶ γένησθε, ἀφελετε τὰς πονηρίας τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν. In Lev. x. 17 of the office of the high priest. Differently in Ezek. xv. 9 = *to refrain from sin, to forsake it*. But in Rom. xi. 27, with God as the subject, it is used of the forgiveness of sin as synon. with ἀφιέναι, ὅταν ἀφελῶμαι τὰς ἀμαρτίας αὐτῶν (from Isa. xxvii. 9), as in Ex. xxxiv. 7, 9; Num. xiv. 18; Zech. iii. 4; Ecclus. xlvii. 12. It expresses the manner in which sin is removed from the subject of it.—The middle occurs in this way only in Rom. xi. 27; Isa. xxvii. 9; 2 Sam. xii. 13; again in the N. T. Luke xvi. 3, whereas in the classics the middle is more frequent than the active; in the LXX. Micah ii. 8; Esth. iv. 4, viii. 2; Ezek. xxvi. 16; Prov. xx. 19, and other places; but on the whole it is rarely used by them.

Περιαίρῶ, *to take away from around*, cf. 2 Cor. iii. 16, τὸ κάλυμμα. Of the taking away of sin by sacrifice, Heb. x. 11; of the divine forgiveness, 1 Chron. xxi. 8; Zeph. iii. 15; Ps. cxix. 39; in the last case τινί τι.

Διαίρῶ, *to take one from another, to divide, to part, to apportion, to assign*. More frequently in the LXX., especially = ῥῆν, ἡχῆ; and here the future also διελῶ, Lev. i. 12, 17, v. 8; likewise Ecclus. xxvii. 25. The middle διελοῦμαι, Ex. xxi. 35; Prov. xvii. 2; the aorist διελάμην, Josh. xxii. 8. In the N. T. τινί τι, Luke xv. 12; 1 Cor. xii. 11.

Διαίρεσις, εὖς, ἡ, (I.) dividing, distribution, Xen., Plato, Polyb., e.g. Pol. iii. 2. 8, συμφρονήσαντες Ἀντίοχος καὶ Φίλιππος ἐπὶ διαίρεσει τῆς τοῦ καταλειμμένου παιδὸς ἀρχῆς; 40. 9, τῆς χωρᾶς. Then (II.) classification, separation, difference, frequently in Aristotle of the distribution of genus into species. In the LXX. (III.) in a passive sense = ἡῤῥῆ, Josh. xix. 51. Oftener = ἡῤῥῆ, division, of the divisions of priests and Levites, the twenty-four ἑφημερίαι of them, 1 Cor. xxiv. 1, xxvi. 1, 12, 19, xxvii. 1, 2, 4, 6, xxviii. 1; 2 Chron. viii. 14, xxxv. 10; cf. vv. 5, 12; Ezra vi. 18. Usually passive. Active only in Judg. v. 16; Ps. cxxxvi. 13; Ecclus. xiv. 15; Judg. ix. 4.

In the N. T. only in 1 Cor. xii. 4, 5, 6, διαίρεσις χαρισμάτων εἰσίν, τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα καὶ διαίρεσις διακονιῶν εἰσίν, καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς κύριος, καὶ διαίρεσις ἐνεργημάτων εἰσίν, ὁ δὲ αὐτὸς θεὸς ὁ ἐνεργῶν τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν = *apportionments or distributions* in a passive sense. That the meaning *differences* is inadmissible is evident not only from ver. 11, πάντα ταῦτα ἐνεργεῖ τὸ ἐν καὶ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα διαιροῦν ἰδίᾳ ἐκάστῳ ὡς βούλεται, but also from ver. 7, ἐκάστῳ δὲ δίδεται ἡ φανέρωσις τοῦ πνεύματος πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον. The χαρίσματα, διακονίαι, ἐνεργ. are various designations of the same things, namely, the gifts wherein the φανέρωσις of the Spirit appears. The apostle is not saying that the Spirit bestows *different* gifts,—for in their plurality their distinctiveness is self-evident,—but he

would remind his readers that the gifts are *distributed*, and therefore the possessors of them are exhorted to a mutual communication and fellowship.

Αἶρω, the Attic form of the Homeric αείρω (according to Curtius, 348, from *Feirow*, and *a* prothetic from a root *var*, to raise, to rise), future ἀρώ, and hence aorist ἤρα, while the imperfect is ἤρον; see Curtius, *Gr.* § 270, 1; Kühner, § 343; 1 aor. pas. ἤρθην, fut. ἀρθήσομαι = to raise, to raise aloft, both to hold or to bear up, and to take away. How varied the situation may be is evident from the comparison of John viii. 59, xi. 39, 41, xx. 1, Rev. xviii. 1, where in every case the same object (λίθος) is spoken of with various kinds of movement. The meanings of the word are arranged according to the variations of aim—(I.) (*a*) in general to lift up, to take up, *e.g.* stones, John viii. 59; Mark vi. 43, κλασμάτων κοφίνους; viii. 8, περισσεύματα; vv. 19, 20; Matt. xiv. 20, xv. 37; Luke ix. 17; Acts xx. 9, ἔπεσεν κάτω καὶ ἤρθη νεκρός; Mark xvi. 18, ὄφεις. The = to raise aloft, to lift up on high, Rev. x. 5, τὴν χεῖρα; John xi. 41, τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἄνω, where the addition ἄνω, like εἰς ὕψος, Isa. xxxvii. 23, εἰς τὸν οὐρ., li. 6, though not necessary, is not superfluous (Wahl); for not only might there be another direction meant, as κύκλῳ, Isa. xlix. 18, εἰς εὐθείαν, Jer. iii. 2, but the expression αἶρειν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς may sometimes signify to turn away the eyes, as in Soph. *Trach.* 795. Figuratively, τὴν φωνήν, Luke xvii. 13; Acts iv. 24. More frequent in the N. T. in these combinations is ἐπαίρειν, see Matt. xvii. 8; Luke vi. 20, xvi. 23, xviii. 23; John iv. 35, vi. 5, xvii. 1; Luke xxiv. 50, xi. 27; Acts ii. 14, and often. Hence arises the use of the word of spiritual excitement, in classical Greek the passive, *e.g.* Soph. *Ant.* 111, αρθεὶς νεικεων ἐξ ἀμφιλόγων. Eur. *Hec.* 69, τί ποτ' αἶρομαι ἔννευχος οὕτω δείμασι; also φόβῳ, ἐλπίζω, often in Plutarch. So in Josephus, *Ant.* iii. 2. 3, οἱ δ' ἦσαν ἐπὶ τὸν κίνδυνον τὰς ψυχὰς ἡρμένον καὶ πρὸς τὸ δεινὸν ἐτοίμως ἔχοντες ἡλπιζον ἀπαλλαγέσθαι ποτε τῶν κακῶν; iii. 5. 1, ἡρμένοι ταῖς διανοαῖαις ὡς μετὰ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας τῶν ἀγαθῶν. Liban. *Or.* x. 265 A, ἡ ψυχὴ . . . τισὶν αἶρεται καὶ τισὶ καθέλκεται καὶ τισὶ μετεωρίζεται (in Wetstein on John x. 24). Connected with this employment of the word is its adoption to render the Hebrew *הָרָם עַד הַנֶּפֶשׁ*, to lift up the soul towards, to long after, Deut. xxiv. 15, Ps. xxv. 1, lxxxvi. 4, cxliii. 8, by the active αἶρειν τὴν ψυχὴν πρὸς τι in the LXX.; cf. ἐπαίρειν τὴν ψυχὴν, Prov. xix. 18. Hence in a somewhat forced and inverted way the word is used in John x. 24, ὥς πότε τὴν ψυχὴν ἡμῶν αἶρεις; *How long do you excite our souls? How long dost thou keep us in suspense?* and there is no need to adopt the strange explanation of Elsner, *Observ. Ser. in loc.*, after the analogy of ψυχὴν αἶρειν ἀπὸ τινος = to kill, John x. 18, *quamdiu enecas nos, h. e. tam diurna mora excrucias*, as in Luc. *Jur. trag.* 43, σὺ ἡμᾶς ἐπισφάττεῖς, *thou killest us with thy words*. Connected with this in like manner is the use of αἶρειν of departure of ships or armies. Thus Acts xxvii. 13, ἄπαντες . . . παρελέγοντο τὴν Κρήτην, where ἀγκύραν is not to be supplied (which Plut. sometimes joins with it), but either the accusative ναῦν or the dative νητ; in the classics the accusative is very rare, *e.g.* Thuc. i. 52. 2, ναῦς ἄπαντες ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς, more commonly

with or without the dative ταῖς νηυσί, as also of departure of an army with or without στρατῷ; cf. Arr. *Exp.* vi. 21, αὐτὸς δὲ ἄρας ἐκ Παττάλων. Thucyd. ii. 23. 1, ἄραντες ἐκ τῶν Ἀχαρνῶν; iii. 32. 1, ἄρας δὲ ἐκ τοῦ ἐμβάτου παρέπλει. Josephus, *Ant.* xiii. 4. 3, ἄρας ἀπὸ τῆς Κρήτης κατέπλευσεν εἰς Κιλικίαν; ix. 11. 1. Answering to this we find Philo and Josephus using αἶρειν for setting out on a journey, Philo, *Vit. Mos.* 615, ἄρας ἐβάδιζε μετὰ γυναικὸς καὶ τέκνων ὁδὸν τὴν κατ' Αἴγυπτον; Josephus, *Ant.* vii. 5. 1 (see Kypke, *Observat. Scr.* ii. 136). So μεταίρω, Matt. xiii. 53, xix. 1; Aquila, Gen. xii. 8, where the LXX. have ἀπέστη. It is unnecessary to take αἶρειν in these places intransitively, as Krüger in Thuc. ii. 23. 1 does; cf. Winer, § 38. 1. It simply stands without an object as in other senses, Matt. ix. 16, αἶρει τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱματίου; Mark ii. 21, αἶρει τὸ πλήρωμα ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τὸ καινὸν τοῦ παλαίου (Rec. τὸ πλ. αὐτοῦ) = **to take away from**, Rev. xxii. 19, εἰάν τις ἀφέλῃ ἀπὸ τῶν λόγων κ.τ.λ. Further, compare συναίρειν, Matt. xviii. 24.—(b) **To take up, to lift up, to carry about**, Matt. xi. 29, ἄρατε τὸν ζυγὸν μου ἐφ' ὑμᾶς; cf. Lam. iii. 27; Theocr. xxvii. 20.—Matt. xxvii. 32, ἵνα ἄρῃ τὸν σταυρὸν; Mark xv. 21. Hence the expression peculiar to the N. T., ἄραι τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ, *to take one's cross upon him*, Matt. xvi. 24; Mark viii. 34 (x. 21, Rec., Tisch. ed. 7); Luke ix. 21. Generally *to bear*, Matt. iv. 6; Luke iv. 11, ἐπὶ χειρῶν ἀρουσίν σε (from Ps. xci. 12); Mark ii. 3, αἰρόμενον ὑπὸ τεσσάρων; Rev. xviii. 21, λίθου.—(c) **To take to oneself, e.g. ῥάβδον, πήραν, ἀργύριον, et al.**; Luke ix. 3, xxii. 36; in this way the middle is used in the classics, e.g. ὄπλα. Generally = *to take, to take away*, Matt. xvii. 27, xx. 14, ἄρον τὸ σὸν καὶ ὑπάγε; xxii. 13; 1 Cor. vi. 15.

Following up this we have now the meaning (II.) (a) **to lift up, to take up in order to take away, e.g.** the covering stone from the grave, John xi. 39, 41, xx. 1; *to lift up in order to carry away, e.g.* κλίνην, κράββατον, Matt. ix. 6; Mark ii. 9, 11, 12; Luke v. 24; John v. 8, 9, 10, 11, 12; τὸ σῶμα, Matt. xiv. 12; τὸ πτώμα, Mark vi. 29, for burial; thus, in Plutarch frequently, equivalent to *to bury*. Hence equivalent to *to take, to carry away*, Mark xv. 24, βάλλοντες κλῆρον ἐπ' αὐτὰ τίς τι ἄρῃ. Also = *to fetch*, Matt. xxiv. 17, 18; Mark xiii. 15, 18.—(b) **To take away from any one**, Matt. xxv. 38, ἄρατε ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τὸ τάλαντον; Luke vi. 29, 30, xi. 29, xix. 24, 26; Matt. xiii. 12; John xx. 2, 3, 15, x. 18, xvi. 22, xvii. 15, ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου.—(c) **To put away, to take out of the way, ἐκ τοῦ μέσου**, Col. ii. 14; ἐκ μέσου ὑμῶν, 1 Cor. v. 2 (Rec., Lachm. ἐξαρθῇ); Mark iv. 15, αἶρει τὸν λόγον τὸν ἐσπαρμένον ἐν αὐτοῖς. John xix. 31, 38, xx. 13, 15, cf. ver. 2. So in the combination αἶρειν τὰς ἁμαρτίας, 1 John iii. 5; τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, John i. 29 = *to take away, to make away with*, answering to the Heb. *הָרַג עֲוֹן*. This denotes either *to bear sin* = *to make atonement*, or *to take away sin* = *to forgive it*. In the first sense the LXX. render λαμβάνειν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, Lev. v. 1, xvi. 21, 22, xix. 8, xx. 17; Num. v. 31; Ezek. iv. 5; cf. Ezek. xviii. 19, 20, λαμβάνειν τὴν ἀδικίαν, or as in Isa. liii. 12, ἀναφέρειν; cf. 1 Pet. ii. 24. Num. xiv. 33, ἀνοίσουσι τὴν πορνείαν ὑμῶν, or as in Num. xx. 17, κομίζειν. Compare Ezek. xxxiii. 10, αἱ ἀνομίαι ἡμῶν ἐφ' ἡμῶν εἰσίν. On the other hand, αἶρειν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν denotes the removing of

sin, putting it away, 1 Sam. xv. 25, xxv. 29. Cf. Ex. xxviii. 38, *ἐξάλειν*. Isa xxxiii. 24, *ἀφεθῇ γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἡ ἁμαρτία* : נָעַן אֶשְׂרָא בְּיָמֶיךָ עָוֹן. In both cases sin is regarded as guilt. Both representations meet in Lev. xx. 19, *ἁμαρτίαν ἀπολίσσουται*, clearly expressing the thought that their sin was to be done away by putting those committing it to death. Where נָעַן אֶשְׂרָא is used to express forgiveness, there seems, as in Lev. xvi. 22, 23, Num. xviii. 1, 23, to underlie it the idea of a transfer of sin to the propitiatory offering; cf. Ex. xxviii. 38. Certainly in *αἶρειν τὴν ἁμ.* what is meant is forgiveness, or, as the case may be, provision for forgiveness. Accordingly, there can be no doubt that in John i. 29 and 1 John iii. 5 the expression has this sense; and this cannot be doubted, even if it be admitted that sin is here spoken of as guilt. The connection in 1 John iii. 5 makes the signification *to take away* unquestionable, *ἐκεῖνος ἐφανερώθη ἵνα τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἄρῃ, καὶ ἁμαρτία ἐν αὐτῷ οὐκ ἔστιν*. Ver. 6, *πᾶς ὁ ἐν αὐτῷ μένων οὐχ ἁμαρτάνει κ.τ.λ.*; cf. vv. 3, 4. The explanation which makes *αἶρ. τὰς ἁμ.* = the taking away of sins, so that they really are not committed (Köstlin, Huther), or the implanting of the new man (Haupt), has against it the use of *αἶρειν* in other places, as also the plural *τὰς ἁμ.*, which does not, like the singular, denote indwelling sin, but sin in its manifestations, sin actually committed. The objection that the words in this sense are not in keeping with the admonition with which they are joined, ver. 3 sqq., is obviated by 1 Pet. i. 17 sqq.; 2 Pet. i. 9; 1 Cor. vi. 20. As to John i. 29, the representation there given is modified by the fact that there Christ is not described as the actor, as in the passage referred to in the O. T. He is not represented as priest (as in 1 Sam. xv. 25; Ex. xxviii. 38) but as victim, as *ὁ ἄμνος τοῦ θεοῦ*, whether we take the expression as borrowed from Isa. liii., or find in it only a reference to the paschal lamb (see *ἄμνος*); compare Isa. liii. 12, סֶכֶל, ver. 13, אֶשְׂרָא, both = *ἀναφέρειν*. As *ἄμνος τοῦ θεοῦ*, Christ (in either case) takes away sin by undertaking the propitiation. In the signification *to do away with*, equivalent to *to destroy*, the word occurs in Acts viii. 33, *ἡ κρίσις αὐτοῦ ἤρθη*, from Isa. liii. 8 (Heb. חָלַל); cf. Diog. Laert. v. 63, *ἀράσθωσαν τὰς συνθήκας, ὡς ἔθετο Δαίππος*.—Lastly, *αἶρειν* occurs (*d*) in later Greek as = *to take out of the way, to kill*, for which no example occurs in earlier writers save Aristophanes, *Ach.* 565. Thus in Matt. xxiv. 39, *ὁ κατακλυσμὸς . . . ἦρεν ἅπαντας, carried them all away*. Acts xxii. 22, *αἶρε ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς τὸν τοιοῦτον*. Luke xxiii. 18, *αἶρε τοῦτον!* Acts xxi. 36; John xix. 15, *ἄρον, ἄρον, σταύρωσον αὐτόν!* In the LXX. *αἶρειν* with its compounds is the proper rendering of אֶשְׂרָא. In the N. T. we have the compounds *ἀπαίρω, ἐξαίρω, ἐπαίρω, μεταίρω, συναίρω, ὑπεραίρω* without any other noteworthy peculiarities, save that *ἐπαίρω* and *συναίρω* in the passages above quoted are without object, and therefore seemingly intransitive.

Δισθάνομαι, to perceive, primarily *to perceive with the senses*, and then figuratively of spiritual perception = *to become conscious of, to observe, to understand*, more of immediate knowledge than of that arrived at by reasoning; cf. Wisd. xi. 14, *ὅτε γὰρ ἤκουσαν διὰ*

τῶν ἰδίων κολάσεων εὐεργετουμένους αὐτοὺς ᾗσθοντο τοῦ κυρίου. In the Apocrypha in both senses; rarely in the LXX., and there only of spiritual perception, as also in one passage only in the N. T. Luke ix. 45, ἡγνούν το ῥῆμα τοῦτο καὶ ἦν παρακαλυμμένον ἀπ' αὐτῶν, ἵνα μὴ αἰσθωνται αὐτό.

Αἰσθησις, εως, ἡ, perception, sensational as well as mental, (a) actively, e.g. βραδεία αἰσθ., *slow to perceive*; then also (b) passively, e.g. αἰσθησιν παρέχειν, *to become sensible of*, αἰσθ. ποιεῖν τι, *to become cognizant of, to make oneself observed by any one*. In the LXX. only in Proverbs = ηγ, xi. 9, xiv. 6, 18, xv. 7, xiv. 10, of knowledge based upon experience, obtained by experience, experimental knowledge, and therefore in like manner passive. Thus in the N. T. Phil. i. 9, προσεύχομαι ἵνα ἡ ἀγάπη ὑμῶν ᾖ μᾶλλον καὶ μᾶλλον περισσεύη ἐν ἐπιγνώσει καὶ πάσῃ αἰσθήσει. Ἐπιγνώσις denotes the insight obtained by a penetrating knowledge, going down to the foundation; αἰσθησις is experimental knowledge, which is or becomes naturally manifold, and therefore it has the addition πᾶσα. The meaning *power* or faculty of perception or knowledge (here = *tact*), answering to the use of the word with reference to the senses merely, is inadmissible here, considering the connection with ἐπιγνώσις; nor can it be required by ver. 10. In Baruch vi. 41, moreover, it has not this meaning (against Wahl).

Αἰσθητήριον, τὸ, *organ of sense*, applied to the spiritual life only seldom, and manifestly in a figurative manner, Plut. *Mor.* 1096 E, ἔστι δὲ τῆς ψυχῆς ἰδίου αἰσθητήριον ὁ νοῦς. So in the LXX. in the only place where it occurs, Jer. iv. 19, τὰ αἰσθητήρια τῆς καρδίας μου μαιμάσσει ἡ ψυχὴ μου. In like manner, but still more decidedly figurative in Heb. v. 14, τελείων δὲ ἐστὶν ἡ στερεὰ τροφή, τῶν διὰ τὴν ἔξιν τὰ αἰσθητήρια γεγυμνασμένα ἐχόντων πρὸς διάκρισιν καλοῦ τε καὶ κακοῦ, where (as in 2 Sam. xix. 36) we cannot suppose there is a passing from the figure to the thing.

Αἰών is in the LXX. = עוֹלָם, which, however, signifies primarily a time whose end or beginning withdraws itself from perception (from עָלַם, *to conceal*), “a conception which begins where the reach of our power of perception ceases” (Orelli, *Die Hebr. Synonyma der Zeit. u. Ewigkeit genetisch u. sprachvergleichend untersucht*, Leipzig 1871, p. 70 sqq.), therefore a *never ceasing time*, **interminable a parte ante**, if regarded as *past*, **endless**, as it regards the future; cf. Gen. vi. 4; Josh. xxiv. 2; 1 Sam. xxvii. 8;—Ex. xv. 18; Deut. xxiii. 3; Neh. xiii. 1. Not until afterwards does it come to mean a definite and specially a future space of time, yet still involving within its limits uninterruptedness, unintermitted continuance; therefore, e.g. Ex. xxi. 6, עוֹלָם לְעוֹלָם, δουλεύσει αὐτῷ εἰς αἰῶνα. So also von Orelli, who calls attention to the fact that, e.g. in Ex. xxi. 6 and in other places, the word should be translated in German, *auf immer*, not *auf ewig*. Though we can hardly say, with Delitzsch on Heb. i. 1, that it denotes “the end of history, which in the view of the speaker forms the boundary of his range of view,” an interpretation which attributes to the conception an ever-changing import, such as it certainly had not in the consciousness of

the O. T. writers,—nevertheless we may adopt his remark on Isa. ii. 2, where he says, “the conception is eschatological, but according to the measure of the speaker’s range of view.” While “in Gen. xlix. the acquisition of Canaan is put into this period of time, in Deut. iv. 30 the destruction of Israel is denoted by it, cf. Hos. iii. 5; and, on the other hand, in Isa. ii. 2, *the end*, in the strictest and most literal sense, is signified, beginning with the commencement of the N. T. aeon and continuing till its conclusion; cf. Heb. i. 1; 1 Pet. i. 20, with 1 Cor. xv. and the Apocalypse” (Delitzsch).—Still we must remember not only the historical development of prophecy in general, but the fact that in every case in close connection with the matter in question there is always a reference to the Messianic future. Thus, for example, the acquisition of Canaan from a certain point of view is a fulfilment of the Messianic promise, just as the deliverance from Egypt serves as a guarantee of the Messianic deliverance. The end of days is the period in which *the history* of the final decision is transacted. Cf. E. Haupt on 1 John, p. 2. As to עולם הָהוּא and עולם הַבָּא, “*Distinctionem hanc*,” says Lightfoot on Matt. xii. 32, “*invenias in unaquaque fere pagina rabbinica*.” עולם הַבָּא is the future which brings recompense; Mishna Sanhedr. 10. 1, “He who says the law is not from heaven has no part in *the future world*.” As the time and world of recompense it has in it nothing that characterizes the present state of the world, Berachoth 17. 1, “the עולם הַבָּא has nothing in common with the עולם הַזֶּה; in it there is neither eating nor drinking, nor marriage, nor business, nor hatred, nor want, nor wrath, but the righteous shall sit on the thrones with their crowns upon their heads, and shall delight themselves in the glory of the Shekinah” (cf. Luke xx. 34, 35; 1 Cor. vi. 13). Pirke Aboth, 4. 16, “The עולם הַזֶּה is like a vestibule to the עולם הַבָּא; deck yourself therefore in the vestibule, so that you may enter the *Triclinium*, the inner chamber.” The עולם הַבָּא is eternal, for (Kiddushin 39. 2, *et al.*) the promise והארכת ימים (Deut. xxii. 7, v. 16) will be in the age which is perfectly enduring, *i.e.* eternal. Certain sects, *e.g.* the Sadducees, asserted there is only one world, אֵין העולם אֶלָּא אחד; and therefore, according to Berach. 9. 5, the concluding form of benediction in the temple which before ended with עַד עוֹלָם was changed into מִן העולם ועד העולם; according to Sal. Raschi, “That they might learn that there were two עולמות, and in contradiction of those who denied the resurrection of the dead.” Cf. Tanch. 52 in Lightfoot (as above), “*Mundus futurus est cum jam exiit homo ex hoc mundo*.”—[For the literature of this subject, see Meuschen, *N. T. ex Talmude illustr.* pp. 1116–1183, where are collected the Dissertations of Herm. Witsius, *Diss. de seculo hoc et futuro*; Jac. Rhenferd, I. *De phrasi graeca N. T. ὁ αἰὼν ὁ μέλλ.*, *et Hebr. עולם הַבָּא, exhibens summum argumentum, quibus probatur, seculum futurum non denotare dies Messiae*; II. *exhibens testimonium rabbinorum*, etc.; III. *vincliciae sententiae de sec. fut.*—Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr.* on Matt. xii. 32; Schoettgen, *Horae Hebr. Diss. de seculo hoc et fut.* pp. 1153–1158; Buxtorf, *Lex. Chald.* s.v. עולם. Wetstein, *Nov. Test.* on Matt. xii. 32. Based upon this, Bleek on Heb. i. 1 gives a not very satisfactory review. See also my treatise on the *Eschat. Rede*, Matt. xxiv., xxv. p. 247 sqq.; Schürer, *Neutest. Zeitgesch.* § 29. 9.] In these expressions עֵלָּא has, so to

speak, lost its meaning *eternity*, and received another for which we have not in German any adequate term. The otherwise corresponding rendering *Weltzeit* is not quite appropriate, because *עולם הזה* is finite, *עולם הבא* is infinite or unending; the one denotes what is temporal, the other what is eternal. We cannot definitely say how this usage was established. The first step is supposed to have been the use of *עולם הבא* to denote the future; but as Orelli (p. 80 sq.) says, "The plural *עולמים*, frequently used in prophetic and poetic diction, while intended to strengthen the conception, unavoidably added a corresponding limitation; and, moreover, by the combinations *נצח נצחים*, *עולמי-ער*, and the prospect of the new Messianic ordering of things, the hitherto established "for ever" itself seemingly came to an end. While, nevertheless, the designation *עולם* was retained for the Messianic order, it became usual also to designate by this word a period whose finite duration could not be denied, whose end indeed was already before the eyes of all; and this the phraseology proves, for the *עולם הבא* was contrasted with the *עולם הזה*, the latter denoting the course of the world period, or what is *temporal*; the former, the aeon beginning with the renewal of the world, or *eternity*." It is a matter of question, however, whether *עולם הזה* or the *לעולם* of the law formed the point of departure of this phraseology, and not rather the *עולם הבא*.

In the O. T. Apocrypha there occurs only one trace of this representation, Tobit xiv. 5, *ἕως πληρωθῶσι καιροὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος*, where from the connection the *αἰὼν οὗτος* must be meant. On the contrary, in 4 Esdr. the expression itself occurs; vii. 42, 43, *Praesens seculum non est finis . . . dies enim iudicii erit finis temporis huius et initium temporis futurae immortalitatis, in quo transivit corruptela*; viii. 1, *Hoc seculum fecit altissimus propter multos, futurum autem propter paucos*. It is no matter of surprise that Philo has not the expression, considering his relation to Messianic hope; it is observable that he places *ἐν τῷ καθ' ἡμᾶς αἰῶνι* in contrast, not with the future, but with the past (*πρὸ αἰῶνος*), *De nom. mut.* 1046a; cf. J. B. Carpzov, *Exercitatt. in Ep. ad Hebr. ex Phil. Al.* on Heb. i. 1 and ii. 5. The absence of the word in this sense in the O. T. Apoc. may be significant, however, as indicating the time when this *theologoumenon* arose.—The transference of *עולם*, in the sense of *αἰών*, to denote *κόσμος*, was all the more natural, because the view of the future passes over to that of a future order of things; the representation of the *world-time*, or *the course of the world*, leads on necessarily to that of *the world* in this time. Compare the derivation of the German *Welt*, from *weralt* = *generation*. Compare Orelli, p. 82, "When *עולם* came to denote, not only the dark hidden distance far away, but the period of time stretching out from our now, the invisible sphere of time, in which all our known life is included, the contents of this sphere would naturally be called by the same name, *i.e.* *the world*, not indeed as space, which like time is unlimited (Levy), but the complex of all matter and forces, all causes and phenomena, which range themselves in uninterrupted temporal sequence, and constitute a life-sphere. There is no proveable trace in biblical Hebrew of the distinction of various *עולמים*, nor of the signification *world*. All the more common are both, in the Jewish language of the Messianic time and in other

dialects." Cf. also Bleek and Delitzsch on Heb. xi. 3. Corresponding herewith is the use of αἰών in the plural in the sense of κόσμος, but in the N. T. only in the Epistle to the Hebrews, intended for Jewish-Christian readers. In apocryphal literature the singular, but only in Wisd. xiii. 9, xiv. 6, xviii. 4. Cf. 4 Esdr. vi. 55, *Propter nos creasti seculum*; ver. 39, *Si propter nos creatum est saeculum, quare non haereditatem possidemus cum seculo?* —It has rightly been observed that αἰώνιος refers specially to the future, while αἰδῖος embraces past as well as future; see αἰδῖος. Cf. Tittmann, *de synon. in N. T.* i. 38, αἰδῖ. *utrumque denotat, et qui praeterito tempore omni fuit et qui non habet finem, sed αἰών. est, cuius nullus finis cogitatur.* This very fact that αἰώνιος, answering to the Hebrew עולם, excludes the end, makes the word appropriate for this use of it, without altogether excluding its application to *endless, long past times.*

Ἀκοή. Compare Thuc. i. 20. 1, τὰς ἀκοὰς τῶν προγεγενημένων . . . ἀβασανίστως παρ' ἀλλήλων δέχεσθαι. Cf. 2 Sam. iv. 4, לְהַשְׁמִיעַ לְיִשְׂרָאֵל לְהַשְׁמִיעַ לְכָל־עָם, ἐν τῷ ἐλθεῖν τὴν ἀγγελίαν Σαούλ, gen. of the object. Gen. of the subject, John xii. 38; Rom. x. 16, ἡ ἀκοὴ ἡμῶν; cf. Obad. i. 1; Jer. xlix. 14, ἀκοὴν ἤκουσα παρὰ κυρίου. Heb. נִשְׁמָע, Isa. xxviii. 9, 19, xxxvii. 7; Isa. lii. 7, εὐαγγελίζεσθαι ἀκοὴν εἰρήνης, and so also Isa. liii. 1, which is quoted John xii. 38; Rom. x. 16, τίς ἐπίστευσεν τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν. According to the connection, נִשְׁמָע is *that which is heard, what one hears, report, news*, as in 1 Sam. ii. 26; 2 Sam. xiii. 30; 1 Kings ii. 28 (ἀκοὴ ἦν ἀκούω), x. 7, and other places, or in a derived sense but akin to this, *that which one says, tells = account, communication, message, announcement.* Thus in Isa. xxviii. 9, lii. 7, liii. 1, and other places. The LXX. render the word thus used in some places by ἀγγελία, Isa. xxviii. 9; Prov. xxv. 26; Ezek. vii. 26, xxi. 12 (the same word which they use in a weakened sense for נִשְׁמָע = *report*, in 2 Sam. iv. 4, showing how nearly akin the significations of ἀκοή and ἀγγελία are). We must find the connection between the primary meaning and the sense of the word in all these passages in the fact that the contents of the communication, announcement, or message is something which the proclaimer of it has himself heard (what the prophet has heard from Jehovah and utters for the people to hear, as Delitzsch explains it). In this way, also, is ἀκοή used. Compare, besides the places quoted above for the passive signification, Plato, *Tim.* 21 A, ποῖον ἔργον τοῦτο Κριτίας . . . διηγείτο κατὰ τὴν Σόλωνος ἀκοὴν, *e Solonis relatione.* Plut. *de ei Delph.* 386 A, πλάττεσθαι ἱστορίαν καὶ ἀκοὴν ἐτέρων. Hence is explained the use of ἀκοή as *term. tech.* for the proclamation of salvation, gospel preaching based upon the divine word, upon the divine commission, synonymous with κήρυγμα, which simply gives prominence to the immediate and commissioned reproduction of the divine message, whereas in ἀκοή speaker and hearer stand in the same relation to the contents of the message. Thus Rom. x. 17, ἄρα ἡ πίστις ἐξ ἀκοῆς, ἡ δὲ ἀκοὴ διὰ ῥήματος θεοῦ (cf. Thuc. in the places quoted, where ἀκοὴν δέχεσθαι is *synon.* with the foregoing πιστεύειν), where, from the connection with ver. 16, we cannot understand the *actus audiendi*; for the thing meant, see Num. xxiv. 4. In like manner

Heb. iv. 2, ὁ λόγος τῆς ἀκοῆς; 1 Thess. ii. 13, παραλαβόντες λόγον ἀκοῆς (cf. Ecclus. xli. 23), passages which clearly show that ἀκοή is used as a *term. techn.* While this is so, however, in Gal. iii. 2, ἐξ ἔργων νόμου τὸ πνεῦμα ἐλάβετε ἢ ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως, and ver. 5, ὁ ἐπιχορηγῶν ὑμῖν τὸ πνεῦμα . . . ἐξ ἔργων νομου ἢ ἐξ ἀκοῆς πίστεως, we can hardly (with Hofmann) read, instead of ἀκοή πίστεως, πιστις ἀκοῆς, a combination required neither by the antithesis with ἐργ. νόμ. nor by the connection with ver. 6, because the antithesis is really heightened by the objectiveness of the gospel preaching being contrasted with the merely subjective conduct. To the conception ἔργα νόμου an ἀκοή πίστεως answers far better than a πιστις ἀκοῆς, in which case we should have expected πιστις εὐαγγελίου. The genitive πίστεως may very well be explained as the genitive of the object, following ἀκοή in its indisputably established passive sense.

Εἰσακούω, -σομαι, 1 aor. pass. εἰσηκούσθην, fut. εἰσακουσθήσομαι. Used by the poets as a strengthened form of the simple verb, and construed in like manner. Otherwise = to listen to, mostly with the gen. of the person or thing, to listen to one, to give heed to, to do his will; according to the connection, either = to obey, or = to hear; cf. Gen. xlii. 21, 22, where we have both meanings side by side. LXX. = נָשָׁא (in the sense to hear, also = נָשָׂא, see below), Gen. xxxiv. 17; Ex. vi. 12; Num. xvi. 8. In the N. T. = (a) to obey, 1 Cor. xiv. 21, ἐν χεῖλεσιν ἐτέρων λαλήσω τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ καὶ οὐδ' οὕτως εἰσακουσονται μου, from Deut. i. 43. In the sense (b) to hear, to give ear to, of hearing prayer, Deut. ix. 19, εἰσήκουσε κύριος ἐμοῦ; Num. xx. 16, τῆς φωνῆς ἡμῶν. In this sense also = נָשָׂא, Job xxx. 15, xxxv. 12; Ps. iv. 2, lxix. 17, cxliii. 1, 7, and often, which is also rendered, and in like connections, by ἐπακούω. So in the N. T. the passive, and with a personal subject, Matt. vi. 7, δοκοῦσιν ὅτι ἐν τῇ πολυλογίᾳ αὐτῶν εἰσακουθήσονται. Heb. v. 7, εἰσακουθεὶς of Christ (see more on this passage under εὐλάβεια). Cf. Ecclus. iii. 5, ἐν ἡμέρᾳ προσευχῆς αὐτοῦ εἰσακουθήσεται. With a thing as subject, Luke i. 13, εἰσηκούσθῃ ἡ δέησίς σου (and so Ecclus. li. 11); Acts x. 31, εἰσηκ. σου ἡ προσευχή. In the LXX. the passive does not occur, but the verb is construed with the accusative, still with a neuter and never with a personal object (in 2 Chron. xviii. 21 the true reading is not εἰσήκουσεν, but ἔσωσεν αὐτόν), δέησιν, Job xxvii. 9 (Ecclus. xxxii. 16); κραυγὴν πτωχῶν, Job xxxiv. 28; τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν τῶν πενήτων, Ps. x. 17; τὸν στεναγμόν, Ex. ii. 25, vi. 5; τὸν γογγυσμόν, Ex. xvi. 7, 8, 9, 12; λόγους, Isa. xxxvii. 4. Compare Herod. ix. 60, ὥστε καὶ ταῦτα ἐσακούειν. Also in the sense to obey, with the accus. of the thing, τὰς ἐντολάς, Deut. xi. 28; Judg. ii. 17, iii. 4 (Ex. xvi. 28, xix. 9 = נָשָׂא). In quite a general sense, Hab. iii. 1, εἰσακήκοα τὴν ἀκοήν σου καὶ ἐφοβήθην; cf. Thuc. iii. 34. 3, ὑπὸ τῆς μείζονος βοῆς τῶν πολεμίων τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς παραγγελλόμενα οὐκ ἐσακούοντες.

Παρακούω, to hear beside, both to hear by the way, and to fail to hear. In the first sense perhaps it might be taken in Mark v. 36 (Volkman, Weiss), if with Tisch. and Tregelles we read παρακούσας τὸν λόγον instead of the Rec. ἀκούσας, which Lachm.

adopts. As, however, the word mentioned in ver. 35, though not addressed to Jesus, must not only have been overheard but understood by Him, the reading παρακούσας seems more probably to have arisen from the misapprehension that Christ's word in ver. 36 implied that He had not heard the communication of ver. 35. Cf. Esth. iv. 13, εἰς παρακούσας = שָׁחַח, Hiphil, which in Ps. xxxix. 13 = παρασιωπᾶν; Symmachus, παρακούειν.—Elsewhere in the N. T. only in Matt. xviii. 17, εἰς παρακούσῃ αὐτῶν . . . εἰς δὲ καὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας παρακούσῃ = not to hear, to pay no heed to, to refuse obedience; LXX. Esth. iii. 8, τῶν νόμων τοῦ βασιλέως οὐ παρακούουσιν = מִצְוָה מִצְוָה. Tobit iii. 4, τῶν ἐντολῶν. Often in Polyb. with the genitive of the person or thing; so also in Josephus, Lucian, Epict. With the accusative, Esth. iii. 3, τὰ ὑπὸ βασιλέως λεγόμενα = עֲבַר. Absolutely, Isa. lxv. 12, ἐλάλησα καὶ παρηκούσατε = נִשְׁמַע אֵל; see Esth. iv. 13.

Ῥπακούω. The use of this word by itself to denote *habitual and constant obedience* is akin both with its use as = נִשְׁמַע, to denote obedience to the declared will of God,—and not only to the law,—Gen. xxii. 18, xxvi. 5; Lev. xxvi. 14, 18; Deut. xxvi. 14, 17, xxx. 2; Jer. xiii. 10, 11; Isa. l. 10, *et al.*, and also with its use with reference to the commands of wisdom, Prov. ii. 2 (cf. xvii. 4) = נִשְׁמַע, Hiphil, Ecclus. iv. 15, xxiv. 22.—In the LXX. it is usually joined with the genitive, only occasionally, as in Gen. xxxix. 10, Prov. viii. 1, xv. 23, Job v. 1, ix. 3, xlii. 22, xiv. 15, with the dative. In profane Greek it occurs with both constructions; but the latter, which is the only one in the N. T., seems to be more usual in prose.

Ἀκροβυστία, ἡ, from ἀκρόβυστος, and like this used only in biblical and Christian Greek; even Josephus and Philo, in spite of undoubted knowledge, seem not to use the word (in Philo, *De Allegor.* i. 49, ed. Paris, it does not occur where Lev. xix. 23 is quoted, and the printed editions usually have ἀκροβυστίαν, but the MSS., according to Pfeiffer, read ἀκαθαρσίαν). According to the construction of the word, it can only be derived from βύω, βύζω, to fill up, to plug, to stop up (Homer, Herod., Lucian, often in later writers); Herod. vi. 125. 3, τοῦ τὸ στόμα (χρυσῷ) ἐβέβυστο. Luc. *Katapl.* 5, βεβυσμένοι τὰ ὦτα. Heges. in Ath. vii. 290 D, βεβ. τὴν ῥῖνα. Therefore ἀκρόβυστος = filled up, stopped up. This derivation is indeed disputed by Fritzsche on Rom. ii. 26, and ἀκροβυστία is explained as = ἀκροποσθία, an expression occurring in Aristotle and medical writers for the κοινὸν δέρματος καὶ βαλάνου (Arist. *H. A.* i. 13, *De part. an.* ii. 13). But ἀκροβυστία does not mean the same as ἀκροποσθία. Fritzsche's statement is quite unsupported and untenable, *pronuntiarunt Alexandrini τὴν βύστην quam Graeci dixerunt τὴν πόσθην*; and equally untenable is his reason for rejecting the derivation from βύω that it is not clear *de cuiusnam membri extremitate agatur*. Ἀκροβυστία and ἀκροποσθία are to be distinguished. While the latter means only τὰ ἄκρα τοῦ αἰδοίου, ἀκροβυστία signifies a certain state of this, without indeed naming it; but though thus silent, it is no more indefinite and general than is

περιτομή, and is as plain in meaning as is this, which was always understood wherever the Jews were known. Thus far, however, we must allow with Winer (§ 16. 4a) that ἀκροβυστία seems to be a sort of substitute for ἀκροποσθία, being in its indefiniteness more decent to denote the thing concealed. The word is clearly one formed by the Jews, perhaps with the Hebrew הַבִּיט in view, and it was used only by them. Cf. Eph. ii. 11, $\text{ὁμοίως τὰ ἔθνη ἐν σαρκὶ οἱ λεγόμενοι ἀκροβυστία ὑπὸ τῆς λεγομένης περιτομῆς ἐν σαρκὶ κ.τ.λ.}$ As the word thus points to and reminds one of ἀκροποσθία, so as both to conceal the thing and to suggest a judgment concerning it, the substantive was first formed, and afterwards the adjective ἀκρόβυστος, as is indicated by the use of ἀπερίτμητος by the LXX. as the usual rendering of the adjective הַבִּיט ; for ἀκρόβυστος occurs first in Aquila, Symm., Theodot., while it is wanting in the N. T. It occurs, however, in the ecclesiastical writers; cf. Ignat. *ad Philad.* vi. 1, $\text{ἀμεινον ἐστιν παρὰ ἀνδρὸς περιτομὴν ἔχοντος χριστιανισμόν ἀκούειν ἢ παρὰ ἀκρόβυστου Ἰουδαισμού.}$

In the LXX. ἀκροβυστία is always used in a physical sense = הַבִּיט , *praeputium*, Gen. xvii. 11, 14, 23, 24, 25; Ex. iv. 25; Lev. xii. 3; Josh. v. 3; 1 Sam. xviii. 25, 27; 2 Sam. iii. 14; Jer. ix. 24. In Deut. x. 16 and Jer. iv. 4, on the other hand, where הַבִּיט stands in a figurative sense— בִּלְהַבִּיט , the LXX. have *σκληροκαρδία*, Aquila, Deut. x. 16, ἀκροβυστία τῆς καρδίας. Cf. Ex. vi. 12, בְּהַבִּיט לֵב ; LXX. *ἄλογος*; Theodot. ἀκρόβυστος χεῖλεσιν.

In the Apocrypha, only in 1 Macc. i. 15, Judith xiv. 10, both times in a literal sense. How little the LXX. thought of a transference of the word appears in their translation of Lev. xix. 23, where “foreskins” of fruit trees are spoken of which were to be treated as the foreskin; the LXX. render הַבִּיט לֵב by *περικαθαρίζειν τὴν ἀκαθαρσίαν*, while Aquila, Jewishly-minded, coins the verb ἀκροβυστεῖν (*ἀκροβυστίζειν* would have been more correct, for the former denotes a state, this latter an act).

The N. T., and especially the Pauline use of the term, is quite in keeping with that of the LXX., inasmuch as the word is never applied to moral and spiritual things. Col. ii. 11, 15 only seems to hint at such a figurative application. A further explanation appears where ἀκροβυστία is not only (a) the physical foreskin itself, *praeputium*, as in Acts xi. 3, Rom. ii. 25, Gal. v. 6, vi. 15, but also (b) the state of ἀπερίτμητος, Rom. iv. 10, τῷ Ἀβρ. . . ἐν περιτομῇ ὄντι ἢ ἐν ἀκροβυστίᾳ. Ver. 11, τῆς πίστεως τῆς ἐν ἀκροβυστίᾳ, εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν πατέρα πάντων τῶν πιστευόντων δι’ ἀκροβυστίας (cf. διὰ περιτομῆς, ii. 27, and the Ep. of Barnabas xiii. 6, πατέρα ἔθνων τῶν πιστευόντων δι’ ἀκροβυστίας τῷ θεῷ). Ver. 12, τοῖς στοιχοῦσιν τοῖς ἔχουσιν τῆς ἐν ἀκροβυστίᾳ πίστεως. Then (c) of the uncircumcised Gentiles (ἔθνη), to designate them as outside the διαθήκαι τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, the O. T. ἐκλογή, or the σπέρμα ᾧ ἐπηγγέλλεται (Eph. ii. 12; Rom. ix. 4; Gal. iii. 19). So in Eph. ii. 11 (where for ἐν σαρκί, cf. Jer. ix. 26, πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἀπερίτμητα σαρκὶ καὶ πᾶς οἶκος Ἰσραὴλ ἀπερίτμητοι καρδίας αὐτῶν); Rom. iii. 30; Gal. ii. 7; Rom. ii. 26, 27.

Ἀλήθεια. In the LXX. ἀληθής, ἀλήθεια, ἀληθινός, ἀληθεύω answer to the derivatives of נא, especially נא and נא, and only occasionally to some other words. נא, נא, נא are divided into two series of words, πιστός, πίστις, πιστεύειν, πιστοῦν on the one hand, ἀληθής, ἀλήθεια, ἀληθεύειν on the other; and in such a way that the verb, which hardly appears save in Niphal and Hiphil, is rendered by πιστόω and πιστεύω, the part. Niphal by πιστός, נא partly by πίστις and partly by ἀλήθεια, but נא, as a rule, by ἀλήθεια (only six times by πίστις), occasionally also by δικαιосύνη, ἐλεημοσύνη, נא שׂא = ἀγαθός, נא, נא = ἀληθώς, ἐν and ἐπ' ἀληθεία, once = ὄντως, נא mostly = γένοιτο. In the Hebrew the fundamental thought is different, the sphere of נא is richer, and the usage runs on different lines from ἀλήθεια, ἀληθής; and as the LXX. employ ἀλήθεια throughout for נא, it has references which do not belong to it in profane usage. The question therefore arises, How far does the usage of the LXX. affect that of the N. T. in the case of this word? Does the N. T. ἀλήθεια occupy the sense and range of the O. T. נא or not? Inclined as we may be to answer in the affirmative, it must not be overlooked that the profane usage, on the other hand, has been sufficiently strong to retain its ground intact in the case of the adj. ἀληθής; that this word stands in the LXX. always as in good Greek, seldom occurring indeed, but oftener in the N. T., where also the sense does not differ from classical usage. The question as to the influence of נא concerns only ἀλήθεια and ἀληθινός.

The fundamental idea in נא is firmness, = *to hold fast*, trans. and intrans., rarely in Kal, of which only the participle occurs = *protector, nurse, παιδαγωγός, τιθηνός*; cf. נא, 2 Kings xviii. 16 = *pillar*; LXX. = ἐστηρυμένα. Usually in Niphal and Hiphil. The Niphal answers to the use of Kal, Isa. xl. 4 = *to be carried*, נא נא נא, αἱ θυγατέρες σου ἐπ' ὤμων ἀρθῇσονται. Next it stands in the sense of *to be firm, sure, reliable*, נא נא, a *sure place*, Isa. xxii. 23, 25, = τόπος πιστός. Then *possess firmness, to be enduring*, נא נא, 1 Sam. ii. 35, et al. = οἶκος πιστός, and of surely springing perennial water. Isa. xxxiii. 16, τὸ ὕδωρ αὐτοῦ πιστόν. Jer. xv. 8, ὡς ὕδωρ ψευδές οὐκ ἔχον πίστιν, and generally of whatever possesses continuance and tenacity. Deut. xxviii. 59, νόσους πονηρὰς καὶ πιστάς. Isa. vii. 9, נא נא נא, "If ye will not hold fast, ye will not remain firm;" Luther, "glaubet ihr nicht, so bleibet ihr nicht" (the translation of the LXX., εἰ μὴ πιστεύσητε οὐδὲ μὴ συνήτε, may be accounted for by the prevailing intellectual reference of πιστεύειν, or of ἀλήθεια in profane usage). Ps. lxxxix. 29, לֹא נֶאֱמַרְתִּי בְּרִי, ἡ διαθήκη μου πιστὴ αὐτῷ (cf. ver. 25). Isa. lv. 3, נא נא נא, ἐνεκεν κυρίου ὅτι πιστός. When applied to words, Ps. xix. 9, cxi. 7; Gen. xlii. 20; 1 Kings viii. 26; 1 Chron. xvii. 23; 2 Chron. i. 9, vi. 17, it expresses the idea of truth, words which verify themselves, *reliable*, = *to be found to be true, to be true*; LXX. Ps. xix. 8, cxi. 7 = πιστός; Gen. xlii. 20 = πιστευθῆναι; in the other places = πιστωθῆναι.—The

Hiphil = *to take fast hold, to keep firm, to trust*, is always = *πιστεύειν*, and with reference to words, statements, etc., it is = *to trust the truth of them*. Thus *תָּמַן* and *תָּמַן* signify *to possess firmness, durability, to prove itself true*, or the quality of *solidity, continuance, permanence*, and in a derived way *trustworthiness, reliability, veracity*. They do not occur in a physical sense like *תָּמַן* with *דִּרְבָּר*, save in Ex. xvii. 12. The combination *תָּמַן שָׁלוֹם* occurs in Jer. xiv. 13 = *ἀλήθεια καὶ εἰρήνη*, Isa. xxxix. 8, cf. Jer. xxxiii. 6, and *תָּמַן* = *peace*, Isa. xxxiii. 6. Isa. xlii. 3, *תָּמַן*, it means to bring or work out the right of the poor and oppressed so that it be established; LXX. *εἰς ἀλήθειαν ἐξοίσει κρίσιν*, which, as quoted in Matt. xii. 20, it is *εἰς νίκος*, evidently an exegetical correction of the strange *ἀλ.* for the sake of the Greek reader. Cf. further *תָּמַן נִסִּים*, a sure, self-attesting, reliable sign; Josh. ii. 12, *δώσετέ μοι σημεῖον ἀληθινόν*; cf. Deut. xiii. 2, 3. It is evident that the rendering *ἀλήθεια* is regarded as the correlative of *πιστεύειν*. As in Josh. ii. 12 *תָּמַן* is predicated of a sign, so in other places it is predicated of the word or of a discourse = *having stability and permanence, a certain and therefore true word*; and of narratives as = *what answers to the reality or facts*; of promises = *engagements which verify themselves by accomplishment*; thus Deut. xxii. 20, *הִנֵּה הַדְּבָר הַזֶּה אִמְתָּ אִם*, *ἐὰν δι' ἐπ' ἀληθείας γένηται ὁ λόγος οὗτος*. Instead of this circumlocutory *ἐπ' ἀληθείας* (cf. Dan. ii. 8, *ἐπ' ἀληθείας οἶδα* = *יָדַעְתִּי בְּיָד*; ii. 47 = *שָׁמַעְתִּי בְּיָד*; and so *דִּבְרָתִי*, Job ix. 2, xix. 4, xxxvi. 3; Isa. xxxvii. 18; *ἐν ἀλ.*, 2 Kings xix. 7), *תָּמַן דְּבָר* is rendered by *λαλεῖν ἀλήθειαν*, 1 Kings xxii. 16; 2 Chron. xviii. 15; Ps. xv. 2; Jer. ix. 5; Zech. viii. 16; Prov. viii. 7. Cf. *ὁμνύναι ἀλήθειαν*, Ps. cxxxii. 12; *λόγοι ἀληθείας*, Prov. xxii. 21; Eccles. xii. 10; Neh. ix. 13, *νόμοι ἀληθείας*, words or laws which stand, which verify themselves. Gen. xlii. 16, *אֵלֶּם לְפָנֶיךָ הָאֲמַתְּ הַדְּבָרִים הַנֶּהְיָא, ἕως τοῦ φανερὰ γενέσθαι τὰ ῥήματα ὑμῶν, εἰ ἀληθεύετε ἢ οὐ*, where the *φανερὰ γεν.* embodies the idea associated with the Greek word while answering to the fundamental thought in the Hebrew word, the being proved or verified, which *תָּמַן* embodies. That this is so, that the fundamental thought in *תָּמַן* is firmness, permanence which ratifies itself, is clear from the synonym *בְּשָׁר*, *firmness, certainty*, Prov. xxii. 21, *תָּמַן אֱמָרִי שָׁשָׁר תִּשְׁמַח לִי, διδάσκω σε ἀληθὴ λόγον καὶ γνώσιν ἀληθῇ*. Gen. xli. 32 = *יָבֵן*. Cf. Prov. xi. 18, *שָׁרָה תִּלְבָּשָׁה אֱמָתָה שָׂכָר*, “a deceitful work, a sure reward.” The representation differs, the thing meant is the same. The Greek keeps in view that which the thing proves itself to be (see above, Isa. vii. 9, the LXX. version), and denotes its reality as established and demonstrated; *ἀλήθεια* expresses the agreement between word and reality, declaration and fact, while the Hebrew (*תָּמַן*) describes that which is spoken of not only as *real*, but as *enduring* and *self-verifying*. What is intended is in the issue the same though the form of thought varies. Compare with Dan. ii. 47, *ἐπ' ἀληθείας ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν αὐτός ἐστι ὁ θεὸς θεῶν*, 2 Chron. xv. 3, *תָּמַן אֱלֹהֵי אֲבֹתֵינוּ רַבִּים יְמִים, ἡμέραι πολλαὶ τῷ Ἰσραὴλ ἐν οὐ θεῶ ἀληθινῶ*.

Here the expressions part company, and while *ἀλήθεια* is retained to render *תָּמַן*, it receives or takes up somewhat of its meaning, which was all the more easy as it was the

correlative of πιστεύειν. Where ἀληθής, ἀλήθεια refer to persons, the reference is to their *trustworthiness* in their engagements, declarations, promises, their truthfulness; ἀληθής = *verax*, ἀλήθεια, *veracity, integrity*, Xen. *Anab.* ii. 6. 25, 26; Plut. *Mar.* xxix. 3, τὸν δὲ Μέτελλον εἰδὼς βέβαιον ἄνδρα καὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἀρχὴν μεγάλης ἀρετῆς κατὰ Πίνδαρον ἡγούμενον. Here was the point of departure for the wider use by the LXX. of ἀλήθεια in the sense of נֶאֱמָר. נֶאֱמָר occurs very often, mostly of persons, especially of God, both as an attribute and as the product of conduct. As an attribute it affirms, by the part. Niphal נֶאֱמָר, 1 Sam. ii. 35, iii. 20, Prov. xxv. 13 (see πιστός), that his nature is to verify or prove himself faithful, so that one may rely upon him; cf. of God, Deut. vii. 9, יְהוָה יִרְאֶה יִרְאֶה יִרְאֶה נֶאֱמָר לָא, θεὸς ὁ πιστὸς ὁ φυλάσσει τὴν διαθήκην καὶ τὸ ἔλεος τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν, καὶ ἀποδίδους τοῖς μισοῦσιν αὐτόν κ.τ.λ.; cf. xxxii. 4, נֶאֱמָר לָא לִי יְהוָה. Accordingly he who approves himself in God's sight and stands before Him (cf. Ps. i. 6, ὁδὸς ἀσεβῶν ἀπολείται), is said to walk in נֶאֱמָר, ἀλήθεια, which is more than veracity, integrity; cf. 2 Chron. xxxii. 1, μετὰ τὴν ἀλήθειαν ταύτην, of the "perfect" walk of Hezekiah before his fall, therefore = *proved faithful*, the state of being approved or verified; cf. Ezek. xviii. 9. 2 Kings xx. 3, περιπάτησα ἐνώπιόν σου ἐν ἀληθείᾳ, καὶ καρδίᾳ πληρεῖ καὶ τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς σου ἐποίησα. What is done in נֶאֱמָר, ἐν ἀλ., possesses stability, and must stand so as to be relied upon; hence Judg. ix. 15, 16, ἐν ἀληθ. καὶ τελειότητι ἐποίησατε; ver. 19. The δουλεύειν τῷ κυρίῳ ἐν ἀλ. (see above, Xen. *Anab.* ii. 6. 26) is not only upright service, but is an attribute belonging to the δούλος who proves himself true, and hence it means faithful and truthful service; 1 Sam. xii. 24, δουλεύσατε αὐτῷ ἐν ἀλ. καὶ ὅλη τῇ καρδίᾳ; without the καὶ in 1 Kings ii. 4; Ps. cxliv. 19, ἐπικαλεῖσθαι τὸν κυριὸν ἐν ἀλ.; Isa. x. 20, οἱ πεποιθότες ἐπὶ τὸν θεὸν τῇ ἀλ. Thus נֶאֱמָר stands in contrast with deception, lying, wickedness, Prov. xi. 18; Hos. iv. 1, οὐκ ἔστιν ἀλήθεια οὐδὲ ἔλεος οὐδὲ ἐπίγνωσις θεοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ἅρα καὶ ψεῦδος καὶ φόνος κ.τ.λ. Cf. 1 Chron. xii. 17, εἰ εἰς εἰρήνην ἦκατε, as opposed to οὐκ ἐν ἀλ. χεῖρός = יְדֵי שָׁמַר (which the LXX. have wrongly apprehended and construed); for where these are a man cannot be trusted. Therefore in Hos. iv. 1, Isa. lix. 14, 15, ἀλήθεια may best be rendered *trustworthiness*. In such passages as Isa. lix. 14, 15, Ps. xi. 1, xxxi. 24, it might indeed be rendered *truthfulness*, provided this is not confined to truth of word; נֶאֱמָר יְשָׁרִים are men who may be trusted, men approved, and approving themselves as true men.

When נֶאֱמָר is predicated of God, it affirms that He proves Himself true towards His people, that His people may rely upon Him; His נֶאֱמָר is the refuge of the suppliant, the hope of the oppressed, and hence is often joined with יְדֵי שָׁמַר. The greatest part of O. T. usage treats of God's נֶאֱמָר, coinciding as this does with the meaning of נֶאֱמָר in itself; cf. Isa. xlii. 3. We find it with יְדֵי שָׁמַר, ἔλεος, Ps. xxv. 10, xxvi. 3, xl. 12, lxi. 8, lxxxv. 11, lxxxix. 14, cviii. 5, cxv. 1, cxvii. 2, cxxxviii. 2; Isa. xvi. 5; cf. Ps. xxxi. 6, ἐλευτρώσω με ὁ θεὸς τῆς ἀληθείας; Ps. lxix. 14, ἐν τῇ πλήθει τοῦ ἐλέους σου, ἐν ἀληθείᾳ τῆς σωτηρίας σου; Ps. xl. 11, xliii. 3, ἐξαπόστειλον τὸ φῶς σου καὶ τὴν ἀλ. σου; Ps. xci. 4,

יְהוָה נֶאֱמָר, ὁπλῶ κυκλώσει σε ἡ ἀλ. αὐτοῦ. But that נֶאֱמָר is not equivalent simply and absolutely to *faithfulness*, is evident from the combinations with רָצָה, נֶרְצָה, and נֶאֱשָׁה, Ps. xl. 11, xlv. 5, lxxi. 21, 22, lxxxv. 11, lxxxix. 14, cxi. 7, cxix. 43, 138, 142, 160; Isa. xvi. 5. Even God's righteousness is the hope of His people (see *δίκαιος, δικαιοσύνη*), and neither this nor His נֶאֱמָר is equivalent to דִּקָּה, or a special form of דִּקָּה. Like righteousness, God's נֶאֱמָר is manifested in contrast with His דִּקָּה, not only in its reverse aspect as judgment upon enemies, Ps. liv. 7, ἐν τῇ ἀλ. σου ἐξολόθρευσον αὐτούς; Ps. xcvi. 13, κρινεῖ τὴν οἰκουμένην ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ καὶ λαοὺς ἐν τῇ ἀλ. αὐτοῦ; cf. vv. 11, 12; Ps. xcvi. 2, 3, 9, but as righteous judgment upon sinful Israel itself, a sense which does not belong to דִּקָּה; cf. Deut. vii. 9; Ps. cxix. 75, ἔγνων κύριε ὅτι δικαιοσύνη τὰ κρίματά σου καὶ ἀληθεία ἐταπείνωσάς με; Neh. ix. 33, σὺ δίκαιος ἐπὶ πᾶσι τοῖς ἐρχομένοις ἐφ' ἡμῖν, ὅτι ἀλήθειαν ἐποίησας καὶ ἡμᾶς ἐξημάρτομεν; Dan. iv. 34 (where ἀληθινά = *ῥῆμα*). It is the truthfulness and reliableness of God, whereby He verifies Himself, which, like righteousness, comes forth in behalf of those who in their poverty need it, in behalf of the oppressed and wretched, and which also, like righteousness, asserts itself in the opposite manner by way of judgment. נֶאֱמָר is once rendered by *ἐλεημοσύνη* where it is manifested as such, Isa. xxxviii. 18, οὐδὲ ἐλπιοῦσι οἱ ἐν ἄδου τὴν ἐλ. σου; cf. Ps. xxx. 11 (see above); but it is not the same, for it does not show itself merely thus; like righteousness, it works justice for the oppressed, and, operating in the same manner as pity, yet extends further. Hence the LXX. in Zech. vii. 9 and Ezek. xviii. 8 render נֶאֱמָר נֶאֱשָׁה by κρίμα δίκαιον instead of ἀληθές,—κρίμα δίκαιον ποιήσει ἀνὰ μέσον ἀνδρὸς καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ πλησίον αὐτοῦ. Righteousness suggests the thought of judgment, the נֶאֱמָר upon conduct, God's self-vindication by action, and on man's part רָצָה is that which has God's judgment on its side, נֶאֱמָר that which has stability; cf. Isa. xxvi. 2, נֶאֱמָר נֶאֱשָׁה רָצָה יְהוָה, δίκαιος λαὸς φυλάσσω δικαιοσύνην καὶ φυλάσσω ἀλήθειαν. "Ελεος, ἀλήθεια, δικαιοσύνη are expected of kings and judges as well as God, Prov. xx. 28, xxix. 14, Ps. xlv. 5, yea, of every good and God-fearing man; Prov. xiv. 22, πλανώμενοι τεκταίνουσι κακά, σπέρμα δὲ δικαίων μισθὸς ἀληθείας; Ps. xv. 2; Isa. xxvi. 2, xlviii. 1, οἱ ὀμνύοντες τῷ ὀνόματι κυρίου θεοῦ Ἰσραὴλ, μμνησκόμενοι οὐ μετὰ ἀληθείας οὐδὲ μετὰ δικαιοσύνης; and that the idea of reliableness or integrity does not disappear here is clear from Prov. xxviii. 6, κρείσσων πτωχὸς πορευόμενος ἐν ἀλ. (ἁ) πλουσίου ψεύδους (ἁ). How little the LXX. intended to use ἀλήθεια simply in the sense of *faithfulness* appears from the fact that they render נֶאֱמָר when predicated of God only three times by πίστις (Ps. xxxiii. 4; Lam. iii. 23; Hos. ii. 22), and elsewhere always by ἀλήθεια (Ps. xxxvi. 4, xl. 11, lxxxviii. 12, lxxxix. 2, 3, 6, 9, 25, 34, 50, xcii. 13, xcvi. 3, cf. ver. 2, c. 5, cxix. 30, 75, 86, 90, cxlii. 1; Isa. xi. 5); but when employed of men they usually render it by πίστις, showing that they did not take ἀλήθεια as = πίστις. And this is strengthened by 2 Chron. xix. 9, Ps. xii. 1, xxxi. 24, where they render נֶאֱמָר (of men) by ἀλήθεια, and these are the very places where, as the connection shows, *faithfulness* does not fully embody what is meant;—2 Chron. xix. 9, οὕτω ποιήσετε ἐν

φόβῳ κυρίου, ἐν ἀληθείᾳ καὶ ἐν πλήρει καρδίᾳ (cf. above, 2 Kings xx. 3; 1 Sam. xii. 24); Ps. xii. 1, ὠλιγόθησαν αἱ ἀλήθειαι (parallel with ἐκλέλοιπεν ὁσιος); Ps. xxxi. 24, ἀληθείας ἐκζητεῖ κύριος. From all this it is evident that the signification *truth* or *integrity* expressed by ἀλήθεια is by no means absorbed by the influence of the Hebrew נֶאֱמַר, or supplanted by the signification *faithfulness*; נֶאֱמַר is in certain circumstances = *faithfulness*, and appears as such, but it is more than this.

Ἀλήθεια, with its meaning *integrity*, receives a new application through the influence of the Hebrew נֶאֱמַר, and does not simply signify, as in profane Greek, *truthfulness in word*, but denotes truthfulness in the entire character and life of him who can be relied upon, and who approves himself in all things. While in profane Greek ἀλήθειαν ἀσκεῖν is affirmed of him who never lets himself fall into any falsehood (Xen. Anab. ii. 6. 25, see above), the O. T. ἀλήθειαν ποιεῖν is more comprehensive, and describes both the man who is faithful and proves his faithfulness, who behaves so that others must trust him, proving himself trustworthy in all circumstances, and the man who does what has reality, stability, firmness; cf. Gen. xlvii. 29; Josh. ii. 14; 2 Sam. xv. 20; Neh. ix. 33. Ἀλήθεια thus retains the significations *truth* and *truthfulness*, but applies these in a far wider range than is usual in Greek, or indeed to a certain extent in German.

Ἀληθεύω, to be an ἀληθής, and to act as such; cf. δουλεύω, θεραπεύω, βασιλεύω, therefore to practise truthfulness, to be truthful, to correspond with truth; Plut. Them. 18, ἀληθεύων λέγεις. Mostly in contrast with ψεύδεσθαι = to speak the truth. Rarely in biblical Greek, where it is once used transitively as = to make true (cf. βασιλεύειν τινά). (I.) Intransitively, (a) to speak the truth, Gen. xlii. 16, ἕως τοῦ φανερὰ γενέσθαι τὰ ῥήματα ὑμῶν εἰ ἀληθεύετε ἢ οὐ = עַד־כִּי־יִבְרָרְכּוּ־בְּאֵזְרֵי־כֶסֶד׃ Prov. xxi. 3, ποιεῖν δίκαια καὶ ἀληθεύειν ἀρεστὰ τὰρὰ θεῷ, where the Hebrew is more comprehensive, עֲשֵׂה־צְדָקָה וְדִבֶּר־אֱמֻנָה, the translation being explained not according to the Scripture combination of ἀλήθεια and δικαιοσύνη, but after the analogy of profane usage ἀλήθεια = *truthfulness*; Gen. xx. 16, πάντα ἀλήθευσον = *speaking the truth in everything*, an explanatory rendering of the misunderstood עֲשֵׂה־אֱמֻנָה. In the N. T. Gal. iv. 16, ἀληθεύων ὑμῖν. Eph. iv. 15, ἀληθεύοντες ἐν ἀγάπῃ; cf. ver. 14.—(b) = To be true; Ecclus. xxxi. 4, ἀπὸ ψεύδους τί ἀληθεύσει; = *of the false what can be true?* Thus, perhaps, but not of necessity, Xen. Anab. vii. 7. 25, πιστευθεὶς ἀληθεύσειν ἃ ἔλεγες, and in Aristotle (see Wahl, *Clavis Apocr.* s.v.), λόγοι ἀληθεύουσι.—(II.) Transitively = to make true, only in Isa. xlv. 26, ἰστών ῥῆμα παιδὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν βουλὴν τῶν ἀγγέλων ἀληθεύων = עָשָׂה, Hiphil. Gen. xx. 16 may likewise be thus construed.

Page 84, line 6, after "appear," insert "or is claimed."

Page 84, line 14, after "to be," insert—"1 Pet. v. 12, ἐπιμαρτυρῶν ταύτην εἶναι ἀληθὴ χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς ἣν ἐστήκατε, 'that that wherein you have come to stand is what you believe it to be, the "actual grace of God,"' not in contrast to error, but for confidence in the face of all that militated against this certainty, in the sufferings that

had come upon the readers. Ἀλ. χάριν being the predicate, has no article; cf. Krüger, § 61. 7. 1; 50. 11. 19; 51. 7. 4; Kühner, § 465. 4. 6a; 461a. 3; 369. Ia (see Hofmann against Huther)."

Page 86, line 1, *after* "ἀληθινόν," *insert*—"John xv. 1, ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ ἄμπελος ἡ ἀληθινή; cf. ver. 2, πᾶν κλήμα ἐν ἐμοὶ μὴ φέρον καρπὸν, with Jer. ii. 21, ἐγὼ δὲ ἐφυτευσά σε ἄμπελον καρποφόρον πᾶσαν ἀληθινήν. The latter passage shows clearly the force of the ἀληθ. in this connection, so that all explanations which find here a reference to the relation between type and archetype, whether between Christ and Israel or between Christ and the natural vine, are mistaken."

Page 86, line 12, *after* "possession," *insert* "the real good, whereas mammon deceives."

Page 86, line 16 from bottom, *for* "further" read "(I)."

Page 87, line 18, *after* "denote," *insert* "(II)."

Page 88, line 2, *after* "sense also," read "(III) in N. T. usage."

Page 89, line 10 from bottom, *after* "τὰ ἔθνη," read "cf. Isa. xxiv. 5, παρέβησαν τὸν νόμον καὶ ἥλλαξαν τὰ προστάγματα κυρίου = ἡῖν."

Page 90, line 1, *after* "Heb. i. 12," *insert* "cf. Ps. cii. 27 = ἡῖν. Jer. xiii. 23, εἰ ἀλλάξεται Αἰθίοψ τὸ δέρμα αὐτοῦ κ.τ.λ. = ἡῖν."

Page 90, line 4, *after* "Ex. xiii. 13," *insert* "Lev. xxvii. 10, 33."

Page 90, line 7, *after* "barter," *insert* "3 Macc. ii. 33; Ecclus. xlvi. 12, ἀντικαταλλάσσω."

Page 90, line 8, *after* "bartered," *insert* "1 Kings xxi. 2, δώσω σοι ἀργύριον ἀντάλλ. ἀμπελώνος σου τούτου (B. ἄλλαγμα.); Job xxviii. 15 = ἡῖν, which is elsewhere = ἄλλαγμα."

Page 90, line 13, *after* κατακλυσμός, *for* "In" read "Here the sense is different from that in."

Page 90, line 14, *before* "like," *insert* "where."

Page 90, line 17 from bottom, *after* "relation," *insert* "LXX. = רח, Hiphil, to do away; Job ix. 34; Jer. xxxii. 31, to give up, to remove; Job xxvii. 5, xxxiv. 5 = רח, Hiphil, to turn away, to hide."

Page 90, line 13 from bottom, *after* "δουλείας," *insert* "Here the genitive δουλείας is evidently to be taken, not with ἀπαλλ., but with ἔνοχοι."

Page 91, line 4, *after* "alteration," *insert* "between several objects."

Page 91, line 9, *after* "στασιάζουσιν," *insert*—"The accusative denotes the person who is to be won or changed, the dative denotes him in whose behalf the reconciliation is to be effected."

Page 91, line 15, *after* "ἀπαλλάσσω," *insert*—"See further, Fritzsche on Rom. v. 10, against the assertion of Tittmann (*De Synon. N. T.* p. 102), that διαλλάσσω is used in cases of mutual hostility, and καταλλάσσω when the hostility is on one side only. Both words are found in both cases, only that καταλ. is more frequent in later Greek, and differs from διαλλ. only in this, that in the same construction the accusative may denote either of the parties."

Page 91, line 18, *after* "exchange," *insert* "Jer. xlviii. 39."

Page 92, line 19, *after* "24," *insert*—"or, as Hofmann admirably says on Rom. v. 10, 'The restoration into a relation to God, wherein we have no more against us towards Him, not the restoration into a bearing towards Him wherein we are no more against Him.' When, however, Hofmann understands Rom. v. 10 of the reconciliation accomplished by Christ's death, but 2 Cor. v. 18, 19 of the reconciliation or conversion gradually coming to pass or accomplished by the apostle, this reconciliation being viewed as a change of relation, not of conduct, towards God, the *καταλλάγητε τῷ θεῷ* of ver. 20 does not sanction this (for compare Acts ii. 40, *σώθητε*), and the imperfect *ἦν* in ver. 19 tells entirely against it. It would be impossible to have described that by the imperfect which was not only going on gradually, but was only an object not yet realized at the time indicated by the *θέμενος ἐν ἡμῖν κ.τ.λ.* The fact that God would reconcile the world to Himself, *i.e.* would convert it, could not be expressed by *ἦν καταλλάσσων*."

Page 93, line 21 from bottom, *after* "affected," *insert* "exchange, permutation (Isa. ix. 4, the only instance in the LXX.)."

Page 95, line 12 from bottom, *after* "ver. 7," *insert* "Joseph. *Ant.* iv. 1. 1, vii. 9. 2."

Page 95, line 4 from bottom, *after* "found," *insert*—"Thus the word occurs in Joseph. *Ant.* xi. 5. 4, *γενομένου δὲ κηρύγματος ὥστε πάντας τοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς αἰχμαλωσίας συνελθεῖν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα, ὡς τῶν ἐν δυσὶν ἢ τρισὶν ἡμέραις οὐκ ἀπαντησάντων ἀπαλλοτριωθησομένων τοῦ πλήθους καὶ τῆς οὐσίας αὐτῶν κατὰ τὴν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων κρίσιν ἀφιερωθησομένης, συνῆλθον οἱ ἐκ τῆς Ἰουδα φυλῆς καὶ Βενιαμίτιδος ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις.* With this we may compare its use in Polyb. i. 79. 6, *ἡ Σαρδῶ . . . ἀπηλλοτριώθη Καρχήδονος*; i. 82. 7. Cf. Dem. *pro Cor.* 88 (255), *τίς ὁ κωλύσας τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον ἀλλοτριωθῆναι* ;"

Page 98, line 1, *after* "and," *insert* "the root *μερ*, as it appears in *μέρος, μοῖρα*."

Page 98, line 10 from bottom, *after* "ἀμαρτάνοντες," *insert* "Here it denotes a missing of the mark as distinct from a losing of the way."

Page 99, line 7 from bottom, *for* "in possession of," *read* "within;" and *after* "the law," *add*—"i.e. fenced in by the law, not=in possession of a law, for what is aimed at is the more accurate defining not of the subject, but of the predicate, and to specify the sphere within which the action spoken of takes place (against Meyer)."

Ἀμαρτάνω. As distinguished from *ἀμαρτάνειν*, *κωπ* is a thoroughly religious conception, and designates the religious character of moral conduct, whereas *ἀμαρτάνειν* is not a distinctly religious conception at all. In the profane sphere, the religious estimate of conduct occurs within a very limited range, because the judgment which in Scripture affects all conduct is applied in the profane sphere only to cases wherein the person transgresses the standard with high hand, and with rebellious mind presumes arrogantly to despise the gods; see *ὑβρις*. How decisively the religious estimate of conduct peculiar to the O. T. qualifies the conception is manifest from the N. T., and from

Paul, who stands as the champion of this fundamental O. T. view, and of the result of O. T. teaching. Why Ἀμαρτάνειν, the weakest word in the profane sphere, is chosen in biblical and especially in N. T. Greek,—seemingly in contrast with the case of other words where the opposite phenomenon appears, *e.g.* ἅγιος, μακάριος,—is not to be explained so much from the kinship of the primary thought contained in אָפּטוּ and ἀμαρτάνειν, but from the energy wherewith the religion of the Bible asserts its moral and religious judgment. As this very word, which of itself contains the most lax and easy condemnation, is chosen, the hearer was obliged to supply the judgment (in all its strength) of the religion of the Bible and Christian preaching, and to adopt a depth of meaning such as he had not been wont to regard as expressed by ἀμαρτάνειν, and the result was that the terms for sin, which before were stronger, such as wrong, evil, wickedness, became comparatively weak, and retired behind the conception *sin*. One speaks much rather now of wrong, evil, etc., than of the condemnation of oneself or others which lies in the word *sin*.

Page 100, line 14 from bottom, after “ἢγ,” add “sometimes נֶחֱמָה, מִצִּיט.”

Page 100, line 8 from bottom, for “is not,” etc., read “is not to the concept *sin* in itself, but to the entire contents of sin, to all that is sin. Cf. Kühner, § 461. 1; Krüger, § 50. 3. 3.”

Page 101, line 16 from top, after “no sin,” insert “who had nothing to do with sin.”

Page 101, line 24 from top, instead of “Ἀμαρτία . . . 25,” read—“It is at least probable that ἀμαρτία is in one place = *sin-offering*, Lev. vi. 18, תַּחֲבִיחַ הַחֵטִּיִּת תֹּאכֶל, οὗτος ὁ νόμος τῆς ἀμαρτίας. For while this is in vv. 10, 18, designated τὸ τῆς ἀμαρτίας, which clearly answers to the τό or τὰ περὶ τῆς ἀμαρτίας in ver. 23, the feminines αὐτήν, αὐτῆς in vv. 19, 20 refer to ἡ ἄμ. in ver. 18, and thus seem to warrant the signification *sin-offering*.”

Ἀμαρτωλός, Aristot. *Eth. Nicom.* ii. 9, τὸ μὲν ἐστὶν ἀμαρτωλότερον τὸ δ' ἦττον; Plut. *Mor.* 25 C, πάντως μὲν ἐν πᾶσιν ἀμαρτωλὸν εἶναι τὸν ἀμαθῆ, περὶ πάντα δ' οὐ κατορθεῖν τὸν ἀστέιον.—It cannot be proved (as Grimm thinks) from 1 Macc. i. 34, ii. 48, 62, Tobit xiii. 6, that among the Jews ἀμαρτωλοί was a name for the ἔθνη, as if thus we were to explain Matt. xxvi. 45 and parallels, and Gal. ii. 15. In Gal. ii. 15, as Hofmann remarks, we have ἐξ ἔθνων denoting race or origin; but it is not their origin that makes them sinners, their origin or race is a distinct designation side by side with ἀμαρτωλοί.

Ἀναμάρτητος, one who has not been guilty, has not erred, but not absolutely, only in a particular case; cf. Herod. v. 39. 2, ἔχει γυναῖκα ἐοῦσαν ἀναμάρτητον ἐαντῷ. Xen. *Ages.* x. 4, ἀφικόμενος ἐπὶ τὸ μῆκιστον ἀνθρωπίνου αἰῶνος ἀναμάρτητος ἐτελεύτησε καὶ περὶ τούτους ὧν ἡγήετο καὶ πρὸς ἐκείνους οἷς ἐπολέμει. Thus perhaps in John viii. 7, ὁ ἀναμάρτητος ὑμῶν. Without this reference, and not confined to the moral sphere = one who has not failed or erred, Xen. *Hell.* vi. 3. 10, ὁρῶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων οὐδένα ἀναμάρτητον διατελοῦντα. Very rarely = without error, infallible (in Plato). In a directly ethical sense, Diog. Laert. vii. 122, ἔτι καὶ ἀναμαρτήτους (εἶναι τοὺς σοφοὺς) τῷ ἀπεριπτώτους

εἶναι ἀμαρτήματι. So often in Epictetus. But not until we come to patristic Greek do we find it=sinlessness in the Christian sense, i.e. perfect holiness. See Ullmann, *The Sinlessness of Jesus*, p. 81.

Page 103, line 16 from top, after "295 ff.," read—"This is true notwithstanding the remark of Weiss that the representation of Christ as the Paschal Lamb occurred first *ex eventu*, and arose from the circumstance that Christ was crucified on the day of the sacrifice of the paschal lamb. Any adequate perception of the national life of Israel, so penetrated by its cultus, or of the currency of the expressions borrowed therefrom or referring thereto, must pronounce this circumstance as insufficient to warrant his pronouncing the reference of John's expression (John i. 29) to the paschal lamb 'quite inadmissible.'"

Page 103, line 23 from top, after "thought," insert—"including as it does the idea of sacrifice. As to the difference between this designation of Christ in the Revelation from that in John i. 29, see ἀρνίον; see also αἶρω."

Page 103, line 25 from top, after "9, etc.," omit to "בִּשָּׁר," and read—"In the LXX. usually for אָדָם, which is rarely rendered otherwise; side by side with ἀνὴρ for אָדָם, אֱנוֹשׁ, also נָכָר, twice for בִּשָּׁר or בִּשְׂרָא (Gen. vi. 13; Job xii. 10); occasionally also for נָשׁ, עָבָר, עָם."

Page 104, line 13 from top, after "σάρξ," insert—"it does not, like σάρξ, include the idea of a sinful bias. Hofmann (on 2 Cor. iv. 16) says, 'What man can conceive of, apart from himself, being the instrument his inner life uses, constitutes *his outer man*.'"

Page 105, line 6 from top, after "Intelligence," insert "cf. the exposition of the Philonic Anthropology in Siegfried, *Philo. v. Alex. als Ausleger des A. T.* p. 235."

Page 105, line 19, after "naturally," insert "'a generic designation of human nature in its sinful degeneracy' (v. Oettingen, *Christl. Sittenlehre*, p. 393)."

Page 105, line 4 from bottom, *dele.* "syn. ἀμαρτωλός."

Page 105, line 2 from bottom, after "Matt. xxvi. 45," insert—"We cannot, however, say that ἄνθρ. is in these places synonymous with ἀμαρτωλός, because the expression is clearly intended to bring out to view very strongly the strangeness of the fact stated. Cf. also 2 Sam. xxiv. 14, πλὴν ἐμπεσοῦμαι εἰς τὰς χεῖρας τοῦ κυρίου, ὅτι πολλοὶ οἰκτιρμοὶ αὐτοῦ σφόδρα, καὶ εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπων οὐ μὴ ἐμπέσω. Isa. xix. 4, παραδώσω τὴν Αἴγυπτον εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπων κυρίων σκληρῶν. See also Matt. x. 17; Gal. i. 10, 11; Eph. iv. 14; Col. ii. 8, 22."

Ἀνθρώπινος. Cf. Aristotle, *Pol.* iii. 15, χαλεπὸν καὶ μείζονος ἀρετῆς ἢ κατ' ἀνθρωπίνην φύσιν. *Pol.* iii. 131 (in Sturz, *lex. Xen. s.v. ἀνθρώπινος*), the ἀνθρώπινον standing over against that which cannot be borne, ὁ οὐκ ἂν τις ὑπομένειεν, δ οὐκ ἂν τις ἐνέγκῃ,—τὸ δὲ ἐναντίον κουφόν, εὐφορον, οἷστόν, ἀνθρώπινον, ἀνεκτόν. Soph. *Oed. Col.* 598, τί γὰρ τὸ μείζον ἢ κατ' ἀνθρωπον νοσεῖς; It is clear from ver. 13b that it does not mean a temptation such as human nature brings with it, nor does it qualify the temptation as to its origin. It cannot therefore be compared with Plut.

Consol. ad Apollon. 118 C, τὰ κοινὰ τοῦ βίου συμπτώματα κοινῶς φέρειν καὶ τὰ ἀνθρώπινα ἀνθρωπίνως.—We have the same reference probably in Acts xvii. 25, οὐδὲ ὑπὸ χειρῶν ἀνθρωπίνων θεραπεύεται.—Differently in Jas. iii. 7, φύσις ἀνθρωπίνη, in contrast with φύσις θηρίων. 1 Pet. ii. 13, ὑποτάγητε πάσῃ ἀνθρωπίνῃ κτίσει.

Ἀνθρωποκτόνος, ὁ, ἡ, *manslaying*, Eurip. *Iph. Taur.* 389, but in *Cycl.* 127, βορᾶ χαίρουσιν ἀνθρωποκτόνῳ, it is taken in a passive sense, *prey or food of murdered men*; cf. 126, which, however, does not seem necessary. Cf. ἀνθρωποκτονεῖν, Eurip. *Hec.* 260. Elsewhere the adjective appears, Plut. *De fluv. et mont. nom.* 1165 A, χρησμὸς ἀνθρ., *oraculum quod de homine mactando monet*. Cf. ἀνθρωποκτονεῖν τοῖς δαίμοσιν in Gregory Naz. — In the N. T. 1 John iii. 15, πᾶς ὁ μισῶν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ ἀνθρωποκτόνος ἐστίν, καὶ οἶδατε ὅτι πᾶς ἀνθρωποκτόνος οὐκ ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον κ.τ.λ. (cf. ver. 12), and John viii. 44 of the devil, ἀνθρωποκτόνος ἦν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς; cf. ver. 40. The word is manifestly chosen on account of the special emphasis which lies in it.

Φιλανθρωπία, ἡ, *human friendship*, denotes that prompt and ready goodwill usually manifest in a friendly, considerate demeanour (opposed to σεμνότης and ὠμότης, dignified, exalted pride, and repellent harshness), and specially in the practice of hospitality, in readiness to help, in tender-heartedness, cherishing and maintaining fellowship. It is simply a transference of the conception when it is predicated of animals which readily attach themselves to men, and when insinuating melodies are described as φιλάνθρωποι, or when the bur is called ἡ φιλάνθρωπος, yet this transference illustrates the idea contained in the word. Φιλανθρωπία is that disposition which cannot always think of self, but must take thought for others, their needs and their wishes. The φιλάνθρωπος serves his fellow-citizens, protects the oppressed, is mindful of the erring, gentle to the conquered, and self-renouncing in reference to his rights; cf. Xen. *Cyrop.* vii. 5. 73, νόμος γὰρ ἐν πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις αἰδιός ἐστιν, ὅταν πολεμούντων πόλις ἀλφ, τῶν ἐλόντων εἶναι καὶ τὰ σώματα τῶν ἐν τῇ πόλει καὶ τὰ χρήματα. οὐκ οὐκ ἀδικία γε ἔξετε ὅ, τι ἂν ἔχητε, ἀλλὰ φιλανθρωπία οὐκ ἀφαιρήσεσθε, ἣν τι ἔατε ἔχειν αὐτούς. Philanthropy was specially characteristic of Athens, not only of Athenian manners, but of Athenian laws, e.g. the law that during the days of the Dionysi no lawsuits should be prosecuted, Dem. xxi. 12, ὑμεῖς μὲν τοίνυν ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι πάντες εἰς τοσοῦτον ἀφίχθε φιλανθρωπίας καὶ εὐσεβείας ὥστε καὶ τῶν πρότερον γεγεννημένων ἀδικημάτων τὸ λαμβάνειν δίκην ἐπέσχετε ταύτας τὰς ἡμέρας. Xenophon represents the elder Cyrus as an ideal of this, *Cyrop.* viii. 7. 6 sqq.; cf. viii. 4. 8, ἐπιδείκνυμαι τὰ ἔργα πολὺ ἡδίων φιλανθρωπίας ἢ στρατηγίας, ὅτι τὰ μὲν κακῶς ποιοῦντα ἀνθρώπους δεῖ ἐπιδείκνυσθαι, τὰ δὲ εὖ; cf. 3 Macc. iii. 15, ἡγησάμεθα μὴ βία δόρατος, ἐπιεικεία δὲ καὶ πολλῇ φιλανθρωπίᾳ τιθνηήσασθαι τὰ κατοικοῦντα . . . ἔθνη εὐποιήσασθαι τε ἀσμένως. How highly it was prized is evident from Plato, *Legg.* iv. 713 D. Plato recognises truth in the myth that attributes a divine origin to princes, because men would reign with ὕβρις and ἀδικία, but ὁ θεὸς φιλάνθρωπος ὢν τὸ γένος ἄμεινον ἡμῶν ἐφίστη τὸ τῶν δαιμόνων ὃ διὰ πολλῆς μὲν

αὐτοῖς ῥαστώνης, πολλῆς δ' ἡμῖν ἐπιμελούμενον ἡμῶν εἰρήνην τε καὶ αἰδῶ καὶ ἐλευθερίαν καὶ ἀφθονίαν δίκης παρεχόμενον ἀστασίαστα καὶ εὐδαίμονα τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀπειργάζετο γένη. In *Conn.* 189 D, he calls Eros θεῶν φιλανθρωπότατος. While the exercise of philanthropy towards those who need protection and help shows that its direction is usually from those above to those below, there is no lack of evidence that it belongs to man as man; witness Aristotle, *Eth. Nicom.* ix. 1, φύσει ἐνυπάρχειν ἔοικε πρὸς τὸ γεγεννημένον τῷ γεννήσαντι . . . καὶ τοῖς ὁμοέθεσιν πρὸς ἄλληλα καὶ μάλιστα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, ὅθεν τοὺς φιλανθρώπους ἐπαινοῦμεν ἴδοι δ' ἂν τις καὶ ἐν ταῖς πλάναις ὡς οἰκεῖον ἅπας ἄνθρωπος ἀνθρώπῳ καὶ φίλῳ. Cf. Stob. Floril. xxxvii. 32. Philanthropy embraces "the promptings and acts of δικαιοσύνη in truth and faithfulness, in friendship and gratitude, in piety and pity;" cf. Nägelsbach, *Nach homer. Theol.* v. 2. 39 sqq. Schmidt, *Ethik der alten Griechen*, ii. 275 sqq. The word occurs as synonymous and side by side with εὐνοία, χρηστότης, πραότης. Still it does not exclude revenge and hatred; cf. Soph. *Ant.* 641, τούτου γὰρ οὐνεκ' ἄνδρες εὗχονται γονὰς κατηκούς φύσαντες ἐν δόμοις ἔχειν, ὡς καὶ τὸν ἐχθρὸν ἀνταμύνονται κακοῖς καὶ τὸν φίλον τιμῶσιν ἐξ ἴσου πατρί. Eurip. *Fr.* 927, ἐχθρὸν κακῶς δρᾶν ἀνδρὸς ἡγοῦμαι μέρος. Xen. *Cyrop.* i. 4. 25. ἄνδρα ἔσεσθαι ἱκανὸν καὶ φίλους ὠφελεῖν καὶ ἐχθροὺς ἀνιάειν. *Ibid.* viii. 7. 28. "The man and the citizen are so little considered in the enemy, that one surrenders all moral considerations, and spares the belongings of the enemy as little as himself, Nägelsbach, p. 249. Nor does φιλανθρωπία lead to the entire abolition of slavery, it does not lessen the aristocratic bias of the antique way of looking at things, nor even moralize on the position of the wife. It is the sign of civilisation, Diod. Sic. xvii. 50, χώρα ἐστερημένη πάσης φιλανθρωπίας, manifests itself in friendly and fashionable intercourse, becomes insincere even to what the N. T. calls men-pleasing, and at last becomes the word to designate unchaste intercourse of youths with men, Aeschin. i. 171.

It cannot therefore be wondered at that the word, in spite of its primary noble meaning, is quite foreign to biblical Greek. The LXX. do not use it, the N. T. has the substantive only in Acts xxviii. 2, Titus iii. 4, and the adverb φιλανθρώπως in Acts xxvii. 3. Philanthropy occurs neither in the list of Israelitish nor in that of Christian virtues. This is explained by the fact that in the O. T. the conception of righteousness is so deep and all-embracing, and in the N. T. ἀγάπη and φιλαδελφία occupy the place of social righteousness, and the great difference between them and φιλανθρωπία is obvious. In a few places in the Apocrypha the adjective φιλάνθρωπος occurs, and the substantive oftener; the adverb φιλανθρώπως and the verb φιλανθρωπεῖν once each. The employment of the word in the Book of Wisdom is characteristic, Wisd. i. 6, φιλάνθρωπον γὰρ πνεῦμα σοφίας; vii. 22, ἔστι γὰρ ἐν αὐτῇ (sc. σοφία) πνεῦμα . . . φιλάγαθον, ὀξύ, ἀκώλυτον, εὐεργετικόν, φιλάνθρωπον; xii. 18, σὺ δὲ δεσπόζων ἰσχύος ἐν ἐπιεικείᾳ κρίνεις καὶ μετὰ πολλῆς φειδοῦς διοικεῖς ἡμᾶς; cf. ver. 19, ἐδίδαξας δέ σου τὸν λαὸν διὰ τῶν τοιούτων ἔργων, ὅτι δεῖ τὸν δίκαιον εἶναι φιλάνθρωπον. This is not a deepening of the profane meaning, but is akin with the weakening of the recognition of

God in Israel indicated in *πρόνοια* and *πατήρ*. In 1 Esdr. and 2 Macc. *φιλόανθρωπος* and *φιλανθρωπεῖν* are used as in profane Greek, 1 Esdr. viii. 10, τὰ φιλόανθρωπα ἐγὼ κρίνας, in proof of the royal grace of Artaxerxes. 2 Macc. iv. 11, τὰ κείμενα τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις φιλόανθρωπα βασιλικά . . . παρώσατο; xiii. 23, ἐτίμησε τὸν νεὼν καὶ τὸν τόπον ἐφιλανθρώπησε. The substantive, 2 Macc. vi. 22, ἵνα . . . διὰ τὴν ἀρχαίαν πρὸς αὐτοὺς φιλίαν τύχη φιλανθρωπίας = *forbearance*; xiv. 9, τῆς χώρας προνοήθητι καθ' ἣν ἔχεις πρὸς ἅπαντας εὐαπάντητον. 3 Macc. iii. 15, 18. The adverb in 2 Macc. ix. 27, ἐπεικῶς καὶ φιλανθρώπως.

In the N. T., while there is nothing peculiar in the use of the word in Acts xxviii. 2, οἱ δὲ βάρβαροι παρείχαν οὐ τὴν τυχοῦσαν φιλανθρωπίαν ἡμῖν (of their hospitable reception of the shipwrecked), and xxvii. 3, φιλανθρώπως τε ὁ Ἰούλιος τῷ Παύλῳ (of the humane treatment of Paul), Titus iii. 4 appears as quite beyond the range of scriptural expression, ὅτε δὲ ἡ χρηστότης καὶ ἡ φιλανθρωπία ἐπεφάνη τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ κ.τ.λ. This is in keeping with the peculiarity of the pastoral Epistles, whose phraseology, more than any other N. T. book, is studded with the current expressions of profane Greek; see *καλός*, *σωτήρ*, *εὐσέβεια*. Still it is evident that the philanthropy of the Deity, as spoken of in the profane sphere, is not different from that here designated as the behaviour of God manifest in appointing to salvation, through baptism, the persons described in vv. 1, 2. The word here includes what it does not mean elsewhere, and is not, as in Wisd. xii. 18, 19, a weakening of the Scripture view; cf. vv. 5–7. God's kindness is here described by a word which answers to the character of the readers as described in vv. 1, 2, giving that description its due import. This accounts for the singular choice of the expression, which has hence passed into patristic Greek, where it is frequently found.

Ἄνωθεν. Always (1) of space in the LXX. = *ἔνω*, *ἔνωθεν*, *ἡνωθεν*, *ἡνωθεν*. Answering to the use of *ἄνω* it is equivalent to *ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*, with prevailing reference to the distance between heaven and earth, the sublime height of heaven above the earth; cf. Job iii. 4, xxxi. 2, 28; Ps. ciii. 11. So in John iii. 31, ὁ ἄνωθεν ἐρχόμενος, over against ὁ ὢν ἐκ τῆς γῆς. John xix. 11; Jas. i. 17, ἄνωθεν ἐστὶν καταβαῖνον ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς τῶν φώτων. Cf. Xen. *Conv.* vi. 7, θεοὶ ἄνωθεν φῶς παρέχουσιν. Jas. iii. 15, 17, ἡ ἄνωθεν σοφία. — (2) Of time (a) in general, from the commencement, from formerly, from of old, e.g. in designating *progenitors*, Aristotle, *Hist. Animal.* vii. 6, εὐκότες τοῖς γεννήσασιν ἢ τοῖς ἄνωθεν γονεῦσιν. Cf. Plato, *Tim.* 18 D. Also simply οἱ ἄνωθεν, *ancestors* = οἱ πρόγονοι, likewise in Aristotle. *App. civ.* 5. 39, ἡ ἄνωθεν ἐλευθερία τε καὶ δημοκρατία. So in Acts xxvi. 4, 5, τὴν μὲν οὖν βιωσίν μου τὴν ἐκ νεότητος τὴν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς γενομένην . . . ἴσασι πάντες οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι προγινώσκοντές με ἄνωθεν. But (b) more definitely, *over again, afresh, from the outset on*; thus frequently in the combinations, ἄνωθεν ἀρχεσθαι in a narrative or train of thought, etc., often in Plato, Dem., Plut., e.g. Plut. *Mar.* xlv. 5, ἱστορεῖ τὸν Μάριον . . . ἐν λόγοις γενέσθαι περὶ τῶν καθ' ἑαυτὸν πραγμάτων ἄνωθεν ἀρξάμενον. Dem. xxi. 160, ἐγὼ καὶ τοῦτο διδάξω, ἄνωθεν δέ βραχύς

γὰρ ἔστ' ὁ λόγος ὃν λέξω. So Luke i. 3, παρακολουθεῖν ἄνωθεν. It may (c) include a reference to the beginning, and the idea of a going back to the starting-point, so that (like the German *von vorn*), as distinct from ἐξ ἀρχῆς, the thought of *repetition* is included; yet without making ἄνωθεν merely = πάλιν. Thus, e.g. Dem. xxi. 77, βούλομαι δὴ καὶ περὶ ταύτης ὑμῖν ἐξ ἀρχῆς εἰπεῖν καὶ διηγήσασθαι . . . ἔστι δὲ περὶ αὐτῶν βραχύς ὁ λόγος κἂν ἄνωθεν ἄρχεσθαι δοκῶ. Josephus, *Ant.* i. 18. 3, δέσας μὴ τῆς προτέρας αὐτῷ φιλίας μηδὲν ὄφελος γένηται . . . φιλίαν ἄνωθεν ποιεῖται πρὸς αὐτόν. So Gal. iv. 9, πάλιν ἄνωθεν δουλεύειν, where πάλιν denotes generally a repetition, which is further defined by ἄνωθεν as a repetition of the beginning = *again from the outset on*. So Wisd. xix. 6, ὅλη ἡ κτίσις ἐν ἰδίῳ γένει πάλιν ἄνωθεν διετυποῦντο. When πάλιν is not used, the stress is more upon the return to the very beginning. Here now also we must place John iii. 3, 7, ἄνωθεν γεννηθῆναι; compare δεύτερον in ver. 4. Stob. *Florileg.* cxxiv. 41, πεττεία τινὲ ἔοικεν ὁ βίος, καὶ δεῖ ὥσπερ ψῆφόν τινα τίθεσθαι τὸ συμβαίνειν· οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν ἄνωθεν βαλεῖν, οὐδὲ ἀναθέσθαι τὴν ψῆφον. In opposition to the exposition espoused by Origen, Ulfilas, Bengel, Meyer, and others, *from above*, *coelitus*, cf. ver. 12, where by τὰ ἐπουράνια are meant what is different from this ἄνωθεν γεννηθῆναι, which rather belongs to the ἐπίγεια. This is decisive also against the consideration that John elsewhere always speaks of the new birth as a birth from God (i. 13; 1 John ii. 29, iii. 9, iv. 7, v. 1), an objection which certainly is of more weight than that ἄνωθεν elsewhere is used by John (three times!) in its *local* sense (Lücke, Meyer, and others). Wetstein, and after him Tholuck, whom Grimm follows, compare Artemidor, *Oneirocrit.* i. 14, "he who has a pregnant wife, and dreams that he is being born of a woman, to whom it seems παῖδα αὐτῷ γεννήσεσθαι ὅμοιον κατὰ πάντα· οὕτω γὰρ ἄνωθεν αὐτὸς δόξειε γεννᾶσθαι."

Ἄπλοῦς. Cf. Xen. *Mem.* iii. 1. 6, where ἀπλοῦς and ἐπίβουλος are contrasted, as in Theophr. *Char. eth.* i. 3, τὰ δὲ τῶν ἡθῶν μὴ ἀπλᾶ, ἀλλ' ἐπίβουλα φυλάττεσθαι δεῖ.— In Prov. xi. 25, ψυχὴ ἡὺλογημένη πᾶσα ἀπλῇ, ἀνὴρ δὲ θυμώδης οὐκ εὐσχήμων, ἀπλ. stands in antithesis with οὐκ εὐσχήμων, and therefore in contrast with disfigurement; here it denotes perfect undisturbed well-being (cf. ἀπλ. in antithesis with *πονηρός*), so we do not need the conjectured ἀπαλή or the like; Schleusner's view, based on 2 Cor. viii. 8, gives a good sense. It is a free, but by no means inappropriate, translation of the text $\text{נְשִׁיחָהּ הַבְּרִיָּה שְׂפָרָה}$, which, however, is quite different in the parallel member. Prov. x. 9, $\text{ὅς πορεύεται ἀπλῶς, πορεύεται πεποιθῶς}$ $\text{כַּבֵּץ הָיָה מִיָּדָהּ}$.

Ἀρά. In the Hebrew, נֶפֶשׁ is the more general concept, and signifies *oath*, generally that which is sworn or sworn to, Gen. xxiv. 41, xxvi. 28; 1 Kings viii. 31; and therefore used of a covenant sworn to, *synon.* and parallel with *διαθήκη*, Deut. xxix. 12, 14 (cf. ver. 27). In a derived sense first in Ezek. xvii. 13, 16, for the malediction involved in the oath, especially in the old form of conjuring the accused;—*curse*, cf. Gen. xxiv. 41, and especially Num. v. 20, 21, 23, 27; so Num. v. 20, ὅρκοι

τῆς ἀρᾶς ταύτης, Ps. x. 7. But אָרַב denotes only *the imprecation, abuse, cursing*. — In the N. T. ἀρά occurs only in Rom. iii. 14, ὃν τὸ στόμα ἀρᾶς καὶ πικρίας γέμει (from Ps. x. 7) = *cursing*.

Κατάρρα. In 2 Cor. v. 21, ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν Χριστὸν ἀμαρτίαν ἐποίησεν cannot be taken as equivalent to ἀμαρτωλὸν ἐποίησεν. No more in Gal. iii. 13 can κατάρρα be confounded with κεκατηραμένος or ἐπικατάρατος. What is to be noted is not so much the omission of the θεοῦ (which occurs in the text quoted, Deut. xxi. 23), but the use of the abstract word. This renders possible the retaining of a very fine limitation, indicated not by the expression itself, but by Him to whom it is applied. Δίκαιοι or δεδικαιωμένοι might have been employed, as for example, in 2 Cor. v. 21, ἵνα ἡμεῖς γενόμεθα δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ, were it not that thus the thought to be conveyed would be weakened. As to the metonymy of the abstract for the concrete, and the question how far the abstract may be rendered by the concrete, this must be decided according to the subject-matter in each case. — Καταράομαι, *to wish any one evil, or curse* from God. With God as the subject, *to decree judgment or ruin*. This is the usual word in the LXX. for אָרַב and אָרַב, and together with ἀράομαι and ἐπικατ. for אָרַב. In Job iii. 5 = אָרַב; in Num. xxiii. 8 = אָרַב.

Ἀρέσχω, from the root *ar*, like ἀραρίσκω, ἄρθρον, ἀρτύω, ἀριθμός, ἀρετή, and other words; see Curtius 339, "The various meanings grow out of the simple idea *to join*, taken transitively, and involving the notion of close union, but not excluding the idea of closeness (Latin, *artus*) and distress (Gothic, *arms*, ἄλγεινός), nor the figurative signification of *pleasing* or *obliging*, which is found also in the German 'zusammen fallen' (compare *convenit*). We see the transfer in the Homeric ἄρσαντες κατὰ θυμόν, *Il.* i. 136; ἐνὶ φρεσὶν ἤραρεν ἡμῖν, *Od.* iv. 777. The fundamental meaning of the root could hardly have been anything else than 'movement towards.' In most applications of it this is regarded as a movement tending to the attainment of the goal in view."

Ἀρέσχω is an iterative form of the root; fut. ἀρέσω, aor. ἤρεσα (perf. ἀρήσεκα, pass. ἤρεσμαι, not in biblical Greek) (I.), originally with the acc. of the person, "*to make one inclined to, content with*," especially in the middle, "*to make oneself inclined to one*," "*to soften one's heart towards one*;" in Homer, Hesiod, also still in Aeschines, once in Xen. *Mem.* iv. 3. 16, ὅταν τις αὐτὸν ἐπερωτᾷ πῶς ἂν τοῖς θεοῖς χαρίζοιτο, ἀποκρίνεται Νόμφη πόλεως. νόμφη δὲ δήπου πανταχοῦ ἐστὶ κατὰ δύναμιν ἱεροῖς θεοῖς ἀρέσκεσθαι. Hence the passive = *to be satisfied*, τινί with something, equivalent to "*to be pleased on account of*," often in Herodotus and Thuc. Then conversely as a later stage, (II.) the active with the dative of the person, ἀρέσκειν τινί, *to please one*; thus usually in Attic prose. So also in biblical Greek; in the LXX. = אָרַב, אָרַב, אָרַב, and other words, without becoming specially marked as a synonym. The combination ἐναντίον, ἐνώπιον, ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς τινός, answering to the Hebrew אָרַב, אָרַב, is peculiar, which we have almost as frequently as the dative;

cf. Gen. xxxiv. 18, xli. 37; Num. xxxvi. 6; Deut. i. 23; Judg. x. 14; 1 Sam. xviii. 5; 2 Sam. iii. 19, 36, xviii. 4; 1 Kings iii. 10, and often. Both constructions also appear in the Apocrypha, ἐναντ. or ἐνώπ., Judith vii. 16, xi. 20, viii. 21. On the other hand, only once in the N. T. Acts vi. 5; elsewhere always with the dative, Matt. xiv. 6; Mark vi. 22; Rom. viii. 8, xv. 1, 2, 3; 1 Cor. vii. 32, 33, 34; Gal. i. 10; 1 Thess. ii. 4, 15, iv. 1; 2 Tim. ii. 4. (III.) Peculiar to the N. T. is the passing of the signification *to please* into *to be pleasing*, i.e. its passing from a relationship to behaviour. We see how easy this transference is in 1 Thess. ii. 15, θεῷ μὴ ἀρεσκόντων καὶ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις ἐναντίων. This signification, which is not classed with the examples gathered by Wetstein (on Gal. i. 10, as opposed to Wieseler) as one usual also in the classics, is not to be explained in the passages in question (Rom. xv. 1-3; 1 Cor. x. 33; Gal. i. 10; 1 Thess. ii. 4) by the use of the present and imperfect to denote intentional, deliberate, and continuous conduct (Krüger, § 50. 1. 6; 2. 2; Kühner, § 382. 6; wrongly explained *de conatu*), for this has nothing to do with verbs denoting states or relationships. The true explanation lies in the primary and literal meaning of ἀρέσκω, never forgotten in linguistic usage, as equivalent to *to satisfy*, *to make content*, *to give satisfaction to*, *to comply with*, and this explains the combination with the accusative. Plato, *Crat.* 433 E, πότερός σε ὁ τρόπος ἀρέσκει; Legg. iii. 702 C, εἴ τινες (νόμοι) ἡμᾶς ἀρέσκουσιν. The essential import of the relation is further explained by the fact that ἀρέσκειν τῷ θεῷ, Rom. viii. 8, 1 Thess. ii. 15, iv. 1, τῷ κυρίῳ, 1 Cor. vii. 32 (very rarely in the O. T., Num. xxiii. 27; Ps. lxix. 32; Mal. iii. 4), does not denote, like the synonym δεκτός, a state of grace or of personal fellowship, but simply—cf. ἀρεστός—relating to God's judgment of man's conduct. We have the word with the accusative of the thing in 1 Cor. x. 33, πάντα πᾶσιν ἀρέσκω, not borrowed from a supposed usage in classical Greek = *to do something to please some one* (Fritzsche on Rom. xv. 1; Wieseler on Gal. i. 10), which is inferred from wrongly-read instances in the classics; πάντα here is simply an accusative more fully defining the verb, Kühner, § 410.

Ἀρεστός, *en*, dear, pleasant, well-pleasing; often in Herod., Xen., Plutarch, and later writers, but otherwise foreign to classical Greek. In combination with the dative, but in the LXX. far oftener with ἐναντί, ἐνώπιόν τινος (see ἀρέσκω), already rarer in the Apocrypha, Tobit iii. 6, iv. 21; once παρά τινι, Prov. xxi. 3; twice with the genitive, Jer. xvi. 12, xviii. 12; Bar. iv. 3, which, however, is explained as making a substantive of the verb. It answers to כִּי, Gen. xvi. 6; Deut. xii. 28; Isa. xxxviii. 3. To שֶׁנִּי, Ex. xv. 26; Deut. vi. 18, xii. 25, xiii. 18, xxi. 9. To שֶׁנִּי, Ezra x. 11, Neh. ix. 24, 37; and here and there to other expressions, e.g. הַיְהוָה, Gen. iii. 6. Usually it denotes *what is pleasing to God*, what God desires or recognises; cf. Bar. iv. 3, τὰ ἀρεστὰ τοῦ θεοῦ, Wisd. ix. 18; but τὸ ἀρεστὸν κυρίῳ, Ecclus. xlviii. 22. Absolutely τὸ ἀρεστὸν in antithesis with ἁμαρτία, Ecclus. xlviii. 16, τινὲς μὲν αὐτῶν ἐποίησαν τὸ ἀρεστὸν, τινὲς δὲ ἐπλήθυναν ἁμαρτίας; cf. Tobit iv. 21. Of God's acting, only in Judith

viii. 17. Of what pleases men, only Gen. iii. 6, xvi. 6; Tobit iv. 3; Jer. xvi. 12, τὰ ἀρ. τῆς καρδίας, as in xviii. 12. It is not used as an epithet of persons, save in Wisd. iv. 14, ἀρεστή γὰρ ἦν κυρίῳ ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ.

In the N. T. Acts xii. 3, ἀρ. τοῖς Ἰουδ., but elsewhere only of God's will, John viii. 29, τὰ ἀρεστὰ αὐτῷ ποιῶ. In 1 John iii. 22, τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ τηροῦμεν καὶ τὰ ἀρεστὰ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ ποιοῦμεν, distinguishing between claim or requirement and satisfaction. In Acts vi. 2, οὐκ ἀρεστόν ἐστιν ἡμᾶς καταλείψαντας τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ διακονεῖν τραπέζαις, the word does not refer to the apostles, but, like Ecclus. xlviii. 16, is to be taken absolutely, as denoting what is pleasing to God.

Ἀρεσκεία, ἡ (not to be accented ἀρέσκεια, after the well-known rule; see Buttmann, *Neutest. Gram.* § 34. ii. 3), from ἀρεσκεύω, to act as an ἄρεσκος (see ἀνθρωπάρεσκος); therefore = the endeavour to please, belonging only to later Greek, and usually in a bad sense = excessive desire to please (Theophrastus, Polybius, Diod. Sic.). So apparently in the only passage of the LXX, where it occurs, Prov. xxxi. 30 = 17, if it be not here *sensu medio* = that by which one tries to please or does what is well-pleasing, as in Diog. Laert. viii. 20 (*lepor in sermone, urbanitas*). In a good sense, several times in Philo and patristic Greek, e.g. πρὸς θεοῦ ἀρεσκίαν, in order to please God, Eustath. *Opusc.* xii. 62 (in Steph. *Thes.*); Philo, *de Profug.* p. 433 B, ἔνεκα ἀρεσκείας θεοῦ γονεῖς καὶ τέκνα ἀπολείπειν; see Lösner, *Observ. ad N. T. e Phil. Al.* 361, where, besides the texts usually cited, *De opif. m.* 33 C, *De Victim.* 837 D, others are named, e.g. *De victim.* 853 B, *quis rer. div. haer.* 498 A, δέχεσθαι τὰς ψυχῆς ἐκουσίους ἀρεσκείας καὶ γνησίους θεραπειάς. In the N. T. only in Col. i. 10, περιπατῆσαι ἀξίως κυρίῳ πρὸς πᾶσαν ἀρεσκίαν, where Tischendorf reads ἀρεσκίαν, the Alexandrine form of substantives from εἶα. We must not render the word satisfaction or pleasing, as if it were derived from ἀρέσκω, a signification which it has not even in Symmachus, Ps. lxxxii. 12, ἀφῆκα αὐτοὺς τῇ ἀρεσκείᾳ τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν, otherwise taken as τὸ ἀρεστόν τῆς κ. Jer. xvi. 12.

Ἀνθρωπάρεσκος, ὁ, ἡ, a word of Hellenistic growth, and, as its meaning shows, only possible in that soil where the distinction between God and man is morally recognised, and life is estimated with that preponderating reference to God which revealed religion brings. It designates not simply one who is pleasing to men (like θεάρεστος, pleasing to God), but one who endeavours to please men and not God, in opposition to the θεῷ ἀρέσαι, *qui hominibus placere studet*; cf. ἀντάρεσκος, Ps. Ignat. *ad Eph.* 9, τὸ δὲ πλάνον πνεῦμα ἐαυτὸ κηρύττει, τὰ ἴδια λαλεῖ, ἀντάρεσκον γὰρ ἐστίν· ἐαυτὸ δοξάζει. Considering its formation, it is not to be taken as like εὐάρεστος, δυσάρεστος, as if it signified "men-pleasing." Εὐάρεστος is from ἀρέσκω, aor. ἀρέσαι, verbal adj. ἀρεστός; but ἀνθρωπάρεσκος is affiliated with ἄρεσκος, and this, like ἀρέσκω, itself an iterative form, denotes one who endeavours to please all, *qui apud omnes gratus esse cupit*. Thus ἄρεσκος occurs sometimes in Aristotle as synonymous with κόλαξ, e.g. *Ethic. Nicom.* ii. 8; iv. 12; *Magn. Mor.* ii. 3, the difference between the two being that the κόλαξ seeks his

advantage (ὅπως ὠφέλειά τις αὐτῷ γίγνηται εἰς χρήματα, *Ethic. Nicom.* iv. 12), whereas the ἄρεσκος only seeks to please, and is a πολύφιλος as distinct from φίλος,—for φίλων ἐστὶ πλῆθος ὠρισμένον, whereas οἱ πολύφιλοι καὶ πᾶσιν οἰκείως ἐντυγχάνοντες οὐδενὶ δοκοῦσιν εἶναι φίλοι πλὴν πολιτικῶς, οἷς καὶ καλοῦσιν ἄρέσκους,—as distinct also from the αὐθάδης, who, without further purpose, brings himself into notice, and will please himself only (αὐτὸς αὐτῷ ἄρέσκειν), such an one οἷος πᾶσιν ὀμιλεῖν καὶ πάντως καὶ πανταχῇ (*Magn. Mor.* i. 29). Compare the description, *Ethic. Nicom.* iv. 12, ἐν δὲ ταῖς ὀμιλίαις καὶ τῷ συζῆν καὶ λόγων καὶ πραγμάτων κοινωνεῖν οἱ μὲν ἄρεσκοι δοκοῦσιν εἶναι, οἱ πάντα πρὸς ἡδονὴν ἐπαινοῦντες καὶ οὐθὲν ἀντιτείνοντες, and Theophrastus, *Char. Eth.* 5. Ἀνθρωπάρεσκος is accordingly to the Greeks a superfluous combination, and has meaning only in antithesis with θεῷ ἀρέσαι; cf. Ignat. *Ep. ad Rom.* ii., οὐ γὰρ θέλω ὑμᾶς ἀνθρωπαρεσκῆσαι ἀλλὰ θεῷ ἀρέσαι. It occurs first in the LXX. Ps. lii. 6, ὁ θεὸς διεσκόρπισεν ὅστᾳ ἀνθρωπαρέσκων, Hebrew יִפְּרֹץ, instead of which the LXX. have seemingly read יִפְּרֹץ (see Hupfeld *in loc.*). And so the Psalter, Sal. iv. 8, ἀνακαλύψαι ὁ θεὸς τὰ ἔργα ἀνθρώπων ἀνθρωπαρέσκων. Ver. 10, ἀνθρωπάρεσκον, λαλοῦντα νόμον μετὰ δόλου (to be punctuated thus, and not taking ἀνθρ. with νόμον, cf. Wellhausen, *Pharis. u. Sadduc.* p. 145, “men-servers, who speak the truth deceitfully;” cf. ver. 7, τοὺς ἐν ὑποκρίσει ζῶντας). Ver. 21, σκορπίσθησαν σάρκες ἀνθρωπαρέσκων, parallel with ὅστᾳ παρανόμων. In the N. T. Eph. vi. 6, μὴ κατ’ ὀφθαλμοδουλίαν ὡς ἀνθρωπάρεσκοι, ἀλλ’ ὡς δοῦλοι Χριστοῦ, ποιῶντες τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκ ψυχῆς. Col. iii. 22, μὴ ἐν ὀφθαλμοδουλίᾳ ὡς ἀνθρωπάρεσκοι, ἀλλ’ ἐν ἀπλότῃ καρδίᾳ φοβούμενοι τὸν κύριον. Oftener in patristic Greek, where the substantive ἀνθρωπαρεσκεία occurs. Cf. Gal. i. 10. Cf. C. L. Struve, *Opuscula selecta* (Lips. 1854), ii. 248; Lobeck, *Phrygisch.* 621.

Εὐάρεστος, ον, excepting Xen. *Mem.* iii. 5. 5, δοκεῖ μοι ἄρχοντι εὐαρεστοτέρως διακείσθαι ἢ πόλιν,—if it be not more appropriate to the sense (against Lobeck, *Phryg.* p. 621) to read εὐαρεσκοτέρως here,—only in biblical and patristic Greek. At any rate, with this exception, it belongs, like the derivatives, only to later Greek. Not in the LXX. In the Apocrypha, Wisd. iv. 10, εὐάρεστος τῷ θεῷ γενόμενος; ix. 10, τί εὐαρεστόν ἐστι παρὰ σοί. In the N. T. in the Pauline Epistles and in Hebrews, and indeed, excepting Titus ii. 9, only with reference to God, of that which God wills and recognises, Rom. xii. 2; Eph. v. 10; Col. iii. 20; Heb. xiii. 21, θυσία, synonymous with δεκτή, Phil. iv. 18; Rom. xii. 1. Of persons, in Rom. xiv. 18; 2 Cor. v. 9 (with reference to conduct and not of personal church-communion, or of the state of grace, and therefore to be distinguished from the otherwise synonymous δεκτός). With reference to men, of slaves in Titus ii. 9 only, ἐν πᾶσιν εὐαρέστους (as in Xen. *Mem. l.c.*), for which Bretschneider refers to Josephus, *Ant.* xii. 6. 2, ἡ διὰ φόβον ἢ δι’ εὐαρέστησιν ὑπακούει. Usually with the dative, in Heb. xiii. 21, ἐνώπιον. In Col. iii. 20, ἐν is not instead of the dative, but εὐαρ. stands absolutely of what is pleasing to God, like ἀρεστόν, Ecclus. xlviii. 16; Acts vi. 2; and the adverb, Heb. xii. 28.

Εὐαρέστως, well-pleasing, Heb. xii. 28; not *lubenti animo*, which would require εὐαρέσκως. Sometimes in Epictetus.

Εὐαρεστέω, to be well-pleasing; Diod. Sic., Diog. Laert. In the LXX. = הלך ה' את, of walking with God, according to God's will, Gen. v. 22, 24 (Ecclus. xliv. 16), vi. 9, xvii. 1, xxiv. 40, xlviii. 50; Ps. cxvi. 9, xxvi. 3, xxxv. 17. Also in Gen. xxxix. 4 paraphrastically as = שרת, Piel, to wait upon, to minister to. In keeping with Gen. v. 22, 24, Ecclus. xliv. 16, we have Heb. xi. 5, 6. The passive, Heb. xiii. 16, τοιαύταις γὰρ θυσίαις εὐαρεστεῖται ὁ θεός, as in classical Greek, often in Diod. Sic., Diod. Laert., meaning to give satisfaction, to make content, to satisfy, like ἀρέσκειν. *E.g.* Diog. Laert. iv. 32, τινὸς Χίου νεανίσκου μὴ εὐαρεστουμένου τῇ διατριβῇ αὐτοῦ; x. 137 (not in Polyb. as Delitzsch says, but δυσαρεστεῖσθαι τινί, Polyb. v. 94. 2, xi. 28. 3). Often in Clemens Alex., see Bleek on Heb. xiii. 16.

Ἄρετή (α) primarily denotes not *virtue* but *ability*, and is used of bodily or mental superiority, not exclusively of men, *e.g.* Plato, *Rep.* i. 335 B, τῶν κυνῶν, ἵππων. *Critias*, 117 B, τῆς γῆς. Polyb. ii. 15. 1, τῆς χώρας, nevertheless mainly of human excellence either bodily or mental. It does not, however, signify ability in and for itself, but what gives to its possessor worth and recognition; cf. Schmidt, *Ethik der alten Griechen*, i. 295, "all that imparts to a person or thing special estimation, whether of a practical, moral, intellectual, or corporeal kind. In Homer especially it denotes any kind of superiority which makes a man noteworthy, beauty, quickness, cleverness, ability in war or in contests, and likewise blessing or prosperity granted by the gods (*Od.* xiii. 45, xiv. 402, xviii. 133). Specially noteworthy and characteristic for national experience is the fact that in the word the virtue or cleverness is inseparably combined with the esteem of others which it commands." Nitzsch on Homer's *Od.* vol. i. 146, says, "By ἄρετή (originally goodwill to men) is denoted with cleverness and ability all praiseworthy happiness, see xiii. 45, xviii. 132; cf. ἀρετᾶν, xix. 114, viii. 329, and hence the superiority of a woman, who in her beauty blooms unsickened by harm or want (xix. 124), is designated ἄρετή." Döderlein, *Homer. Glossar.* ii. 82, says, "By ἄρετή Homer does not mean any moral attribute, courage, uprightness, nobleness of mind, such as are meant by it in post-Homeric Greek." Thus the word is = acknowledged superiority, the recognition of ability, fame, esteem, honour, synon. with δόξα, κύδος, καύχημα. Cf. Theogn. 106, ἀρετῆς δ' ὀλίγοις ἀνδράσι μοῖρ' ἔπεται. Ver. 87, μῆδ' αἰσχροῖσιν ἐπ' ἔργμασι μῆδ' ἀδίκουσιν τιμὰς μῆδ' ἀρετὰς ἔλκεο μῆδ' ἄφενος. Hesiod, *Opp.* 315, πλούτῳ δ' ἀρετὴ καὶ κύδος ὁπῆδει. It occurs still in this sense in later Greek, specially in the combination δόξα καὶ ἀρετή; cf. Plut. *De aud. poet.* 6 (*Mor.* 24 B), where the distinction is made that ἀρετή signifies not only *virtue*, ἀλλὰ καὶ δόξας ἐπιεικῶς καὶ δυνάμεις περιποιεῖ, and that therefore poets call τὴν εὐδοξίαν ἀρετὴν καὶ δύναμιν, just as ἔλαια denotes both the olive tree and the olive, φηγός the hazel tree and its fruit the nut. For this he cited examples, Ζεὺς δ' ἀρετὴν ἀνδρεσσιν ὀφέλλει τε μινύθει, and Hesiod,

Orp. 315. It is not used so often thus by the Attic writers, still cf. *Soph. Philoct.* 1420, *πρῶτα μὲν σοι τὰς ἐμὰς δείξω τύχας, ὅσους ποιήσας καὶ διεξελθὼν πόνους ἀθάνατον ἀρετὴν ἔσχον.* *Thuc.* i. 33. 2, *φέρουσα ἐς μὲν τοὺς πολλοὺς ἀρετὴν.* But often in *Plut. Mor.* 535 D, *πῶς οὐ παρίσταται δεινὸν εἶναι τὸ τῆς ἰδίας δόξης καὶ ἀρετῆς ἀφειδεῖν.* 547 A, *ἀν μὴ μόνον ἔχουσιν ἡλικίαν ἀλλὰ καὶ δόξαν καὶ ἀρετὴν.* *Vit. Cleom.* xxxi. 1, 2, *τὸν μὲν κάλλιστον θάνατον ἐν τῇ μάχῃ προηκάμεθα . . . ὁ δὲ δεύτερος δόξῃ καὶ ἀρετῇ νῦν ἔτι πάρεστιν ἡμῖν.* *Tib. Graech.* ix. 1; *C. Graech.* xviii. 1; *Dion. et Brut. comp.* i. 1; *Galb.* iii. 1; cf. *Hrdn.* iii. 6. 3, *μετὰ τοσαύτης δόξης τε καὶ ἀρετῆς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐκάμετε.* In these cases it is equivalent to **distinction**, both that which distinguishes a man, and the distinction which on account of this he receives or wins; whereas *δόξα* is only the recognition gained (cf. *Polyb.* ii. 17. 1, *τὰ πένδια . . . μεγάλην ἐπ' ἀρετῇ δόξαν εἴληφε*). This meaning coincides with the use of the word to denote the ability or cleverness whereby the appreciation of others is won, *merit*, *desert*, e.g. *Thuc.* iii. 58. 1, *καίτοι ἀξιούμεν γε καὶ θεῶν ἔνεκα τῶν συμμαχικῶν ποτε γενομένων καὶ τῆς ἀρετῆς τῆς εἰς τοὺς Ἕλληνας καμφθῆναι ὑμᾶς κ.τ.λ.* Hence on *Thuc.* ii. 51. 3, *οἱ ἀρετῆς τὴν μεταποιούμενοι*, the scholiast explains *φιλανθρωπίας καὶ ἀγάπης*; i. 69. 2, *τὴν ἀξίωσιν τῆς ἀρετῆς ὡς ἐλευθερῶν τῆς Ἑλλάδος φέρεται.* This use of the word has a double source; *ἀρετή* is "that attribute of a person or thing on account of which it is prized, because it fulfils its special design; hence the fruitfulness of the soil is called *ἀρετή*, the power of seeing is called the *ἀρετή* of the eye, swiftness the *ἀρετή* of the horse, beauty the *ἀρετή* of the woman, and thus mention is often made of the *ἀρετή* of the steersman, the flute-player, the architect" (*Schmidt, l.c.*). Hence the question may be put, *ἄρα διδακτὸν ἡ ἀρετή*; *Plato, Men.* 70 A, and the opinion expressed, *ἀρετὴ ἂν εἴη οὔτε φύσει οὔτε διδακτὸν, ἀλλὰ θεία μοῖρα παραγιννομένη ἄνευ νοῦ.* This is true of all bodily and mental excellences, *Plato, Rep.* i. 353 B, *ὀφθαλμῶν, ὠτων.* *Gorg.* 504 C, *ἡ ὑγίεια . . . καὶ ἡ ἄλλη ἀρετὴ τοῦ σώματος.* *Rep.* iv. 444 D, *ἀρετὴ μὲν ἄρα, ὡς ἔοικεν, ὑγίαιά τις ἂν εἴη καὶ κάλλος καὶ εὐεξία ψυχῆς, κακία δὲ νόσος τε καὶ αἰσχος καὶ ἀσθένεια.* *Aristotle, Eth. Nicom.* iv. 7, *θηλείων ἀρετὴ σώματος μὲν κάλλος καὶ μέγεθος, ψυχῆς δὲ σωφροσύνη.* Thus *ἀρετή* belongs to him who distinguishes himself, proves himself capable, the proof being his activity for others and before them; so that the *ἀρετή* of a man is this his **ability** proved and recognised by and in the behalf of others, that whereby he makes himself appreciated, be it goodwill, kindness, well-doing, or anything else. Thus *ἀρετή* in *Xen. Anab.* i. 4. 8, *τῆς πρόσθεν ἔνεκα περὶ ἐμὲ ἀρετῆς*, of the approval and merit obtained by Xenias and Pasion from Cyrus, the ability which they evinced; further, in § 9, *ἀκούοντες τὴν κύρου ἀρετὴν*, of the honourableness of Cyrus in recognising and rewarding their *ἀρετή*. Thus *ἀρετή* designates any **ability or aptness which commands and wins recognition**, superiority and excellence in those qualities which one expects or discovers in a man.

Connected with this use of *ἀρετή* to denote recognition and appreciation by others, we have (b) the prevailing employment of the word in a moral sense, introduced by the

sophists, as = *virtue*, which ἔφθρονας παρέχεται καὶ δικαίους καὶ ἀγαθοὺς ἐν πράξεσι, Plut. *de aud. poet.* 6, *moral aptness*; and this meaning so prevails that Plutarch after his manner endeavours to connect it with the signification *distinction* or *fame*. Aristotle, *Eth. Nicom.* ii. 5, ἡ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀρετὴ—ἐξὺς ἀφ' ἧς ἀγαθὸς ἄνθρωπος γίνεται, καὶ ἀφ' ἧς εὖ τὸ ἐαυτοῦ ἔργον ἀποδώσει.

While ἀρετή in its ethical sense possesses so very prominent a position in profane Greek that it appears as the principle of all moral capacity and conduct, it strangely disappears in this sense in biblical Greek. Those apocryphal books of the O. T. which have been specially influenced by the profane sphere, *e.g.* the Book of Wisdom, 2 and 4 Maccabees, make this use of it, but the O. T. not once, and the N. T. only in one place, and this somewhat doubtful. But even in its non-ethical sense ἀρετή occurs in the LXX. and N. T. very seldom, and with very marked limitation. (a) The LXX. use it to render *ἡ*, *splendour, glory, adornment*, Hab. iii. 3, ἐκάλυψεν οὐρανοὺς ἡ ἀρετὴ αὐτοῦ (*sc. κυρίου*). Zech. vi. 13, αὐτὸς (*i.e.* the *מֶלֶךְ*) λήψεται ἀρετήν, usually δόξα, once also μεγαλοπρέπεια, ἀγιοσύνη, ὡραιότης; cf. ἐλαία κατάκαρπος, Hos. xiv. 7. Further, ἀρεταί = *ἡ* (usually rendered *αἴνεσις*, rarely *καύχημα*, *δόξα*, *ἀγαλλίαμα*), Isa. xlviii. 12, δώσουσιν τῷ θεῷ δόξαν, τὰς ἀρετὰς αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς νήσοις ἀναγγελοῦσιν; xliii. 21, λαόν μου ὃν περιποιησάμην τὰς ἀρετὰς μου διηγείσθαι; xlii. 8, τὴν δόξαν μου ἐτέρῳ οὐ δώσω, οὐδὲ τὰς ἀρετὰς μου τοῖς γλυπτοῖς. Cf. Add. Esth. iv. 8, ἀνοῖξαι στόμα ἐθνῶν εἰς ἀρετὰς ματαίων. It answers to the plural *הַמְּלָכִים* in Isa. lxiii. 7, τὸν ἔλεον κυρίου ἐμνήσθην, τὰς ἀρετὰς κυρίου ἐν πᾶσι οἷς ὁ κύριος ἡμῖν ἀνταποδίδωσιν. Here therefore it stands in the sense of *glory, distinction, recognition*, as in profane Greek *synon.* with *δόξα*, and later (Plut., Herodian) in the phrase *δόξα καὶ ἀρετή*. It is clear from the parallel in Add. Esth. iv. 8 that what is mainly meant is the pre-eminence belonging to God, and not to the manifestation of Himself in revelation. But this latter element is not wholly to be excluded, as appears from Isa. lxiii. 7, where it is parallel with ἔλεος, as in profane Greek, denoting the appreciation or desert with reference to others whereby one becomes distinguished and can lay claim to distinction. Connected herewith are the two N. T. passages, 1 Pet. ii. 9, ὅπως τὰς ἀρετὰς ἐξαγγείλητε τοῦ ἐκ σκότους ὑμᾶς καλέσαντος κ.τ.λ.; 2 Pet. i. 3, τοῦ καλέσαντος ἡμᾶς ἰδίᾳ δόξῃ καὶ ἀρετῇ. While in the former passage it is = *praise*, in the latter the reference is to the self-manifestation of God, whereby He (to speak in a profane way) has rendered us service through our appropriation of His redemption, and thus as *synon.* with *δόξα*, God's excellent glory, by the manifestation of which to us He has claim to our regard. This is the truth expressed in the remark of Krebs, *Observ. e Flav. Jos.*, where he endeavours to prove that ἀρετή here is = *beneficentia*, as in Joseph. *Ant.* xvii. 5. 5, μάλιστα δὲ τὴν ἀρετὴν ἐπιπολὺ ἐξηγεῖτο τοῦ βασιλέως ἥπερ εἰς τε τροφὰς καὶ παιδεύματα χρησάμενος τῶν υἱέων; xvii. 5. 6, τὰ πάντα γὰρ ὡς ἐν ἐρημίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ διεπεπραγμένος . . . αὐθις ἐνεπαρῶνει τῇ ἀρετῇ τοῦ θεοῦ.—In Phil. iv. 8, εἴ τις ἀρετὴ καὶ εἴ τις ἔπαινος, the combination with ἔπαινος leads to the supposition that ἀρετή here is that which claims and receives

acknowledgment, and therefore includes the moral virtues; nevertheless it does not stand, as is clear from the preceding ὅσα προσφιλή, ὅσα εὖφημα, side by side with ὅσα ἀληθῆ κ.τ.λ., in a distinctively ethical sense; cf. Plato, *Rep.* vii. 536 A, πρὸς σωφροσύνην —καὶ ἀνδρείαν καὶ μεγαλοπρέπειαν καὶ πάντα τῆς ἀρετῆς μέρη.

Consequently—with exception perhaps of 2 Pet. i. 5, to be presently examined—in biblical Greek (*b*) it is not used in an ethical sense, as may be inferred by a comparison with those places in the Apocrypha where it does thus stand. It occurs in Wisd. iv. 1, κρείσσων ἀτεκνία μετ' ἀρετῆς, ἀθανασία γάρ ἐστιν ἐν μνήμῃ αὐτῆς, ὅτι καὶ παρὰ θεῷ γινώσκεται καὶ παρὰ ἀνθρώποις; v. 12, ἀρετῆς μὲν σημείον οὐδὲν ἔσχομεν δεῖξαι, ἐν δὲ τῇ κακίᾳ ἡμῶν κατεδαπανήθημεν; viii. 7, εἰ δικαιοσύνην ἀγαπᾷ τις, οἱ πόνοι ταύτης εἰσὶν ἀρεταί· σωφροσύνην γὰρ καὶ φρόνησιν ἐκδιδάσκει, δικαιοσύνην καὶ ἀνδρείαν. This last passage shows what O. T. conception must be included, viz. righteousness, which, according to the profane view, belongs to the category of ἀρετή. A weakening of the biblical mode of expression and a withdrawal of the religious element appears in 2 Macc. xv. 12, Ὅνιαν . . . ἄνδρα καλὸν καὶ ἀγαθόν . . . ἐκ παιδὸς ἐκμεμελετηκότα πάντα τὰ τῆς ἀρετῆς οἰκεία. (In the remaining places in 2 Macc. it denotes ἀνδρεία, courage and steadfastness; 2 Macc. vi. 31, μνημόσυνον ἀρετῆς καταλιπών; xv. 17, παρακληθέντες δὲ τοῖς Ἰουδα λόγοις πάνυ καλοῖς καὶ δυναμένοις ἐπ' ἀρετὴν παρορμηῆσαι καὶ ψυχὰς νέων ἐπανδρῶσαι; but in x. 28, οἱ μὲν ἔγνων ἔχοντες εὐημερίας καὶ νίκης μετ' ἀρετῆς τὴν ἐπὶ τὸν κύριον καταφυγὴν, it is perhaps = *distinction, fame*.) In 4 Maccabees the most decided attempt is made to transfer the classical concept to Jewish soil, where (x. 10) we have the expression παιδεία καὶ ἀρετὴ θεοῦ (θεοῦ being the gen. of the object). With the author of this book ἀρετή is, as distinguished from the profane view, a decidedly religious concept, and denotes steadfast faithfulness and verification in all that belongs to εὐσέβεια; xii. 14, ἐπλήρωσαν τὴν εἰς τὸν θεὸν εὐσέβειαν . . . τοὺς τῆς ἀρετῆς ἀγωνιστάς; xvii. 12, ἀρετὴ δι' ὑπομονῆς δοκιμάζουσα; ix. 18, μόνοι παῖδες Ἑβραίων ὑπὲρ ἀρετῆς εἰσὶν ἀνίκητοι; i. 8, ἡ ἀνδραγαθία τῶν ὑπὲρ ἀρετῆς ἀποθανόντων. It is parallel with εὐσέβεια in vii. 22, εἰδὼς ὅτι τὸ διὰ τὴν ἀρετὴν πάντα πόνον ὑπομένειν μακάριόν ἐστιν, οὐκ ἂν περικρατήσειεν τῶν παθῶν διὰ τὴν εὐσέβειαν. But 4 Macc. i. 2, μεγίστη ἀρετὴ . . . φρόνησις, which is in keeping with the tendency of this treatise *de rationis imperio*, shows how unwilling the author was to give up the Greek view for the sake of a change of meaning. He can make use of it as he does only by giving prominence to one aspect of ἀρετή, steadfast faithfulness, and recognising herein the sign of the clever or able man. (Other places where ἀρ. occurs here are ix. 31, xi. 2, xiii. 23, etc.) The profane ἀρετή lacks a religious basis, though it was not altogether foreign to the Greek to reckon εὐσέβεια as an ἀρετή. Thus the use of the word was out of harmony with the divinely related tendency of Jewish and Christian life; it contained too much self-glorification to be admitted readily into Scripture language. It had nothing in common with Pauline preaching, and could be employed only as in Phil. iv. 8, where it does not stand in an expressly ethical sense; and as to the other N. T. writings it was unsuitable, because it

did not adequately express the antithesis to sin. Even in 2 Pet. i. 5, ἐπιχορηγήσατε ἐν τῇ πίστει ὑμῶν τὴν ἀρετὴν, ἐν δὲ τῇ ἀρετῇ τὴν γνώσιν κ.τ.λ., it is hardly (if we compare vv. 6, 7) equivalent to *virtue*. It is evident from what has already been said that it is not here to be taken as in ver. 3; but if it meant in general the doing of what is right and good, the specializing of vv. 6, 7 would be inconsistent. Considering the connection, it is most appropriate to explain it, according to the analogy of 4 Macc., as denoting steadfastness in maintaining and manifesting faith.

Ἀρπάζω, the future in classical Greek usually ἀρπάσομαι, more rarely ἀρπάσω, as in the N. T. John x. 28, and in the LXX. Lev. xix. 13, according to codex A ἀρπάσεις; but B reads ἀρπά, as in Hos. v. 14, ἀρπῶμαι, Attic form of the future, like dissyllables in ἀζω, ἐζω, ἔω; see Krüger, § 31. 3. 7; Lobeck, *Phryg.* 746. The aorist ἤρπασα, passive ἤρπάσθην, Rev. xii. 5; non-Attic 2nd aorist ἤρπάγην, Polyb. and others, 2 Cor. xii. 2-4, Wisd. iv. 11, answering to the future ἀρπάξω occurring in Homer and in later writers; passive ἀρπαγήσομαι, 1 Thess. iv. 17; compare also the forms ἄρπαγμα, ἀρπαγμός, side by side with ἄρπασμα, ἀρπασμός, Lobeck, *Phryg.* 241. It signifies to seize upon with force, to rob, differing from κλέπτειν as an open act of violence from cunning and secret thieving; cf. Aristoph. *Plut.* 372, οὐ κέκλοφας ἀλλ' ἤρπakas. Soph. *Phil.* 643 s., οὐκ ἔστι λησταῖς πνεῦμ' ἐναντιούμενον, ὅταν παρῇ κλέψαι τε χάρπάσαι βιά. Though generally denoting robbery of another's property, it is not exclusively thus used, but sometimes means generally forcibly to seize upon or take to oneself; cf. Homer, *Il.* xii. 445, "Ἐκτωρ δ' ἀρπάξας λᾶαν φέρεν κ.τ.λ.; Xen. *Cyr.* ii. 3. 10, μάχαιράν γε μὴν εὐθὺς παιδίον ὦν ἤρπαζον ὅπου ἴδοιμι; *Anab.* v. 9. 8, ὁ δ' ἐπειδὴν προΐδεται, ἀπαντὰ ἀρπάσας τὰ ὅπλα καὶ μάχεται πρὸ τοῦ ζεύγους; iv. 6. 11, τοῦ ἐρήμου ὄρους καὶ κλέψαι τι πειρᾶσθαι λαθόντας καὶ ἀρπάσαι φθάσαντας; cf. Herod. ix. 107. 2, ἀρπάζει μέσον καὶ ἐξάρας παῖει ἐς τὴν γῆν; Polyb. ix. 107. 2, ἤρπακότες ἐν τῷ Περσικῷ πολέμῳ τὴν τῶν Ἑλλήνων εὐχέρειαν. Accordingly in Biblical Greek (A) = to rob, LXX. = ἔλν, ἔρπ, ἔρπ; in the N. T. John x. 12, 28, 29, to take away by force, to seize, to snatch away, Matt. xiii. 9; Acts xxiii. 10; Jude 23. Specially of rapture, Acts viii. 39; 2 Cor. xii. 2, 4; 1 Thess. iv. 17; Rev. xii. 5. (B) to take to oneself by force, John vi. 15, ἀρπάζειν αὐτὸν ἵνα ποιήσουσιν βασιλέα. Also = to use force against one, Ps. x. 9 = ἔρπ, ἀρπάσαι πτωχόν. Compare Micah ii. 2, διήρπαζον τὸν ἄνδρα καὶ τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ = ἔρπ, parallel with καταδυναστεύω; and to this we must refer Matt. xi. 12, βιασταὶ ἀρπάζουσιν τὴν βασ. τοῦ οὐρανοῦ; see βιάζω.

Ἀρπαγή ἡ, (A) active, robbery, plundering, Heb. x. 34; 1 Macc. xiii. 34, πᾶσαι αἱ πράξεις Τρύφωνος ἦσαν ἀρπαγαί. In this sense perhaps Luke xi. 39, τὸ ἔσωθεν ὑμῶν γέμει ἀρπαγῆς καὶ πονηρίας, where the genitive ὑμῶν and the combination with πον. confirm the active meaning; and hence probably the same is to be preferred in Matt. xxiii. 25, ἔσωθεν δὲ γέμουσιν (ἐξ) ἀρπαγῆς καὶ ἀκρασίας, though with reference to the contents of the cup and platter the passive meaning is seemingly the more correct.

Yet the combination with ἀκράσια which denotes an attribute, and the partial explanation of the figure in Luke, tell in favour of the active signification; cf. Eccles. v. 7, ἄρπαγὴ κρίματος καὶ δικαιοσύνης. (B) Booty, prey, Nahum ii. 13; Isa. iii. 14; Judith ii. 11. In the LXX. more frequently διαρπαγή.

Ἄρπαγμός, ὁ, in biblical Greek only in Phil. ii. 6, ὃς ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων οὐχ ἄρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ, ἀλλὰ κ.τ.λ.; paralleled in classical Greek only in Plutarch, *de pueror. educ.* p. 11 F, καὶ τοὺς μὲν Θήβησι καὶ τοὺς Ἡλίδι φευκτέον ἔρωτας καὶ τὸν ἐκ Κρήτης καλούμενον ἄρπαγμὸν, "*et amores quidem quales Thebis sunt et Elide et quae in Creta vocatur raptio, fugiendi*," and by Phryn. *Appar. Soph.* in Bekker, *Anect. gr.* i. 36, δέσις· ὁ δεσμός, ὡς ἄρπασις ὁ ἄρπαγμός καὶ λόγισις ὁ λογισμός, which latter quotation shows the appearance of the word in linguistic usage, and is so far important as indicating its meaning. As to what this meaning is, the passage in Plutarch shows that the word is used transitively = *actus rapiendi*, and this is confirmed by the same transitive meaning of the form ἄρπασμός occurring likewise once only in Plutarch, *Convival. disp.* ii. p. 664 A, οὐ γὰρ φιλικὸν οὐδὲ συμποτικὸν οἶμαι προοίμιον εὐωχίας ὑφαίρεσις καὶ ἄρπασμος καὶ χειρῶν ἄμιλλα καὶ διαγκωνισμός, ἀλλ' ἄτοπα καὶ κυνικά καὶ τελευτῶντα πολλάκις εἰς λουιδωρίας καὶ ὀργὰς κ.τ.λ., where ὑφαίρεσις and ἄρπασμος signify clandestine stealing and open robbery. Meyer and Hofmann therefore rightly adopt the transitive meaning in Phil. ii. 6. The Greek exegesists indeed make it = ἄρπαγμα (often in the LXX.), *robbery, a thing robbed*; so Chrysostom, *Oecum.*, Theophylact, Theodoret; cf. Wetstein *in loc.*, and Cramer, *Catena Graec. Patr.*, οὐχ ὡς ἄρπαγμα εἶχεν ἀλλὰ φυσικόν; whereas heretics explained it as = *res rapienda*, θεὸς ὦν ἐλάττων, οὐχ ἦπασε τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ τῷ μεγάλῳ καὶ μείζονι. But this simply shows that a rendering of this rare word intransitively was not regarded as strange, this occurring also in the case of other nouns in μός, and that the explanation of ἄρπαγμός depended upon Christological considerations. For the real meaning of ἄρπαγμός in the passage, this tells all the less, in that the transitive meaning is indisputable in classical Greek, and is unquestionably confirmed also in patristic Greek. The passage in Cyril, *de adorat.* i. 25 (in Wetstein), καὶ οὐχ ἄρπαγμὸν τὴν παραίτησιν ὡς ἐξ ἀδρανούς καὶ ὑδαρεστέρας ἐποιεῖτο φρενός, might indeed be rendered not actively (as Meyer holds), but passively, "He did not quickly take advantage of the refusal of the angels (Gen. xix. 23) as a prey for himself." Still this place only shows the possibility of a passive rendering in our text. But, on the other hand, there is another passage decisive for the active meaning, inasmuch at least as the representation is as nearly as possible the same as in our text. Cf. Possini, *Catena in Marc.* x. 24, ὁ δέ γε σωτὴρ θεραπεύει αὐτοὺς—τῷ δεῖξαι ὅτι οὐχ ἐστὶν ἄρπαγμός ἡ τιμή, τῶν ἐθνῶν γὰρ τὸ τοιοῦτον; compare Mark x. 42, οἱ δοκοῦντες ἄρχειν τῶν ἐθνῶν κατακυριεύουσιν αὐτῶν καὶ οἱ μεγάλοι αὐτῶν κατεξουσιάζουσιν αὐτῶν. Accordingly, Phil. ii. 6 affirms that Christ did not regard His equality with God as if He were an ἄρπαξ, to force it upon those to whom He stood in the relationship of God. (Cf.

Aristotle, *Pol.* v. 10, *τύραννοι κατέστησαν βασιλείας ὑπαρχούσης*.) That this transitive meaning of ἄρπαγμός is necessary here, and that the passive is inadmissible, is clear from the fact that τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ cannot be taken as the object of ἀρπάζειν. For if it were the object it must be essentially different from μορφὴ θεοῦ, which it can no more be than can ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος be essentially different from μορφὴ δούλου λαβών. As μορφὴ δούλου includes εἶναι ἴσα ἀνθρώποις, so the μορφὴ θεοῦ includes the εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ. Certainly the two expressions do not in both cases denote absolutely the same thing; they differ as absolute divine existence (ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπαρχ.), and divine existence in relation to the world—existence as man among men, and as man in relation to God (*σχήματι κ.τ.λ.*, answering to the μορφὴ δούλου). There is another proposed distinction which is also inadmissible,—the supposition of Weiss and others that the εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ is something different from the μορφὴ θεοῦ, *i.e.* the divine δόξα which did not yet belong to Christ, but was destined to be His. This would involve the impossible thought that the ὁμοίωμα ἀνθρώπων is something not implied in the μορφὴ δούλου, but following upon the assumption of it. (The Fathers all are perfectly right in representing the εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ as identical with the μορφὴ θεοῦ, but christological interests call for a more accurate definition.) If this be so with the εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ, it cannot be the object of ἀρπάζειν; and if it cannot, it is clear that ἄρπαγμός cannot either be equivalent to ἄρπαγμα, nor can it be *res rapienda*, but must be taken actively; *i.e.* τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ is to be regarded, so to speak, as the subject of ἀρπάζειν, and is to be explained as above, “He did not esteem the being-equal-with-God as identical with the coming forth or action of an ἄρπαξ.” Weiss’s objection, that the object of such action is wanting, is not to be met (as Meyer does) by saying that it is implied in the idea of ἄρπαγμός, “his not appropriating to himself power and glory, riches, pomp, and glory of the world,” suggesting a distorted thought, and a false contrast with ἐκένωσεν ἑαυτόν. Neither can the object, as Hofmann thinks, be left undetermined, as if the design simply was to bring out as clearly as words could express it the implied or possible contrast with the actual fact of the κένωσις. The object is sufficiently indicated by the εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ. Authoritative coming by force to affirm equality with God can have reference only to the world, in relation to which Christ stands as God, and Christ did not come forcibly or authoritatively as an ἄρπαξ to compel the submission of the world to Himself (*cf.* ver. 4, μὴ τὰ ἑαυτῶν σκοποῦντες), but He renounced Himself, “emptied Himself,” and so on. Therefore “He esteemed not His equality with God as something requiring an act of force against the world, or a thing to be forced upon the world.” What has already been remarked under ἀρπάζω, shows that the object of the ἄρπαγμός need not of necessity be something belonging to another (Meyer). As to ἡγείσθαι with two accusatives, compare 2 Pet. iii. 15; 1 Tim. vi. 5; Thuc. ii. 44. 3; Dem. viii. 66; Eur. *Med.* 1224; Plato, *Legg.* vii. 837 C; *Crat.* 435; Aesch. *Prom.* 169. Concerning the old exposition = ἄρπαγμα, see its full exposition in Lamb. Bos. *Exercitatt. philol. in N. T. loca nonnulla*, etc., 1713, p. 196 sqq.

Ἄρτιος, *a, on*, from the root *αρ*, = joining together, joining on to, fitting, compare Hippocrates, 809 G, οἱ σπόνδυλοι ἐντὸς ἄρτιοί εἰσιν ἀλλήλοισι καὶ δέδενται πρὸς ἀλλήλους. In Homer and Pindar of *appropriate well-chosen words*, e.g. *Od.* viii. 240, ὅς τις ἐπίσταιτο ᾗσι φρεσὶν ἄρτια βάζειν; xix. 248, ὅτι οἱ φρεσὶν ἄρτια ἤδη (*Il.* v. 326), because he was appropriately in accord with him, *i.e.* "he knew how in everything to hit his purpose, to divine his thoughts and wishes" (Faesi). It is used for the most part (in Xen., Plato, Aristotle, Plut., and others) of *even numbers*, which in the reckoning leave no remainders, as opposed to *περιττός*, *odd*. Otherwise comparatively rare of thoughts and members = in *appropriate position, sound*, Hesychius, ἄρτιον ὑγιές, ὁλόκληρον. Eurip. *Troí.* 417, οὐ γὰρ ἀρτίας ἔχεις φρένας, *opp.* 408, εἰ μὴ σ' Ἀπόλλων ἐξεβάκχευσεν φρένας. Lucian, *De sacrif.* 6, of Vulcan, οὐδὲ ἄρτιον τῷ πόδε χωλευθῆναι γὰρ κ.τ.λ. Diodorus, iii. 32, ἀρτίους τοῖς σώμασιν. In this sense also figuratively of the general relationships of life, e.g. in a fragment of Solon's in Demosthenes, xix. 255 (422), εὐνομία δ' εὐκοσμία καὶ ἄρτια πάντ' ἀποφαίνει. Cf. Philo, *Leg. ad Caj.* p. 1000, μένει δ' ἄρτιον καὶ πλήρης ἡ ἡγεμονία. In Herod. with following infinitive = *ready, in position, equipped for something*. It is accordingly an inappropriate generalizing of the conception to explain it according to *Glossar. Graec. in sacros N. F. libr. ex MSS.* ed. J. Alberti, p. 163, ἄρτιος ὑγιής, τέλειος, and by Huther, on 2 Tim. iii. 17, as = *perfect*. In this one passage of biblical Greek, ἵνα ἄρτιος ᾖ ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ ἄνθρωπος πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἐξηρτισμένος, it means, as Hofmann rightly shows, simply in *due or appropriate condition* (and thus able to fulfil all demands), and is not equivalent to the expression in Col. i. 28, ἵνα παραστήσωμεν πάντα ἄνθρωπον τέλειον ἐν Χριστῷ, from which, indeed, it differs, as *ability to stand moral testing* differs from *moral completeness*. Nor can Col. ii. 10, ἐστὲ ἐν αὐτῷ πεπληρωμένοι, be appropriately adduced. Ἄρτιος is to be compared, not with τέλειος, but with ὁλόκληρος (see Trench). In 2 Tim. iii. 17, as the addition πρὸς πᾶν κ.τ.λ. clearly shows, it is not *the state as such* that is spoken of, but the state as antecedent and preparative to conduct. Compare also the meaning of its derivations.

Ἐξαρτίζω, perfectly to prepare, to complete for a certain purpose, fully to equip. Very rare, and like all the derivatives of ἄρτιος only in late Greek, but pointing back to the meaning of ἄρτιος in Homer and Herodotus, and preserved by the poets, in *appropriate condition*. Hence ἀρτίζω is = *to put in appropriate condition*, in Diod., Sext. Hesychius, ἀρτίσασθαι παρασκευάσασθαι. The compounds ἀπ-, ἐξ-, κατ-αρτίζω occur, and of these in biblical Greek ἀπαρτίζω in Symmachus, Ps. vii. 10, cxix. 73; ἀπαρτισμός, Luke xiv. 28; ἐξαρτίζω, Acts xxi. 5, 2 Tim. iii. 17, and very often καταρτίζω (once προκατ.). Ἐξαρτίζω seems to be the most rare. In Lucian, *Ver. hist.* i. 33, there appears ἐξήρτυτο for ἐξήρτιστο; Diod. xiv. 29, ἐξερτυμένας (τρίηρεις) is read instead of ἐξηρτισμένας; with certainty in Josephus, *Ant.* iii. 2. 2, πολεμεῖν πρὸς ἀνθρώπους τοῖς ἅπασιν καλῶς ἐξηρτισμένους, and in an inscription given by Boeckh, ii. 420. 13, τὸ ἐπὶ τὴν πόμπην ἀνκλάριον ἐξαρτιζόμενον], in harmony with which 2 Tim. iii. 17 is to be

explained, πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἐξηρτισμένους. Akin to this is Acts xxi. 5, ἐξαρτίσαι τὰς ἡμέρας, like ἀπαρτίζω in Symm. Ps. cxix. 73 = *to complete, fully to establish*, compared with the same word in Symm. Ps. vii. 10 = *to terminate, to bring to an end*, as also ἀπαρτίζειν is often used in later Greek of the terminating of a space of time, e.g. Hippocr. *De Morb.* iv. 11, ἀπηρτισμένης τῆς περιόδου.

Καταρτίζω, *to put a thing in its appropriate position, to establish, to set up*, and indeed primarily *restituere*, then *constituere*; first in Herod. = *to bring right again, to bring into order*, v. 28, synon. with καταλάσσειν, v. 29. Thus in Plutarch, Dion. Hal., and in surgery of the setting of limbs. Then generally *to put into its proper position, to equip, to arrange*, e.g. ships, in Polyb. Diod. Sic. In the LXX. in the first meaning only in Ps. lxxviii. 10, καὶ ἡσθένησεν, σὺ δὲ κατηρτίσω αὐτήν = פִּלַּל, Pilel; elsewhere in the more general sense, Ps. lxxiv. 16, lxxxix. 38 = פָּלַל, Hiphil; cf. Ps. lxxx. 16, xviii. 34, and = שָׁפַל, Shaphel, Ezra v. 11, vi. 14, iv. 13. Further in Ps. xvii. 5 = פָּשַׁח, and Ps. xl. 7. σῶμα κατηρτίσω μοι, instead of the more special פִּלְּתִי פְּרִיָּהּ וְנִיחָא. In both senses in the N. T. (I.) *to put into position, to bring right*, τὰ δίκτυα, Matt. iv. 21; Mark i. 19; then *to bring right again*, Gal. vi. 1, καταρτίζειν τινά, sc. προλημφθέντα ἐν τινι παραπτώματι. 1 Thess. iii. 10, καταρτίσαι τὰ ὑστερήματα τῆς πίστεως, *to make up what is wanting*. In other passages, (II.) = *to put in its right position, to make perfect, to prepare*, with various applications. Thus Heb. xi. 4, κατηρτίσθαι τοὺς αἰῶνας, of the creative activity of God, analogous to Ps. lxxiv. 16, lxxxix. 38.—Heb. x. 5, σῶμα καταρτίσω μοι, from Ps. xl. 7; Heb. xiii. 21, ὁ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης—καταρτίσαι ὑμᾶς ἐν παντὶ ἔργῳ ἀγ. εἰς τὸ ποιῆσαι κ.τ.λ. The perfect and complete setting up of an object is the main element in the conception, and comes into prominence especially in Luke vi. 40, κατηρτισμένος πᾶς ἔσται ὡς ὁ διδάσκαλος αὐτοῦ, and in Rom. ix. 22, ἤνεγκεν ἐν πολλῇ μακροθυμίᾳ σκευὴ ὀργῆς κατηρτισμένα εἰς ἀπώλ. = *complete, ready*, for destruction, for ruin, where the literal sense is almost lost if it be merely rendered = *prepared*. In like manner 1 Cor. i. 10, ἵνα ᾗτε κατηρτισμένοι ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ νοῦ καὶ ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ γνώμῃ, is to be explained *to stand perfected*; cf. Eph. iv. 14.—2 Cor. xiii. 11, καταρτίξεσθε. *Be perfected*, of the completion of the Christian character (Hofmann), at which the readers should aim. The rendering of the Hebrew פָּלַל (elsewhere ἐτοιμάζω, κατορθόω, διορθόω, ἀνορθόω, and other words) by καταρτίζω ought to have settled this element in the word.

Κατάρτισις, ἡ, once in Plutarch, *Alex.* vii. conjoined with ἐπιστάσια, = *completing, perfecting* (Plut. *Them.* ii., with παιδεία, but here Bekker reads κατάρτυσις). 2 Cor. xiii. 9, τοῦτο καὶ εὐχόμεθα, τὴν ὑμῶν κατάρτισιν, must, according to the whole context from vv. 5–11, be taken in the sense of *consummatio*. The preceding ἀσθενῶμεν does not certainly justify the rendering *restoration*, after Ps. lxxviii. 10.

Καταρτισμός, ὁ, in classical Greek only medically; see above, καταρτίζειν. In biblical Greek only in Eph. iv. 12, πρὸς τὸν καταρτισμὸν τῶν ἁγίων = *perfecting*,

completion; cf. ver. 13. It differs from *κατάρτισις*, 2 Cor. xiii. 9, in that *κατάρτισις* denotes the process in its progress, *καταρτισμός* the process as completed. The concept stands alone and self-contained, see *καταρτίζειν*, and is not (with Grimm) to be taken with the following *εἰς ἔργον διακ. κ.τ.λ.*, because the *ἄγιοι* are not the subjects but the objects of the *διακονία*, the subjects being the persons named in ver. 11. See Harless, Hofmann, Schmidt *in loc.* Thus *εἰς ἔργον διακ.* is a second description of the purpose of the *ἔδωκεν κ.τ.λ.*, ver. 11, differing, however, in that *πρὸς κατ. τ. ἁγ.* gives the result to be attained by the twofold description *εἰς ἔργ. διακ.*, *εἰς οἶκ. τ. σ. τοῦ Χυ.* The *ἀποστ.*, *προφ.*, *εὐαγγ.*, work *εἰς ἔργον διακ.*, i.e. by way of ministration, and thus the body of Christ is built up, and the *καταρτισμός τῶν ἁγ.* is realized.

Προκαταρτίζω, to perfect beforehand, to make right, equip beforehand, only in medical and in patristic Greek (here in the sense of *predestination*). 2 Cor. ix. 5, of the offerings for the Jerusalem Church, which the apostle wished to find already made up.

Ἀρχω, to be first, to begin, to rule. Agreeing, according to Curtius, with the Sanscrit *arhāmi*, to be worth, to have ability, to be able; *arhas* = worthy, etc. "The ground-concept common to both is that of *worth*, perhaps even of *splendour*, *ἀρχειν λάμπειν* (Hes.)." J. Grimm derives the German *ragen* from this. (I.) To begin, to make a beginning; in this sense in the middle only, in biblical Greek throughout, and for the most part in the classics also. LXX. = *לָחַץ*, Hiphil; *לָא*, Hiphil; Gen. ii. 3, *וַיִּשְׁלַח אֱלֹהִים אֶת הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ וְאֶת הַיָּרֵחַ* = *ἤρξατο ποιῆσαι*. Followed by *ἀπό*, Matt. xx. 8; Luke xxiii. 5, xxiv. 47; Acts i. 22, viii. 35, x. 37; 1 Pet. iv. 17; John viii. 9. With the genitive only, as e.g. *ἀρχ. λόγου*, Xen. *Anab.* iii. 2. 7, only in 2 Chron. xx. 22. But sometimes in the LXX. followed by the infinitive with *τοῦ* (cf. Buttmann, *Gramm. d. N. T. Sprachgebr.* p. 228 sqq.); Judg. xx. 39; 2 Chron. xxxiv. 3; Ezek. xiii. 6; Jonah iii. 4; yet usually and in the N. T. always the simple infinitive follows, as in the classics, Matt. iv. 17, xi. 7, 20, etc. The combination with a participle following, e.g. *ἀρχομαι διδασκων* (compare Krüger, lvi. 5. 1, and concerning the difference between this and the infinitive, see Passow, *Lex.*), does not appear in biblical Greek; the converse, *ἀρχόμενος ἔλεγον*, Plato, *Theaet.* 174 B, 187 A, occurs in Acts xi. 4, *ἀρχόμενος δὲ Πέτρος ἐξελίθετο αὐτοῖς*, and in like manner Luke iii. 23 is to be explained,—*αὐτὸς ἦν Ἰησοῦς ἀρχόμενος ὥσπερ ἐτῶν τριάκοντα*, for to supply an infinitive from the context, such as *ποιεῖν τε καὶ διδάσκειν*, like Acts i. 1 (Keil), or more vaguely = *officium messianum administrare* (Grimm), is as inadmissible here as it is unnecessary in Acts xi. 4. The usage of classical Greek above named shows that there is no need to read *ἤρξατο εἶναι ὥσπερ ἐτῶν τριάκοντα*.—(II.) To rule, to conduct, to be foremost; LXX. = *לָחַץ*, also occasionally *עָצַר*, *רָדָה*, *פָּשַׁט*, and other verbs. In the N. T. only in Matt. x. 42; Rom. xv. 12, *ὁ ἀνιστάμενος ἀρχειν ἐθνῶν*, from Isa. xi. 10, *וְשָׁרַף עֵשָׂא לְנֶפֶשׁ עַמּוּד לְנֶפֶשׁ עַמּוּד*. Elsewhere in this sense only the substantival participle occurs, *ὁ ἀρχων*, which also occurs in the classics, in the poets as = *ruler*, *chief lord*, and then in prose as = *chief*, *overseer*, and for those who hold official rank, Plut. *Them.* v. 4, of the

highest governmental office; *Cat. min.* xxxiv. 4, xl. 2, of tribunes. The plural of the authorities, Plutarch, *Public.* ii. 2. Further, of governors and the like, and generally of all who occupy posts of prominence. In the N. T. (a) generally = Lord, Rev. i. 5, ὁ ἄρχων τῶν βασιλέων τῆς γῆς, of Christ; cf. Dan. viii. 25, ἄρχων ἀρχόντων. 1 Chron. xxix. 12, ἄρχων πάσης ἀρχῆς. *Chief* or *first*, Matt. xx. 15; Acts iv. 26 (from Ps. ii. 2), vii. 27, 35; 1 Cor. ii. 6, 8. Οἱ ἀρχόντες of the magistracy, Rom. xiii. 3; cf. Acts vii. 35, τίς σε κατέστησεν ἄρχοντα καὶ δικαστήν, so also Luke xii. 58; Acts xvi. 19. (b) Specially, and here first with the genitive following, Luke viii. 41, τῆς συναγωγῆς; compare ἀρχισυναγωγός, Mark v. 22, 35, 36, 38; Luke viii. 49, xiii. 14; Acts xiii. 15, 18, viii. 17. For this simply ἄρχων εἰς, Matt. ix. 18, cf. ver. 23, but it does not follow hence that ἄρχων is a title of the ruler of the synagogue; see Schürer, *Neutest. Zeitgesch.* p. 629.—Luke xiv. 1, οἱ ἄρχοντες τῶν φαρισ., “those holding prominence, and specially esteemed among the Pharisees” (Hofm.). Acts xxiii. 5, ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ λαοῦ, of the high priest, from Ex. xxii. 27 = כֹּהֵן, where, however, the high priest is not specially meant. Without this special limitation, of the members of the Sanhedrim, Luke xxiii. 13, τοὺς ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ τοὺς ἄρχοντας καὶ τὸν λαόν, cf. ver. 35, xxiv. 20; Acts iv. 5, τοὺς ἄρχοντας καὶ τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους καὶ τοὺς γραμματεῖς, cf. ver. 8; John vii. 26, 48; Acts xiii. 27; John iii. 1, ἄρχων τῶν Ἰουδ., cf. vii. 51, xii. 42. While Josephus describes the high priests as distinct from the other members of the council in *Bell. Jud.* ii. 17. 1, οἳ τε ἄρχοντες καὶ οἱ βουλευταί, in Luke xxiii. 13 they are distinguished as ἀρχιερεῖς and ἄρχοντες, cf. Acts iv. 5, 6; but in Acts iii. 17, iv. 8, John vii. 26, 48, they are designated collectively ἄρχοντες. In Acts xiv. 5 used of the chief of a Jewish community of the dispersion. It is doubtful whether in Luke xviii. 18 a member of the Sanhedrim is meant; cf. Matt. ix. 18, 23; Luke xiv. 1. These are meant only where the connection indicates it.—Lastly, of Satan, ἄρχων τῶν δαιμονίων, Matt. xii. 24; Luke xi. 15; τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, John xii. 31, xvi. 11; ὁ τοῦ κόσμου ἄρχων, John xiv. 30; τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ ἀέρος, Eph. ii. 2.—In the LXX. it is the distinctive word for כֹּהֵן, שָׂרֵף, and שָׂרֵף, but is also used to render שָׂרֵף, שָׂרֵף, שָׂרֵף, שָׂרֵף.

Αὐθάδης, es (from αὐτός and the root of ἀνδάνω, ἡδομαι; ἄδην, to one's full, enough), self-pleasing, self-satisfying, arrogant. Cf. Plato, *Epist.* iv. 321 B, μὴ οὖν λανθανέτω σε ὅτι διὰ τοῦ ἀρέσκειν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις καὶ τὸ πράττειν ἐστίν, ἢ δ' αὐθάδεια ἐρημία ξύνοικος. Αὐθάδεια is, according to Plato, *Rep.* 590 A, akin to δυσκολία, morose dissatisfaction, and according to Aristotle, *Ethic. Magn.* ii. 3, contrasted with σεμνότης and ἀρεσκέα; according to Theophrastus, *Char. Eth.* xv., ἀπήθεια τῆς ὁμιλίας, hardness and harshness in conversation, inconsiderateness. In Hippocrates αὐθάδης appears in combination with ἰδιογνώμων. Plato, *Legg.* iv. 720 C, προστάξας—καθάπερ τύραννος αὐθαδῶς, therefore the inconsiderate of others asks only concerning self. Cf. Diod. Sic. *Ant. Rom.* ii. 12, τοῖς βασιλεῦσιν βουλευτήριον ἦν ἐκ τῶν κρατίστων καὶ οὐχ ὥσπερ ἐν τοῖς καθ' ἡμᾶς χρόνοις αὐθάδεις καὶ μονογνώμονες ἦσαν αἱ τῶν ἀρχαίων

Βασιλέων δυναστεΐαι. Hesychius, ὑπέρφρων, ἰδιογνώμων. Aeschylus, *Prom.* 64, calls the point of the nail driven pitilessly through the breast of Prometheus σφηνὸς γνώθος αὐθάδης. In the LXX. = *ἡ*, Gen. xlix. 3, 7, *powerful*; Prov. xxi. 24 = *ἡ*, αὐθ. καὶ ἀλάζων. Accordingly in Tit. i. 7, αὐθάδης denotes one who pleasing self listens to no one, and inconsiderately asserts himself alone, selfish, stubborn; cf. the κατακυριεύειν τῶν κλήρων, 1 Pet. v. 3, and the positive contrast ἐπεικῆς, 1 Tim. iii. 3, denoting the opposite of standing upon strict rights; 1 Cor. xiii. 5, ἡ ἀγ. οὐ ζητεῖ τὰ ἑαυτῆς, οὐ παροξύνεται. Also in 2 Pet. ii. 10. See Trench.

Under Β α ἶ ν ω :—

Ἀ πα ρ ά β α τ ο ς, ον, rare, and only in later Greek; from παραβαίνω, as the combinations with νόμος, ὅρκος, and the like show. (I.) = *that cannot be transgressed, inviolable.* Very rarely in this sense. Proxagor. *ap. Phot. Bibl. Codd.* 62, pp. 20, 28, σπονδὰς συντηρεῖν ἀπαραβάτους. Usually with the signification derived from this (II.) *invariable, unchangeable*; in harmony with which is the remark of Phryn., ἀπαράβατον παραιτοῦ λέγειν, ἀλλ' ἀπαραίτητον. So Plut. *de fat.* 1 (p. 568 D), ἡ εἰμαρμένη λόγος θεῖος ἀπαράβατος δι' αἰτίαν ἀνεμπόδιστον, *synon.* with αἰδῖος, *de plac. phil.* 885 B; likewise of fate, τάξιν καὶ ἐπισύνδεσιν ἀπαραβάτον. Cf. A. Gell. v. 2, εἰμαρμένη ἐστὶ φυσικὴ σύνταξις τῶν ὄλων ἐξ αἰδίου τῶν ἐτέρων τοῖς ἐτέροις ἐπακολουθούντων καὶ μετὰ πολὺ μὲν οὖν ἀπαραβάτου οὐσης τῆς τοιαύτης συμπλοκῆς. Plut. *de def. orac.* 410 F, εἰ βουλόμεθα τῷ ἡλίῳ κατὰ τὰ πάτρια τὴν νενομισμένην τάξιν ἀπαράβατον ποιεῖν, "we would bring proof that the sun's motion assumed by those before us hitherto is invariable," as opposed to *ibid.* C, τὸν οὐρανὸν ὁμοῦ καὶ τὰ σύμπαντα μεθίσταντες. The word has this meaning also in combination with νόμος. Plut. *conviv.* ix. 14 (p. 745 D), ἡ δ' ἐν θεοῖς ἀνάγκη δύστυχτος οὐκ ἐστὶν οὐδὲ δυσπειθὴς οὐδὲ βιαία πλὴν τοῖς κακοῖς, ὥς ἐστι νόμος ἐν πόλει τοῖς βελτίστοις τὸ βέλτιστον αὐτῆς ἀπαράτρεπτον καὶ ἀπαράβατον οὐ τῷ μὲν ἀδυνάτῳ τῷ δ' ἀβουλήτῳ τῆς μεταβολῆς, where, as the οὐ τῷ—μεταβ. shows, ἀπαράτρ. καὶ ἀπαράβ. are one and the same conception. Galen. in Hippocr. *de fractur. comm.* i. 44 (181), πρὸς γὰρ τὸ κατεπεῖγον αἰεὶ χρὴ τὸν ἰατρὸν ἵστασθαι καὶ μὴ καθάπερ νόμον ἀπαράβατον φυλάττειν τὰ κελευσθέντα πρᾶττεσθαι; cf. what precedes, μή τις οἰηθεὶς εἰς τὸ διηνεκές εἶναι τὸ παρηγγελμένον ὑπ' αὐτοῦ. Jamblich. *vit. Pyth.* 28, προρρήσεις σεισμῶν ἀπαράβατοι, *terrae motus infallibiliter praedicti.* Ocell. *de rer. nat.* i. 15, αὕτη (*sc.* ἡ ἰδέα τῆς κατὰ κύκλον κινήσεως) δὲ ἀπαράβατος καὶ ἀδιέξοδος. Eriphan. *Haeres.* lxxvi. p. 983, ἡ μὲν μεταβάλλεται, ἡ δὲ ἀπαράβατον ἔχει φύσιν. Hence used with τήρησις, εὐσέβεια, *e.g.* Hierocl. *carin. aur. Pythagor.* 26, ἡ τῶν καθηκόντων τήρησις ἀπαράβατος δικαιοσύνη ἂν εἴη; *ibid.* 72; Joseph. *c. Apion.* ii. 41, εὐσέβεια ἀπαράβατος = *immutable.* So also of persons, Joseph. *Ant.* xviii. 8. 2, οὐδ' ἂν αὐτοὶ παραβαλόμεν τοῦ νόμου τὴν προσαγόρευσιν, θεῷ πεισθέντες κἀρετῇ (*al.* θεοῦ πεισθέντες ἀρετῇ) καὶ πόνοις τῶν ἡμετέρων προγόνων εἰς νῦν ἀπαράβατοι μεμενηκότες, *not = sine transgressione vivimus*, but = "we have invariably persevered, have remained

stedfast; cf. Arrian, *Epict.* ii. 15. 1, τῷ κριθέντι ἀπαρβαύτως ἐμμένειν. The adverb often occurs in this sense in patristic Greek. Accordingly we are to explain Heb. vii. 24, ὁ δὲ διὰ τὸ μένειν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ἀπαράβατον ἔχει τὴν ἱεροσύνην = *an unchangeable, eternal priesthood*; compare above, Galen. *l.c.*, where νόμος ἀπαράβατος stands side by side with εἰς τὸ διηνεκὲς εἶναι τὸ παρηγγελμένον. The assumption of an active meaning = *not passing over to another*, as analogous with σκέλη ἀδιάβατα (keeping within compass), is not only untenable, and totally against the constant usage of the word, but is neither adequate to the foregoing διὰ τὸ θανάτῳ κωλύεσθαι παραμένειν, nor to the following ὅθεν καὶ σώζειν εἰς τὸ παντελὲς δύναται, for which we should have had ὅθεν καὶ αὐτὸς σώζειν κ.τ.λ.; compare Matt. i. 21, xii. 50.

Ἵπερβαίνω, *to transgress, to overstep, to step over, to pass by, and to go beyond*; figuratively in the sphere of morals τοὺς νόμους, συνθήκην, synon. with παραβαίνειν, and, like it, without any such addition = *to sin*; ὑπερβ. καὶ ἀμαρτάνειν, in Homer and Plato. In biblical Greek, (I.) literally, *to step over, to ascend or climb*, τείχος, 2 Sam. xxii. 30; Ps. xviii. 30. Compare Homer, *Il.* xii. 468, 469; Eurip. *Bacch.* 654; ὄριον, Job xxiv. 2; cf. xxxviii. 11. With reference to time, Job xiv. 5, εἰς χρόνον γὰρ ἔθου καὶ οὐ μὴ ὑπερβῇ. *To outstrip or outrun; to fetch over*, 2 Sam. xviii. 23. (II.) Figuratively, πρόσταγμα αἰώνιον, Jer. v. 22; here, however, not in a moral sense, as it does not occur, like its synonym παραβαίνειν, to denote sin in the biblical sense,—perhaps because this expression, answering more to the Greek view of the nature of sin as ὕβρις, seemed less appropriate to the spirit of Scripture language than παράβασις, in keeping with the view of sin as παρακοή. Thus it occurs in biblical Greek, not in the sense *to surpass any one*, but attaching itself to the sense *to outstrip*. It is, on the contrary, used (III.) often as synon. with παρέρχεσθαι = *to pass by, negligere*, most strikingly in Micah vii. 18, τίς θεὸς ὥσπερ σύ; ἐξαίρων ἀνομίας καὶ ὑπερβαίνων ἀσεβείας = עֲשֶׂה לַעֲבָרִי וְלִפְנֵי נִצְּיָן. In this sense, *to pass over something*, often in Plato. Aristotle, *De Gener.* i. 8, ὑπερβάντες τὴν αἴσθησιν καὶ παριδόντες αὐτήν. Compare also πάρεσις, Rom. iii. 25. With personal object, ὑπερβ. τινά, *to pass by any one, to leave him unnoticed, unconsidered, or to treat slightly*; Plutarch, *Lucull.* iv. 4, τελευτῶν ἐπίτροπον τοῦ παιδὸς ἔγραψεν ὑπερβὰς Πομπηίου. *De amor. prol.* iv. (par. 496 D), of a mother's love, ἔτι θερμὴ καὶ διαλγὴς καὶ κραδαιομένη τοῖς πόνοις οὐχ ὑπερέβη τὸ νήπιον οὐδὲ ἔφυγεν, ἀλλ' ἐπεστράφη κ.τ.λ. Thus Job ix. 11, ἐὰν ὑπερβῇ με, οὐ μὴ ἴδω· ἐὰν παρέλθῃ με οὐδ' ὥς ἔγνω. Also vv. 2, 3. Aquila, Symm., Theod. have also in Prov. xx. 2 ὑπερβαίνων instead of the ὁ δὲ παροξύνων αὐτόν of the LXX., because they take the Hithpael of עָבַר in a sense indicated also by the καὶ ἐπιμιγνύμενος occurring in some MSS. of the LXX., not = "to grow angry with one" (the usual meaning, to break forth in wrath, to become angry), but = "to pass by one, to despise him;" cf. Prov. xiv. 16. In this manner, therefore, we must explain ὑπερβαίνειν in the only place where it occurs in the N. T., 1 Thess. iv. 6, τὸ μὴ ὑπερβαίνειν καὶ πλεονεκτεῖν ἐν τῷ πράγματι τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ. To render it *to sin*, as

in the combination above quoted, ἵπ. καὶ ἁμαρτ. (Lünemann), is clearly against the connection, which requires not a general, but a special warning. It must, with *πλεονεκτεῖν*, be taken as having τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ as its object (Hofmann), and both words together express the idea of *inconsiderate overreaching*; ἵπερβ. expressing the inconsiderateness of this overreaching, or as a synonym strengthening the conception. On ἐν τῷ πράγματι, "in the existing business or matter the one may have with the other," see Krüger l. 2. 4.

Βάλλω, βαλῶ, ἔβαλον, βέβληκα. From the Alexandrine form of the 2nd aorist in α (see αἰρέω), we have once in Acts xvi. 23, according to A D, the 3rd pers. plur. ἔβαλαν, but in ver. 37 ἔβαλον, the two forms being interchanged here as elsewhere also by one and the same writer. Trans. = **to throw, to lay**; intrans. **to fall**. Intransitively it occurs nowhere in biblical Greek, and seldom in the LXX.; in the N. T. only in the Gospels, Acts, Revelation, and once in James and in 1 John. In the LXX. oftenest in the combination βάλλειν κλήρους = לָקַח לְבָרָה, Ps. xxii. 19; Prov. i. 14; Jonah i. 7; Neh. x. 35, xi. 1; Esth. iii. 7; without לָקַח, 1 Sam. xiv. 42; peculiarly βάλλειν τί τιμὴν ἐν κλήρῳ, Ezek. xlvii. 22, xlviii. 29; and in Micah ii. 5, לָקַח אֶת־הָאָרֶץ, to assign something by lot. Again = לָקַח, Joel iv. 3; Obad. 11; Nahum iii. 10. Elsewhere these expressions are rendered by διδόναι, τιθέναι, ἐκφέρειν κλήρον, διδόναι ἐν κληρῷ. This βάλλειν κλ. does not occur in the classics, yet it is not strange, cf. βαλλ. κύβους, ψῆφον, which, however, are rare. In the Apocrypha, βάλλειν κλήρον, Ecclus. xxxvii. 8; in the N. T. Matt. xxvii. 35; Mark xv. 24; Luke xxiii. 34; John xix. 24 (from Ps. xxii. 19). Elsewhere in the LXX. only occasionally = לקח, נתן, גזל, and others.

The N. T. usage of the word presents but little that is peculiar; for βαλλεῖν εἰρήνην, Matt. x. 34, compare φιλότητα, Hom. *Il.* iv. 16; λύπην, Soph. *Phil.* 64. For β. εἰς τὴν καρδίαν, John xiii. 2, compare ἐν καρδίαις, Pind. *Ol.* xiii. 21; εἰς νοῦν, Pind. *Pyth.* iv. 133. The phrase β. ἔξω, Matt. v. 13, xiii. 48, Luke xiv. 35, John xv. 6, does not refer to any specially Jewish notions, but is only a weightier ἐκβάλλειν = *to reject, to expel*; cf. 1 John iv. 18, ἔξω βάλλει τὸν φόβον = *to drive away*. Peculiar, however, to the biblical circle of thought are the combinations β. εἰς γέενναν, Matt. v. 29, 30 (another reading is ἀπέρχεσθαι, as in Mark ix. 35); Matt. xviii. 9; Mark ix. 47; cf. ἐκβ. εἰς γέενν., Luke xii. 5; εἰς πῦρ, Matt. iii. 10, vii. 19, xviii. 8; Luke iii. 9; compare John xv. 6; εἰς τὴν λίμνην τοῦ πυρός, Rev. xx. 10, 14, 15 (εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον, Rev. xx. 3), of damnation or perdition.

Παράβαλλω is in the LXX. = פָּרַשׁ, Hiphil, Prov. iv. 20, v. 13, xxii. 17; cf. ii. 2. Intransitively = *to draw near to*, e.g. εἰς τὴν πόλιν, Polyb. xii. 5. 1; εἰς χώραν εὐδαίμονα, xxi. 8. 14. Thus in Acts xx. 15, παρεβάλομεν εἰς Σάμον. — Παραβολή also means intransitively *a lying side by side with*; thus of ships in naval battle, ἐκ παραβολῆς μάχεσθαι, τὸν ἀγῶνα συνιστάναι; in Polyb. and Diodor. Sic. the Hebrew לָקַח is usually rendered by παραβολή, though occasionally by παροιμία, Prov. i. 1, xxv. 1, xxvi. 7;

and *προοίμιον*, Job xxvii. 1, xxix. 1. The corresponding Arabic word, according to Gesenius and Delitzsch, signifies *that which exhibits, representation*, be it thing or person (likeness or type), and *هز* always means an illustrative speech, pithy, with certain tokens of the allegorical, especially the gnome, the moral proverb, which presents general truths in terse little pictures. *هز* has certainly a more general range than *παραβολή* in its primary sense, but in the usage of the LXX. *παραβολή* receives the full range of *هز*, and passes thus with widened meaning into the N. T. The *παραβολαί* of Christ are extended picture representations in the form of narrative (see Göbel, *Die Parabeln Jesu*, i. p. 3); cf. Luke xii. 14, xxi. 29, also Matt. xiii. 45, 46, the historical form occasionally giving way to the simple comparison, John x. 1-16; Luke xv. 3-10; Mark iv. 26. Illustrative of the kinship of these parables, in the strictest sense, with merely figurative utterances, Mark iv. 21 sqq., as connected with the preceding parable, is suggestive.—As to Heb. xi. 19, it is in point of fact true that the manner in which Abraham received back his son was a parable or resemblance of Christ's resurrection; but the question is, what was it to Abraham? (cf. ver. 2), and not what it is for us, or as viewed in the light of the range of sacred history. The receiving back of Isaac was for Abraham a pledge of the promise and hope bound up in him; the parable lay in the fact that he had his son again. As he now had received Isaac, so would he in due time become partaker of the promise. And this naturally suggests the statement in John viii. 56, Ἀβραὰμ . . . ἡγαλλιάσατο ἵνα ἴδῃ τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ἐμήν, καὶ εἶδεν καὶ ἐχάρη.

Βασιλικός, ἡ, ὄν, not so common in the classics as *βασιλεύς*, but more frequent in biblical Greek, yet only seldom in the N. T. (I.) *Kingly, belonging to a king*, Acts xii. 20, *βασιλική*, sc. *χώρα*. So of kingly offices, e.g. β. οἰκονόμοι, also absolutely, John iv. 26, 29, as often in Plutarch, Polybius; in Josephus, mainly of officers. (II.) *Befitting a king, of kingly dignity*, Acts xii. 21, ἐσθῆς βασιλ. With this we must class Jas. ii. 8, νόμος βασιλ., a law of kingly rank, i.e. a commandment which, as a king, is concerned with all under it = ἐντολή μεγάλη καὶ πρώτη, Matt. xxiii. 38; cf. Gal. v. 14; Rom. xiii. 8. So Plato, *Min.* 317 C, τὸ ὀρθὸν νόμος ἐστὶ βασιλικός. There seems also to be an indirect reference to *βασιλεία* in ver. 5, so that *βασιλικός* here, like ἐντολαὶ β. in 2 Macc. iii. 13, gives prominence to the authority which backs up the command; cf. Dan. iii. 22, τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦ βασιλέως ὑπερίσχυεν. Further, in Herodian, ii. 14. 2, νόμῳ βασιλικῷ καλλιεργήσας = *more imperatorio*.

Βασιλεία, ἡ, *kingship*, designating the dignity, power, and form of government, as well as (especially in later Greek) the sphere of government belonging to a *βασιλεύς*; and therefore *kinghood* or *kingship*, as well as *kingdom*. The German word "Königtum," which seems to have come into use since the 18th century in contrast with the French Revolution (Hildebrand in Grimm's *Deutschem Wb.*), is used only of the dignity and form of governing; but following the analogy of *Kaisertum*, *Herzogtum*, etc., may also

signify *kingdom*, a sense in which it appears in Anglo-Saxon, Old Norse, English, Danish, etc.; and in the plural "Königtümer." The termination *-tum* primarily denotes position and rank; in a derived sense only is the word transferred in different ways to the sphere or range of government, and we have thus the same change as in *βασιλεία*, for the use of which in these two senses see Acts xvii. 12, 17. (I.) As a designation of **rank** and **power**, it occurs always in the LXX. answering to the Hebrew *מַלְכוּת*, e.g. 1 Sam. x. 16, 25, xi. 14, 2 Sam. xii. 26, ἡ πόλις τῆς βασι. 1 Kings i. 46, θρόνος τῆς β., ii. 15, 22; Isa. lxii. 3, διάδημα β. Ezek. xvii. 13, τὸ σπέρμα τῆς β. Dan. i. 3; Ps. xxii. 29, τοῦ κυρίου ἡ βασι. Obad. 21, ἔσται τῷ κυρίῳ ἡ β. So in dates, where it answers to the infin. of *מַלְכוּת*, e.g. ἐν τῷ ὀγδόῳ ἔτει τῆς βασι., 2 Kings xxiv. 12, xxv. 1, 27, and often, and also for the concrete *מַלְכוּת*; 1 Kings xi. 14, ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματος τῆς βασι.; 2 Chron. xii. 2, xiii. 1. But as = *מַלְכוּת* it appears in the sense of *kingship* and of *kingdom*; in the former, 1 Sam. xx. 31, xxiv. 21, ἡ βασι. 'Ισρ., the kingship or dominion over Israel; cf. 1 Chron. xxviii. 5, καθίσει αὐτὸν ἐπὶ θρόνου βασιλείας κυρίου ἐπὶ 'Ισρ.; 1 Sam. xxviii. 17; 2 Sam. iii. 10, and often. Ps. xlv. 7, ῥάβδος εὐθύτητος ἡ ῥάβδος τῆς βασι. σου; ciii. 9, ἡ βασι. αὐτοῦ πάντων δεσπόζει. In Ps. cxlv. 11–13, we have as parallels *δεσποτεία* and *δυναστεία* (this being the only place in the Psalms in which *מַלְכוּת* occurs). In Dan. iii. 34, parallel *ἐξουσία*, very often in Daniel, where *מַלְכוּת* appears repeatedly (but *מַלְכוּת* not at all) in the sense *kingship*, iv. 14, 22, 31, 33, v. 18, 21, vii. 14, 27. Rarely does *βασι.* in this sense answer to *מַלְכוּת*, as in 1 Sam. xiii. 13, 14; 1 Kings ix. 5; in xi. 11, 13, parallel with *σκήπτρον*, but never in the Psalms or prophets, where *מַלְכוּת* is always = *kingdom*.

Βασιλεία in this sense is rare in the N. T., but most frequently (though not always, as stated in ed. 2) in the Revelation; cf. Rev. xii. 10, xvii. 18, ἡ ἔχουσα βασιλείαν ἐπὶ τῶν βασιλείων τῆς γῆς. In like manner Rev. xvii. 17, δοῦναι τὴν βασι. αὐτῶν τῷ θηρίῳ; xi. 15, ἐγένετο ἡ βασι. τοῦ κόσμου τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν. Besides these passages we have 1 Cor. xv. 24, ὅταν παραδίδῃ τὴν βασι. τῷ θεῷ; Luke i. 33, τῆς βασι. αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔσται τέλος; xxiii. 42, ὅταν ἔλθῃς ἐν τῇ βασι. σου; Matt. xvi. 28, ἕως ἃν ἴδωσιν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον ἐν τῇ βασι. αὐτοῦ, with which Meyer appropriately compares Plato, *Rep.* vi. 499 B, τῶν νῦν ἐν δυναστείαις ἢ βασιλείαις ὄντων. It is no argument against this to say that in Matthew *βασι.* never occurs in this sense, and that in Matt. xiii. 41 the *βασι. τῶν οὐρ.* is designated the kingdom of Christ (Weiss). In Luke there is only i. 33 (besides xxiii. 42) for this sense, and in favour of our interpretation is Matt. xxv. 31, ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ . . . τότε καθίσει ἐπὶ θρόνου δόξης αὐτοῦ. Note also the form of the expression in Mark and Luke, where "the kingdom of God" does not stand for "the kingdom of Christ," but the coming of God's kingdom is identified with the coming of Christ as King.—In John xviii. 36, ἡ βασι. ἡ ἐμὴ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, *βασιλεία* does not signify *kingship* (Hofm., Weiss); compare xix. 11.

(II.) **Kingdom, realm**; so in the LXX. = *מַלְכוּת* (see above), and especially = *מַלְכוּת*, but

nowhere in a theocratic sense; the quotation in Trommius, 1 Chron. xxix. 11, is false; the rendering of the LXX. does not correspond to the Hebrew here, הַמְּלָכָה הַזֶּה , the only place in which מְלָכָה is predicated of God, but almost always מְלִיכָה .—In the N. T. Matt. iv. 8; Luke iv. 5, $\text{ἔδειξεν αὐτῷ πάσας τὰς βασ. τῆς οἰκουμένης, τοῦ κόσμου}$; Matt. xii. 25, $\text{πάσα βασ. μερισθεῖσα—πάσα πόλις ἢ οἰκία}$; ver. 26, ἡ βασ. τοῦ σατανᾶ ; compare Mark iii. 24; Luke xi. 17, 18.—Matt. xxiv. 7, $\text{ἐγερθήσεται βασ. ἐπὶ βασ.}$; Mark vi. 23, xiii. 8; Luke xix. 12, 15, xxi. 10; Acts i. 6; Mark xi. 10; Heb. xi. 23. Peculiar to the N. T. is the expression ἡ βασ. τοῦ θεοῦ (over against τοῦ σατανᾶ , Matt. xii. 26, 28), mainly in Mark and Luke, and in the other books (excepting Matthew) only John iii. 3, 5; Acts i. 3, viii. 12, xiv. 22, xix. 8, xx. 25, xxviii. 23, 31; Rom. xiv. 17; 1 Cor. iv. 20, vi. 9, 10, xv. 50; Gal. v. 21; Col. iv. 11; 1 Thess. ii. 12; 2 Thess. i. 5; 2 Tim. iv. 1, 18. For this in Matthew we have $\text{ἡ βασ. τῶν οὐρανῶν}$, and τοῦ θεοῦ only in xii. 28, xix. 24, xxi. 31, 43; in vi. 10, $\text{τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν τοῦ ἐν τοῖς οὐρ.}$ (cf. xiii. 43, xxvi. 29; Luke xi. 2); absolutely, ἡ βασ. , Matt. viii. 12, ix. 35, xiii. 19, 38, xxiv. 13; Luke xii. 32 (in Matt. vi. 33, Tisch. ed. 8, following Cod. κ reads, $\text{ζητεῖτε τὴν βασιλείαν καὶ τὴν δικαιοσύνην αὐτοῦ}$; Lachm. following Cod. B, $\text{τὴν δικ. καὶ τὴν βασ. αὐτοῦ}$). Concerning βασ. τοῦ X. , see below. Considering the manner in which this expression is thenceforward used, so unmistakeable in meaning, and requiring no explanation (cf. Matt. iii. 2, iv. 17, v. 3; Mark i. 15; John iii. 3, 5), we are compelled to the belief that, like $\text{αἰὼν οὗτος, μέλλον}$, it belonged to the common phraseology of religious life and of the schools at the time; and this is decidedly confirmed by Luke xvii. 20, unless we take the question of the Pharisees, $\text{πότε ἔρχεται ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ}$, to be the prompting of a conviction produced by Christ's miracles, in contrast with their usual bearing towards Him, or as not meant seriously, and thus contradicting their Messianic expectations. It must be allowed that the expression *in the Messianic sense* is very unusual in Rabbinical literature. Mention is made more frequently of the $\text{מְלִיכּוּת שְׁמַיִם}$, not, indeed, as equivalent to *the kingdom of heaven*, but as meaning the dominion of heaven, i.e. of God (שְׁמַיִם , denoting God, see below), and this not in a Messianic sense, but as = God's supremacy, God's all-prevailing dominion; compare Berach. ii. 2, "Why do we pray, שְׁמַע (Deut. vi. 4–9) before שְׁמַע אֱמֻנָה (Deut. xi. 13–21)? Because we first submit to the yoke of heaven's rule, and afterwards to the yoke of heaven's command." The formula $\text{קַבֵּל עוֹל מְלִיכּוּת שְׁמַיִם}$, "to take the yoke of heaven's rule," is a name for *the fear of God*; compare "the kingdom of your God hath revealed itself;" therefore in both places the phrase is not merely equivalent to $\text{מְלִיכּוּת שְׁמַיִם}$ in its general sense, *supremacy of God*, but to the Messianic sense of the phrase; and the latter quotation is of special importance as bearing on the adoption of the phrase by John the Baptist, Matt. iii. 2. Compare further the petition in the Kaddish, which is clearly a Messianic prayer, and which may be traced in its primitive form as far back as the 2nd century, and might possibly be older. $\text{יְמַלֵּךְ מְלִיכּוּתֵינוּ}$, "May He bring in His kingdom," $\text{בְּעִנְיָנָא זְכוּרָא וְזָכוּרָא}$, "soon and quickly" (in the form of prayer by Maimonides, with the

further addition וְיִצְמַח פְּדוּתָהּ וְיִקְרִיב מְשִׁיחָהּ וְיַפְרֵק עַמָּיהָ, "May His redemption spring forth, and His Anointed come and save His people"). Thus it is indisputable that the expression occurs in the language of the schools and of common religious life; and this confirms the assumption that Jesus put His own impress upon it. Inadmissible as it is to attribute the use of it in the synagogue to Christian influences, it is equally inconceivable to suppose that the expression was adopted at the same time independently by both. It simply remains for us, therefore, to explain the exceeding rareness of the expression in a Messianic sense in the literature of the synagogue. And even this difficulty vanishes when we consider the reaction of Pharisaism against that very Messianic hope which Pharisaism itself had nurtured; cf. Wellhausen, *Pharisäer u. Sadducäer*, p. 22 sqq. Hamburger R. = *Encykl. f. Bibel u. Talmud* II., art. "Messias," p. 760. The fact that this reaction against "the written indications of the Messianic sects" led to the cancelling of an expression which had become the Shibbolath of Christianity is as interesting as it is obvious. Besides the few traces that are extant, there are others in the pseudo-apocryphal Babylonian Gemara, Berach. ii. f. 13. 2, "When one puts his hand over his face to pray, he takes upon himself the yoke of the kingdom of heaven." Again, the explanation given in Berach. Sohar on Exodus, fol. 39, col. 154, "What means the word *with fear* (Ps. ii. 11, *serve the Lord with fear*)? The same as is said in Ps. cxi. 10, *the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom*, and this is the dominion (kingdom) of heaven." Moreover, ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ is used in the same sense in the Apocrypha and the pseudo-Apoc. (Tobit xiii. 1; Wisd. vi. 5, x. 10; *Cant. tr. puer.* 30; Psalt. Sal. xvii. 4). Thus far we find no place where the expression has any other meaning, so that Schürer (in his dissertation, "der Begriff des Himmelreichs aus Jüdischen Quellen erläutert," in *Jahrb. für prot. Theol.* 1876, i. p. 166) says, "The expression מַלְכוּת שָׁמַיִם does not occur in Rabbinical literature in the sense *kingdom of God*." But Levy, in his new Heb. and Chaldee Lexicon of the Talmud, cites a place in which it does mean "kingdom of God" in the Messianic sense, *Cantic. rabba*, s.v. תָּאנָה, f. 15b on Song ii. 12, "Israel's time is come when he shall be redeemed, the time of the cutting off of the foreskin is come (that is, by Joshua); the time is come when the kingdom of the Cuthim (*i.e.* the Romans) shall be destroyed; the time is come of מַלְכוּת שָׁמַיִם, of the kingdom of heaven, when it shall be revealed. הַיָּע וְיָמֵהּ שֶׁל מַלְכוּת שָׁמַיִם שֶׁתִּהְיֶה (compare Delitzsch, *Hebr. Uebers. des N. T.* Matt. iii. 1, מַלְכוּת הַשָּׁמַיִם הַיָּע)." This Midrash, indeed, does not probably date farther back than the 9th century, nevertheless the substance of it is older, and reaches back probably to the time of R. Akiba. Occasionally, moreover, there occur — though very seldom — in the Targums the expressions מַלְכוּתָא דִּי and מַלְכוּתָא דְאֱלֹהָא, the first in the Targ. Jon. Micah iv. 7, וְהַתְגַּלִּי מַלְכוּתָא דִּי עֲלֵיהֶן, "the kingdom of Jehovah reveals itself over them;" the latter in the Targ. Jon. Isa. xl. 9, אֲתִגְלִיֵּא מַלְכוּתָא דְאֱלֹהֵכֶן, literature. Thus Assumpt. Mos. 10, "et tunc parebit regnum illius in omni creatura illius et tunc zabulus (*i.e.* diabolus) finem habebit et tristitia cum eo abducetur." *Orac. Sibyll.* iii. 47–50, τότε δὲ βασιλεία

μεγίστη ἀθανάτου βασιλῆος ἐπ' ἀνθρωποῖσι φανεῖται. Another part of the same work, which must be regarded as of earlier date (iii. 766, 767), says that God would establish βασιλῆιον εἰς αἰῶνας πάντας ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους. (In the Psalter. Sal. xvii. 4, the βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ is indeed primarily the basis, and only secondarily the object of Messianic hope, but the expression there means God's dominion or rule, not *kingdom of God*.) Compare Schürer, *Neutest. Zeitgesch.* pp. 567 sqq.

If, then, the Christian adoption of this comprehensive expression in both its forms, denoting the object of Messianic hope, from the language of common religious life and of the schools, be indisputable, the view advanced by Weiss in support of his hypothesis is utterly untenable, namely, that the phrase βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν, instead of τοῦ θεοῦ in Matthew, was invented by the evangelist himself after the idea supposed to underlie it took root in his mind, namely, that "upon the destruction of Jerusalem all hope of a literal accomplishment of the theocracy in Israel was surrendered." "The expression involves the idea that complete salvation, or the completed kingdom, would be realized, not on earth, but in heaven" (Weiss, *Neutest. Theol.* p. 593). This agrees, indeed, with the views of some Rabbis regarding Messianic hope (see Hamburger as above (I.) under *Theokratie*), but not with the meaning of the phrase as used by Matthew. Wellhausen (as before, p. 23) right well expresses its true meaning, "The fundamental conception of Messianic hope is that of the *Malkuth*; . . . both the name and the idea are antithetic—the heavenly in contrast with the earthly *Malkuth*. The latter now rules the world, its opposite has not yet appeared, like all the treasures of hope it is as yet in heaven." No passage in Matthew warrants the view that the kingdom is there represented as something removed and future, though besides its present it has likewise a future. Nothing is meant by the βασιλ. τῶν οὐρ. of Matthew different from the βασιλ. τοῦ θεοῦ of Mark and Luke; and Matt. v. 3, compared with ver. 4, shows how little it denotes what is entirely beyond the grave, and removed from earth.

Nevertheless Schürer's view (*Jahrb. für Prot. Theol.*, as before), already named by Buxtorf, is not to be maintained; that as in the Rabbinical מלכות שמים, *God's dominion*, as already in Dan. iv. 23, מְלָכְתָּא שְׁמַיָּא (Theodotion, ἡ ἐξουσία ἡ ἐπουράνιος; LXX. κύριος ζῆ ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἡ ἐξουσία αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ πάσῃ τῇ γῇ), so here *heaven* is simply God's name. It is very true indeed that שמים, like שְׁמַיָּא (the latter following Ezek. iii. 12), in the Talmud and Midrash, was employed for the name of God, which, out of reverence, one shrinks from naming, and thus became God's name; cf. Buxtorf, *Lex. Chald. talm. et rabbin.* s.v. שמים; Weber, *System der altsynag. paläst. Theol.* p. 145. In this sense οὐρανός occurs in the Apocrypha, 1 Macc. iv. 10, 24, 55; 2 Macc. iii. 15, ix. 20, xv. 34, now directly, now indirectly; and in the N. T. Luke xv. 18, 21 (not Mark xi. 30; John iii. 27. Dan. iv. 23 is capable of another interpretation; see the version of Theodotion quoted above). But though we must allow that βασιλ. τῶν οὐρ. answers to the Rabbinical מלכות שמים, this does not imply that the οὐρανοί in βασιλ. τῶν οὐρ., as employed by Christ, is only a name for God. Used as a name of God, we always have

the singular οὐρανός, and never the plural. But, apart from this, it is impossible, with the expression as in Matt. v. 34 before us, to suppose that οὐρανοί in the phrase βασιλ. τῶν οὐρανῶν may be taken simply as a name for God. As βασιλ. τ. οὐρ. is akin to מלכות שמים, not in the sense of *God's dominion*, but in the Messianic sense of *the kingdom of God*, the variation of the expression might easily be made, without danger of misconception, by Him who was wont plainly and in no covert words to speak of God, and who revealed to man His Father's name. Far rather must this be recognised as fitly belonging to Him, that Jesus Himself filled this conception, adopted from the popular phraseology, with a new meaning. Lipsius therefore (*Jahrb.* etc. iv. 189) rightly rejects the assumption of Schürer with the argument, that he who chose as God's abiding designation, "Our Father, which art in heaven," could not again employ the term *heavens* by metonymy for God. Nevertheless, it cannot be granted that βασιλ. τ. οὐρ. or מלכות שמים in its Messianic sense was first developed from מלכות שמים in its general religious sense. For this, the latter meaning bears too much the character of deterioration. If βασιλ. τῶν οὐρ. be a comprehensive phrase for the object of Messianic hope, and of prophecy which awakens this hope, the connection with Daniel, in the significance which this book has as bearing upon Messianic hope, is obvious. Not, however, with Dan. iv. 23, as Kuinoel, Hävernick, Hitzig, and in particular Schürer, think,—for there is no trace there of any Messianic reference,—but with Dan. ii. 44, 45, where the contrast with the world-kingdom, that contrast which so thoroughly moulded Messianic hope during the later centuries down to the time of Christ, finds its distinctive expression. Cf. Dan. vii. 13, 14.

It can hardly now be doubted that the expression βασιλ. τῶν οὐρ. was used by Jesus Himself side by side with βασιλ. τοῦ θεοῦ; it is much too peculiar to be regarded as a mere synonym side by side with β. τ. θ., which alone is retained in the apostolic preaching. From Matt. xii. 28, xxi. 43, where β. τῶν οὐρ. would not have been appropriate, it is evident that this expression does not entirely coincide with βασιλ. τ. θεοῦ, but gives prominence to a special phase of this kingdom. That we find it in Matthew only (John iii. 5, Tisch. ed. 8, is quite inadequately attested), while the two other Synoptics have only β. τ. θ., is in keeping with the design of his Gospel. The peculiarity of it in Matthew is the antithesis expressed by it. It tells against so-called materialistic or worldly Messianic hopes entertained by the contemporaries of Jesus, and against the fashion of this world in its entirety; cf. Matt. v. 3, xix. 14, 23, 24. The origin of the expression in connection with Daniel points to this. Cf. also John xviii. 36, οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου. It is a kingdom which has not its origin in the present earthly order of things, but which comes down to earth from heaven as a new order, moulded not after the pattern of this present life; a kingdom wherein what hitherto was heavenly and beyond this world is manifested, and to which also the future belongs. βασιλ. τ. οὐρ. stands related to βασιλ. τ. θεοῦ, as the Daniel prophecies do to the rest of prophecy.

Thus βασιλ. τ. θεοῦ or τῶν οὐρανῶν is a comprehensive expression for the goal of

prophecy; that order of things wherein God's redeeming purpose realizes itself. O. T. anticipations may easily be traced in such prophecies as Isa. ii., xi., lii. 7; Micah iv.; Jer. xxiii. 5 sqq., xxxiii. 14 sqq.; Ezek. xxxiv. 23 sqq., xxvii.; Dan. ii. 44, vii. 14; and in such passages as Ps. xciii.-xcix. These anticipations consist in God's relation to Israel as distinct from other nations, *i.e.* God's kingly dominion manifest in Israel by salvation and redemption, to the nations which oppose Israel by judgment; cf. Deut. vii. 6-8, xiv. 2; Ex. xv. 18. Israel is His realm, Ex. xix. 6, Deut. xxxiii. 5, Isa. xxxiii. 22, inasmuch as His will (as law and promise) determines the nationality; God is Israel's king, and works Israel's salvation.

Βιαστής, οὗ, ὁ, the violent, he who by violence compels or endeavours to compel; like **βιαστός**, forced; **βιασμός**, violence. The word occurs only once in Philo, also in patristic Greek, and has therefore an Hellenistic origin. In the classics is found only the Doric **βιατός** in Pindar, with the meaning *strong, courageous*. In the passage quoted by Lösnér from Philo, *De Agricult.* p. 200 C (Mang. i. 314. 5), **βιαστής** stands undoubtedly in a bad sense, τῆς ψυχῆς—ὑπὸ βιαστῶν καταπνεύοντων εἰς αὐτὴν παθῶν καὶ ἀδικημάτων ἀντιρρέπουσας καὶ κλινομένης ἐξαιρόμενον ἐπιβαίνει τὸ κύμα. In like manner also Matt. xi. 12.

Βίβλος, ἡ, originally *the Papyrus plant*; compare the **βίβλιος** of the LXX.; unknown to classical Greek; in Isa. xviii. 1, ἐπιστολαὶ βίβλιναι, where ἐπιστολαί is a mistranslation of the Hebrew נַפְלִיִּם, *boats of Papyrus*; Greek βάριδες παπυριναί, then used of *the bark* of the plant, then *the writing material* named as made from it, *paper*, but only of *paper written upon* (compare 2 Tim. iv. 13, τὰ βιβλία, μάλιστα τὰς μεμβράνας), and hence = *book*. (As to the spelling **βύβλος**, **βυβλίον**, and the difference of linguistic usage, which has fixed **βίβλος** as the word for *written paper*, see Pape.) LXX. = פָּפִיר (oftener, however, **βιβλίον**), Gen. v. 1; Ex. xxxii. 31, 32; Isa. i. 8, and other places. In the N. T. Luke iii. 4, xx. 42; Acts i. 20, vii. 42, xix. 19; Mark xii. 26. For Matt. i. 1, βίβλος γενέσεως Ἰϋ Χϋ = הַיְיָ הַזֶּה פָּפִיר, see under *γένεσις*. The expression β. ζωῆς, Phil. iv. 3, is peculiar; see also ἡ β. τῆς ζωῆς, Rev. iii. 5, xx. 15; τὸ βιβλίον τῆς ζ., Rev. xiii. 8, xvii. 8, xx. 12, xxi. 27; compare Luke x. 20, τὰ ὀνόματα ὑμῶν ἐνγεγράφται ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. The expression is closely connected with the O. T. Ps. lxix. 29, Isa. iv. 3, Ex. xxxii. 32, 33, Dan. vii. 10, compare Rev. xx. 12, and has hardly been borrowed from the lists of citizens in towns—from which the dead are struck out, an enrolment found in Athens, but by no means universal (see Dio Chrys. *Rhodiac.* xxxi. 336 C, in Wetstein on Rev. iii. 5); and as to Israel, not attested by Ezek. xiii. 9 as compared with Jer. xxii. 30; Ps. lxxxvii. 6 implies only a list of the people of a great kingdom. Far more probably the expression had its origin in the genealogical lists (not so much officially and publicly authenticated as preserved, Josephus, *c. Ap.* i. 7, *vi.* 1), reference to which is also traceable in Ezek. xiii. 9, Jer. xxii. 30, and with which the representation of a note-book, cf. Ps. lvi. 9, Mal. iii. 16,

was associated. In both cases the idea is a notification for the future, and thus the thought of a document, forming the basis of a judicial decision, naturally suggested itself, Dan. vii. 10; Rev. xx. 12; compare Isa. iv. 3, סִימָן בְּתַבְרֵה־לָב, οἱ γραφέντες εἰς ζωὴν. The Book of Life contains those who are God's possession (2 Tim. ii. 19), and as such are appointed to eternal life, Rev. xvii. 8, xiii. 8; compare Ps. cxxxix. 16; enrolment in the Book of Life means destined to eternal life; compare Acts xiii. 48, τεταγμένοι εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον, i.e. elected or chosen, having part in and belonging to the kingdom of God, compare Ps. lxxxvii. 6; and thus it becomes the token of this destiny or heirship in its incontestable certainty; hence, too, the ἐξαλειφθῆναι receives its weight as the annulling of the divine election, Rev. iii. 5 compared with Ex. xxxii. 31, 32. Cf. Josephus, *Antt.* xviii. 4. 2, 'Ηρώδης . . . τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς ἐξήλειψε τῶν διαθηκῶν εἰς τὸ βασιλεῦσαι μεμνημένων ἐκείνου. As to the relation between election and rejection, between eternal and historical election, by which the questions usually raised in connection with Rev. iii. 5, xiii. 8, xvii. 8, are to be decided, see ἐκλέγεσθαι.

Βιβλίον, τὸ, the book. The force of the diminutive fell so much into disuse that another diminutive, βιβλιδιον, from βίβλις, whose plural is = βιβλίον, was formed (in the N. T. βιβλαριδιον, Rev. x. 2, 8, 9, 10; unknown in the classics). *Βιβλίον* occurs oftener than βίβλος, and in the LXX. is the usual word for סֵפֶר, once for שְׁרָר, 2 Chron. xiii. 22, and for סֵפֶר, 1 Chron. xxvii. 24. As to a difference in the employment of βίβλος and βιβλίον, see under (II.). In the N. T. (I.) a written document, βιβλίον ἀποστασίον = סֵפֶר הַפְּרִיטָה, Deut. xxiv. 1, Matt. xix. 7, Mark x. 4, the bill of divorcement. (II.) **Book, τοῦ νόμου**, Gal. iii. 10; 'Ἡσ. τοῦ προφ., Luke iv. 17; whereas βίβλος denotes a book embracing several writings, βίβλος ψαλμῶν, Luke xx. 42, Acts i. 20; βίβλος τῶν προφ., Acts vii. 42; Μωυσέως, Mark xii. 26; but not necessarily, cf. βίβλος λόγων 'Ἡσ., Luke iii. 4; compare βιβλίον λόγων, 1 Kings xv. 7, 23, and often. Elsewhere again, Luke iv. 20; John xx. 30, xxi. 25. Often in the Revelation. **Τὸ βιβλίον**, Heb. ix. 19, x. 7 (Ps. xl. 8), denotes τὸ βιβ. τῆς διαθήκης, Ex. xxiv. 7; 2 Kings xxiii. 1, 21; 2 Chron. xxxiv. 30; סֵפֶר הַבְּרִית, in Nehemiah, סֵפֶר הַתּוֹרָה, Neh. viii. 3, and often; once in 2 Chron. xxxiv. 14; also סֵפֶר תּוֹרַת יְהוָה, Neh. ix. 3. מִשְׁנָה in 2 Kings xiv. 6. This τὸ βιβλ. standing alone, Ps. xl. 8, Heb. x. 7, ix. 19, is the only Scripture precedent for the subsequent ecclesiastical use of the words τὰ βιβλία = ἡ γραφή of the Holy Scriptures. In Rev. v. 1–9, it is the emblem of the divine decree, closed and to be revealed. As to βιβλ. τῆς ζωῆς, see βίβλος.

Γάλα, ακτος, τὸ, milk, 1 Cor. ix. 7; according to an ordinary and familiar figure, often occurring in Philo (*De Agric.* i. 301, *De Migr. Abr.* i. 440, and elsewhere; see Siegfried, *Philo von Alex.* pp. 261, 329; J. B. Carpzov, *Scr. Exerc. in Ep. ad Hebr.* on Heb. v. 12, 13; Wetstein on 1 Cor. iii. 2), the elementary teaching of the gospel is designated *milk*, 1 Cor. iii. 2, Heb. v. 12, 13, as distinguished from the στερεὰ τροφή, appropriate for those grown up, ὁ τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγος, whose several parts are

enumerated in Heb. vi. 1, 2. The comparison not merely denotes a difference in the *form* of the preaching (Henrici), as growth in knowledge denotes merely another form of appropriation, 1 Cor. xiv. 20; Eph. iv. 14; 2 Pet. iii. 18; compare also 1 Cor. ii. 13 sqq. The figure, as employed in 1 Thess. ii. 7, indicates a difference in the *kind* of converse of the apostle with his readers. Thus, for example, the argument of the Epistle to the Hebrews concerning the high-priesthood of Christ is not included in *milk*. The Philonic use of the metaphor does not quite tally with that of Scripture, for Philo understands by it the first steps of actual knowledge, the ἐγκύκλια προπαιδεύματα in relation to ἐπιστήμη; see Siegfried, p. 261. Differently conceived is the comparison in 1 Pet. ii. 2, ὡς ἀρτιγέννητα βρέφη τὸ λογικὸν ἄδολον γάλα ἐπιποθήσατε, ἵνα ἐν αὐτῷ αὐξηθῆτε, εἰ ἐγεύσασθε ὅτι χρηστὸς ὁ κύριος. The apostle here is not dealing with the different stages of the spiritual life and their respective needs; he is contrasting the natural with the spiritual life, and in the position brought about by regeneration, the word of God, which is both the source (i. 23) and the nourishment thereof, is designated γάλα.

Γάμος, ον, ὁ, (I.) **marriage, marriage feast**, John ii. 1, 2. Also in the plural γάμοι, Luke xii. 36, Matt. xxii. 2, 3, 4, 9, alternately with the singular, vv. 8, 10, 11, 12; Matt. xxv. 10. The expression ὁ γάμος τοῦ ἀρνίου, Rev. xix. 7, 8, rests, like the parables, Matt. xxii. 2 sqq., xxv. 1–10, upon the relation of God to Israel, and points back thereto as it is presented in Isa. liv. 4 sqq., Ezek. xvi. 7 sqq., Hos. ii. 19. (Cf. Pirke R. Elieser, 41, in Schoettgen, *Hor. Hebr.* in Matt. xxv. 1, “Moses went through the camp of the Israelites and roused them up from sleep, saying, Rise from your sleep; already is the bridegroom come, and seeks the bride, that he may conduct her home, nay, already he is waiting for her. Then came the bridesmaids and led the bride out, as in Ex. xix. 17, and the bridegroom came to meet the bride, *i.e.* that he might give them the law, Ps. lxxviii. 8.”) This relationship of Jehovah to Israel was accomplished in the Messianic time, to which the expression, John iii. 29 and perhaps Matt. ix. 15, points; compare the beautiful drift of the Midrash on Solomon’s Song, reaching back certainly into the second century (in Wünsche, *Biblioth. Rabbin.* Lief. 6. 7), and the Messianic import of Ps. xlv. (Heb. i. 8), of which ver. 3 is thus rendered by the Targumist, “Thy beauty, O king Messiah, is pre-eminent,” etc.; and to this relationship also the Messianic title in Isa. ix. 5, יְהוָה לָנוּ, must, according to Delitzsch, refer. This relationship of God to His people is in the N. T. Christ’s relation to His redeemed Church; cf. 2 Cor. xi. 2; Eph. v. 26, 27; Rev. xxii. 17, xxi. 2. The marriage of the Lamb is the consummation of salvation to be ushered in by the Parousia. (II.) **A festive feast**, Luke xiv. 8, compare ver. 17; Esth. ix. 22, γάμοι καὶ εὐφροσύνη = נְחֻמָּה וְנִשְׂחָה. Not thus used in profane Greek. (III.) **Marriage**, Heb. xiii. 4; in the plural, Wisd. xiii. 17, xiv. 24, οὔτε βίου οὔτε γάμων καθαρὸς ἔτι φυλάσσουσιν. Ver. 26, γάμων ἀταξία μοιχεία καὶ ἀσέλγεια. This meaning leads on to the expressions πρὸς γάμον λαμβάνειν, δίδοναι.

Ἀρτιγέννητος, ον, seldom used in profane Greek, Lucian, *Dial. Mar.* 12. 1, βρέφος

αὐτῆς ἀρτυγέννητον. In Ael. ἀρτυγενής. Plutarch, *Consol. ad Ap.* p. 113 D, distinguishes παῖδες, νήπιοι, ἄρτι γεγονότες, *pueri, infantes, recens nati*. In Biblical Greek only in 1 Pet. ii. 2, ὡς ἀρτυγέννητα βρέφη τὸ λογικὸν ἄδολον γάλα ἐπιποθήσατε; compare i. 23, ἀναγεγεννημένοι, which led to the choice of this rare word. Better than the reference of Wetstein to the designation of the Rabbinical scholars (not of the proselytes, as Huther says) as *sucklings*, is Elsner's allusion to the similar thought in Achill. Tat. i. 37, ὥσπερ τὰ ἀρτίτοκα τῶν βρέφων οὐδεὶς διδάσκει τὴν τροφήν, αὐτόματα δὲ ἐκμανθάνει καὶ οἶδεν ἐν τοῖς μάζοις οὖσαν αὐτοῖς τὴν τράπεζαν.

Γίνομαι, the form universally used since Aristotle, and already probably the usual form in Xenophon, of the Attic γίγνομαι, derived from γιγένομαι (see Kühner, § 333. 232. 3a), from the root γεν, to which also γυνή, γνήσιος belong; Latin, genus, gigno, gnascor; Gothic *keinan*, German *keimen*, Low German *kienen*, *Kind*. See Curtius 175. Besides the usual forms γενήσομαι, ἐγενόμην, γεγένημαι, and γέγονα, we find in biblical and later Greek the frequently occurring aorist ἐγενήθην (see Krüger, § 40; Lobeck, *Phryn.* 109), e.g. Gen. xlii. 25, xlii. 2; Ps. xc. 1, 2; Jer. xii. 8, xviii. 22, and often; in the N. T. almost exclusively by Paul, 1 Cor. i. 30, iv. 9, x. 6, xv. 10; 2 Cor. iii. 7, vii. 14; Eph. ii. 13; Col. iv. 11; 1 Thess. i. 5, 6, ii. 5, 7, 14. Elsewhere only in Matt. xi. 23, Lachm., Tisch.; Acts iv. 4; Heb. iv. 3, x. 33, xi. 34. In 1 Pet. iii. 6, the imperative γενήθῃτω, plural γενήθητε, Matt. vi. 10, ix. 29, xv. 28, xxvi. 42; 1 Pet. i. 15; and in some O. T. quotations, Matt. xxi. 42; Mark xii. 10; Acts i. 20; Rom. ix. 29, xi. 9; 1 Pet. ii. 7. Of the two forms of the perfect, γεγένημαι occurs rarely (Deut. xvii. 4; John ii. 9; Acts vii. 52, Rec.), usually γέγονα with the Alexandrine termination *av* for *ασιν* in the 3rd plural, which is often adopted in the N. T.; see Winer, § xiii. 2; Kühner, § 209. 9.

The verb signifies both absolutely to become, and relatively to become something, akin to *to be* and *to be so and so*.

(I.) To become, to begin to be, (a) of persons, to become, to be born, John i. 15, viii. 58; Rom. i. 3; Gal. iv. 4; Heb. vii. 16; of creation and what belongs thereto, John i. 3, 10; Heb. iv. 3, xi. 3; 1 Cor. xv. 37; Matt. xxi. 19. (b) of circumstances and occurrences, to begin, to originate, to take place, e.g. γογγυσμός, διωγμός, πολεμός, χαρά, etc., Acts vi. 1; Matt. xiii. 21; Rev. xii. 7; Acts xv. 2, 7, xxi. 40, *et al.* (c) Of proceedings and events, their beginning and their course, to happen, to come to pass, Matt. i. 21, xxi. 42, xxiv. 6; Mark vi. 2; Luke ii. 2; Heb. vii. 12; 2 Tim. ii. 18, and often. This is a Hebraism very frequent, especially in Luke and Acts, much rarer in Matt. and Mark, not appearing elsewhere in the N. T., answering to the Hebrew וָיָא, καὶ ἐγένετο, or ἐγένετο δέ, and καὶ ἐγένετο . . . καί, after a clause inserted either with ἐν and the infinitive (Mark ii. 15, Rec., and often), or with ὅτε (Luke ix. 18), or the genitive absolute (Matt. ix. 10). Likewise ἐγένετο δὲ . . . καί (Luke v. 1, ix. 28, 51, only in Luke), or καὶ ἐγένετο with ὅτε, ὡς, ἐν (after a clause), with the inf., Acc. c. Inf. following the finite verb,

Matt. xi. 1; Luke ii. 15, Tisch., v. 1; Mark ii. 23, iv. 4, and often; so also ἐγέν. δέ in Luke (the acc. cum inf. with τοῦ, Acts x. 25, Lachm., Tisch.). Connected with γίνεσθαι *τινι*, used also in profane Greek, to happen to one, to experience, to befall (e.g. Xen. *Cyr.* vi. 3. 11), Acts ii. 43, vii. 40, Mark iv. 11, 2 Tim. iii. 11, is the Pauline repellent denial μὴ γένοιτο, Rom. iii. 4, 6, 31, vii. 7, 13, ix. 14, xi. 1, 11; Gal. ii. 17, iii. 21; in fuller form Gal. vi. 14, ἐμοὶ δὲ μὴ γένοιτο καυχᾶσθαι κ.τ.λ.; in this latter way in the LXX. = הָיָה , Gen. xlv. 7, 17; Josh. xxiv. 14; 1 Kings xxi. 3; μὴ γέν. with *Acc. c. Inf.* following Josh. xxii. 29. Positively γένοιτο = הָיָה , Num. v. 22; Ps. xli. 14, lxxii. 19, lxxxix. 53, cvi. 48. (d) To express the historical appearing of persons, John i. 6; 1 John ii. 18; 2 Pet. ii. 1; with further limitation, Mark i. 4, ἐγέν. Ἰωάννης βαπτίζων.

(II.) Relatively, to become something, with a predicate or adverbial limitation. The predicate a substantive, Matt. iv. 3, xiii. 32; John i. 14; 1 Cor. iii. 11; Acts vii. 52, *et al.*; an adjective, Mark iv. 19; Acts i. 18, xvi. 29; Rom. vi. 5; 1 Pet. i. 16, and often; εἰς τι, Matt. xxi. 42; John xvi. 20; 2 Cor. viii. 13; 1 Thess. iii. 5, *et al.* In circumstances in which one finds oneself, with ἐν, e.g. ἐν ἐκστάσει, Acts xxii. 17; ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ, Luke xxii. 44; ἐν πνεύματι, Rev. i. 10, and the like; very peculiar is γιγονέναι ἐν Χριστῷ, of the beginning of the Christian life, Rom. xvi. 4. With adverbs, οὕτως, Matt. xix. 8; cf. ὥς, ὥσπερ, Matt. vi. 16, x. 25, xviii. 3; 1 Thess. ii. 10, *et al.* Of the place where one has arrived, enters, with εἰς, Acts xxi. 17, xx. 16; where one is, ἐν, Rev. i. 9; whence one goes away, or is brought from, ἐκ μέσου, 2 Thess. ii. 7. So also of relations in which one finds himself, σὺν τινι, μετὰ τινος, πρὸς τινα, ἐπάνω τινός. The relation of ownership is expressed by the genitive γίν. τινός, some thing to become some one's, Luke xx. 14, 33; τινί, some one to become some one's, Rom. vii. 3, 4.

Γένεσις, εως, ἡ, (I.) active, origin, rise, birth, Matt. i. 18; Luke i. 14, where in both places the Textus Rec. reads γέννησις. (II.) Passive, (a) race, lineage, γενεά, Wisd. iii. 13, xii. 10. Thus Matt. i. 1, βίβλος γενέσεως Ἰν Χυ. LXX. = הַגִּנְזָא , Ex. vi. 24, 25; Num. i. 18, *et al.* הַגִּנְזָא , Gen. ii. 4, v. 1, but elsewhere always the plural for this. Accordingly βίβλ. γεν. signifies genealogy or book of genealogy. Also = generation, e.g. Ecclus. xlv. 1, and = kind, species, Wisd. xix. 11, xvi. 26; Plato, *Vir. Civ.* 265 B. (b) being, existence. Thus often in Plato and in the Book of Wisdom; e.g. Plato, *Phaedr.* 225 D, τὴν πρώτην γένεσιν βιοτεύειν. *Vir. Civ.* 274 E, τὸν ἐκ τῆς νῦν περιφορὰς καὶ γενέσεως βασιλέα καὶ πολιτικόν, in antithesis with τὸν ἐκ τῆς ἐναντίας περιόδου ποιμένα. Compare Wisd. vii. 5 with 6. Accordingly, ὁ τροχὸς τῆς γενέσεως, Jas. iii. 6 (cf. *Pseudo Phocyl.* 27, κοινὰ πάθη πάντων ὁ βίος τροχὸς ἄστατος ὄλβος), and Jas. i. 23, κατανοεῖν τὸ πρόσωπον τῆς γενέσεως αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐσόπτρῳ, the aspect, the form of his being. Γένεσις has not the meaning "temporal condition of being," at least in the place cited by Hofmann, Plutarch *de ei Delph.* 18.

Ἀπογίνομαι, literally, to become away. (I.) Primarily the opposite of παραγίν. and προσγίν., therefore = to come or go away, to cease, sometimes to be far or away, *abesse*, e.g.

Plato, *Alcib.* 126 A, ὑγείας μὲν παραγιγνομένης, νόσου δὲ ἀπογιγνομένης, and often. With the genitive *to be separated from, not to have or take part in*, e.g. τῆς μαχῆς, Herod. ix. 69; τῶν ἀμαρτημάτων, Thuc. i. 39. 3. (II.) *To pass away, to die*. That this meaning is thus connected with the former is evident from the fact that Hippocrates expresses both the ceasing of a sickness and the end of a person by ἀπογίνεται, so that the term resembles the German *Hingang, Hintritt*, Latin *exitus*; cf. Josephus, *Ant.* v. 1. 1, Μωϋσέως δὲ τὸν προειρημένον τρόπον ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἀπογεγονότος, where ἀπογιν. refers to the death of Moses, but is not = *to die*; compare ἐξ ἀνθρ., also iv. 8. 48, πορευομένου δὲ ἔνθεν οὐ ἔμελλεν ἀφανισθῆσθαι. But when once the word was used to denote *departure* by death it attained a certain emphasis, and it came to mean (III.) the direct opposite of γίγνεσθαι. Thus contrasted it appears, e.g. in Herod. v. 4, κατὰ τὸν γινόμενόν σφι καὶ ἀπογινόμενον ποιέουσι τοιάδε. Plutarch, *consol. ad Appolon.* 15 (p. 109 F), οἷσι συ διαφορὰν εἶναι μὴ γενέσθαι ἢ γενόμενον ἀπογίνεσθαι. Clem. Alex. *Strom.* v. p. 242, 17, ed. F. Sylb., ὧ γινόμενοι καὶ ἀπογινόμενοι, θεὸς μισεῖ ἀναΐδειαν. In Dion. Hal. (*Ant. Rom.* iv. 15) it appears simply in contrast with γεννᾶσθαι. (Except in Herod. ii. 85, cxxxvi. 2, vi. 58. 2; Thuc. ii. 51. 3, it appears only in later Greek, e.g. Plut. *La.* 113 D; Teles in *Stob. eclog.* cviii. 83; Strabo xvii. 807, et al.)

Παλιγγενεσία (as to Tisch. retaining the *ν* before *γ, κ, χ, ξ*, and therefore the reading *παλιγγενεσία*, see Sturz, *De dial. Mac. et Alex.* p. 131 sqq., and Tisch.'s preface to ed. 7), **regeneration, renewal**. The word belongs to later Greek, and occurs first in Cicero, *Ad Attic.* vi. 6, when he speaks of his return from banishment as *παλιγγ.*, *amicorum literarum ad triumphum vocant, rem a nobis, ut ego arbitror, propter hanc παλιγγενεσίαν nostram non negligendam*. It occurs often in Plutarch as synonymous with ἀναβίωσις, and opposed to ἀποβίωσις, e.g. with reference to the Dionysus myth, τὰς ἀποβιώσεις καὶ παλιγγενεσίας, *de ei Delph.* 9 (389 A); *de Is. et Os.* 35 (364 F), ὁμολογεῖ . . . τοῖς λεγομένοις Ὀσίριδος διασπασμοῖς καὶ ταῖς ἀναβιώσεσι καὶ παλιγγενεσίαις, *de def. orac.* 51 (p. 438 D), εἰσὶ δ' οἱ καὶ τὰ ἐπάνω φάσκοντες οὐχ ὑπομένειν ἀλλ' ἀπαυδῶντα πρὸς τὸ αἶδιον καὶ ἄπειρον ὀξέσι χρῆσθαι μεταβολαῖς καὶ παλιγγενεσίαις; *conviv. disp.* viii. 3. 4 (722 D), καθάπερ ἐκ παλιγγενεσίας νέα ἐφ' ἡμέρῃ φρονεοῦντες, *tanquam denuo renati nova die nova concilia suscipiunt*; *de carn. esu* i. 7 (996 C), τὰ γὰρ δὴ περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον μεμυθευμένα . . . ἀνηγμένος ἐστὶ μῦθος εἰς τὴν παλιγγενεσίαν; *ibid.* ii. 4 (998 C), χρῶνται κοινοῖς αἱ ψυχαὶ σώμασιν ἐν ταῖς παλιγγενεσίαις καὶ τὸ νῦν λογικὸν αὐθις γίνεται ἄλογον καὶ πάλιν ἡμερον τὸ νῦν ἄγριον ἀλλάσσει δὲ ἡ φύσις ἅπαντα. Further, compare Lucn. *encom. misc.* 7, καί μοι δοκεῖ ὁ Πλάτων μόνον αὐτὸ παριδεῖν ἐν τῷ περὶ ψυχῆς καὶ ἀθανασίας αὐτοῦ λόγῳ ἀποθανοῦσα γὰρ μῦτα τέφρας ἐπιχυθείσης ἀνίσταται καὶ παλιγγενεσία τις αὐτῇ καὶ βίος ἄλλος ἐξ ὑπαρχῆς γίγνεται. It is clear that *π* is contrasted with *πρώτη γένεσις* or *νῦν γένεσις* (see under *γένεσις*), and is a *term. techn.* for the Pythagorean doctrine of transmigration. Philo designates the life after death as *παλιγγ.*; *de Cherub.* 159. 45, ed. Mang., μετὰ τὸν θάνατον . . . εἰς

παλιγγενεσίαν ὁρμήσομεν οἱ μετὰ ἀσωμάτων σύγκριτοι, and elsewhere he uses it of the future of the world; *de vit. Mos.* ii. 144. 35, ταῦτα τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἀνδρῶν ἀριστεία καὶ ἀθλα, δι' ὧν οὐ μόνον αὐτοὶ (Noah and his family) καὶ γένη σωτηρίας ἔτυχον τοὺς μεγίστους ἐκφυγόντες κινδύνους . . . ἀλλὰ καὶ παλιγγενεσίας ἐγένοντο ἡγεμόνες καὶ δευτέρας ἀρχηγέται περιόδου. But he clearly has not in his mind a new world after the destruction of this; see *de mund. incorrupt.* 501. 10, where he combats those, οὔτε τὰς ἐκπυρώσεις καὶ τὰς παλιγγενεσίας εἰσηγούμενοι τοῦ κόσμου. Cf. M. Antonin. xi. 1, τὴν περιοδικὴν παλιγγενεσίαν τῶν ὅλων. Eus. *praep. ev.* xv. 19, ὅπως δοξάζουσιν οἱ Στωικοὶ περὶ τῆς παλιγγενεσίας τῶν ὅλων. Plut. *de plac. phil.* i. 3 (877 C). The strict meaning of the word is therefore in linguistic usage evidently **eschatological**. Then figuratively it is used as in Cicero, *l.c.*, and thus occurs in Philo, *leg. ad Caj.* 593. 32, τὸν ἐπικρεμáμενον αἰὲ τοῦ θανάτου φόβον ἀπώσω καὶ τεθνεῶτα τῷ δέει ζωπυρήσας καθάπερ ἐκ παλιγγενεσίας ἀνήγειρας. Joseph. *Ant.* xi. 3. 9, τὴν ἀνάκτησιν καὶ παλιγγενεσίαν τῆς πατρίδος ἐορτάζοντες, of the guaranteed return from the Babylonish captivity. Thus παλιγγενεσία τῆς γνώσεώς ἐστιν ἡ ἀνάμνησις, Olympiodor. in Cousin, *journal. des sav.* 1834, 448. Thus we can understand how it is that the word occurs very seldom—only twice—in biblical Greek. The LXX. use it only once, and this in an eschatological sense, πάλιν γενέσθαι; Job xiv. 14, ἱπομενῶ ἕως πάλιν γένωμαι = יְהַלֵּךְ נִיבָ-וַעַד; cf. 14a, יְהַלֵּךְ נִיבָוַעַד מֵאָדָם. In the N. T. (a) eschatologically, **world-renewal**; Matt. xix. 28, ἐν τῇ παλιγγενεσίᾳ ὅταν καθίσῃ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρ. κ.τ.λ. Therefore as akin to the Philonic use we have for this, Mark x. 30, Luke xviii. 30, ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τῷ ἐρχομένῳ; Acts iii. 21, χρόνοι ἀποκαταστάσεως πάντων; Matt. xxii. 30, ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει. Thus Theophyl., παλιγγενεσίαν τὴν ἀνάστασιν νόει. Euthym., παλιγγ. λέγει τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν ὡς παλινζῶϊαν. Nevertheless the term must not be limited to the resurrection, but is to be understood of the restoration or renewal of all things, as completely synonymous with ἀποκατάστασις, with which it is interchanged in Josephus, *Ant.* xi. 3. 8, 9. Compare Rev. xxi. 5, ἰδοὺ καινὰ ποιῶ τὰ πάντα. It answers to the Rabbinical עֲלִיָּה וְיִשְׁעָה; cf. Buxtorf, *Lex. Talm.* עֲלִיָּה וְיִשְׁעָה; Weber, *Syst. der altsynag. Theol.* p. 382; מִשְׁלָּח מִתַּחַת, Onkelos on Deut. xxxii. 12, and in the Kaddish as given in Maimonides, where world-renewal, quickening of the dead, and salvation of the living are combined. Further, compare Berthold, *Christolog. Judd.* § 45, who cites among others R. Bechai (Schilchan orba, fol. 9. 4), Tempore illo mutabitur totum opus creationis in melius et redibit in statum suum perfectum ac purum, qualis erat tempore primi hominis antequam peccasset. (b) Of **regeneration** through baptism, Tit. iii. 5, ἔσωσεν ἡμᾶς διὰ λούτρου παλιγγενεσίας καὶ ἀνακαινώσεως πν. ἁγίου. How strongly the eschatological meaning retained its force appears from Origen's comment on Matt. xix. 28, where he explains the word of baptism, because it is the προοίμιον ἐκείνης τῆς παλιγγενεσίας, i.e. of the ἀνάστασις. We must therefore assume that this designation of baptism is connected with the reference to the death and resurrection of Christ in Rom. vi. 3, Col. ii. 12, iii. 1, and the συνεγεργῆναι τῷ Χριστῷ in Col. iii. 1; Eph. ii. 5, 6. A mere transference of the word as in the passages

above quoted is not an adequate explanation. It does not therefore stand in the sense of Ezek. xxxvi. 26, 27.

Γενεαλογία. In the LXX. the word is uncertain, and occurs only in a few MSS., Ezra viii. 1, 1 Chron. iv. 33, vii. 5, in its passive sense as = ὡπλητῆ. In the N. T. only in 1 Tim. i. 4, *μηδὲ προσέχειν μύθοις καὶ γενεαλογίαις ἀπεράντοις, αἵτινες ἐκζητήσεις παρέχουσιν μᾶλλον ἢ οἰκονομίαν θύ τὴν ἐν πίστει*, and Tit. iii. 9, *μωρὰς δὲ ζητήσεις καὶ γενεαλογίας καὶ ἔριν καὶ μάχας νομικὰς περιίτασο*. The combination *μῦθοι καὶ γενεαλογίαι*, is borrowed from profane Greek. Polyb. ix. 2. 1, *πολλῶν γὰρ καὶ πολλαχῶς ἐξηριθμημένων τά τε περὶ τὰς γενεαλογίας καὶ μύθους*, with reference to the *γενεαλογικὸς τρόπος* of the historical writing, ix. 1, 4, which gives the fables of gods and heroes. Cf. Plat. *Tim.* 22 A, *περὶ Δευκαλίωνος καὶ Πύρρως μυθολογεῖν καὶ τοὺς ἐξ αὐτῶν γενεαλογεῖν*. Pausan. v. 14. 9, *γενεαλογεῖ δὲ ἐν τῷ ὕμνῳ νεώτατον παίδων Διὸς Καιρὸν εἶναι*. The Stoics treated these fables of gods and heroes as allegorical expositions of the early philosophic talk, as "the original or primary philosophy in an historical garb." Cf. *μήθῳ φιλοσοφεῖν*, Plut. *conv. disp.* i. 1. 3 (613 D). Accordingly, L. Annaeus Cornut. *de nat. deorum*, ed. Osann, p. 80 (born about A.D. 50), says, *δεῖ δὲ μὴ συγχεῖν τοὺς μύθους μηδ' ἐξ ἑτέρου τὰ ὀνόματα ἐφ' ἕτερον μεταφέρειν, μηδ' εἴ τι προσεπεπλάσθη ταῖς κατ' αὐτοὺς παραδεδομέναις γενεαλογίαις ὑπὸ τῶν μὴ συνιέντων ἀ αἰνίττονται κ.τ.λ.* We can hardly distinguish between *μῦθος* and *γενεαλογίαι*; *γενεαλογία* accentuates the form, and *μῦθοι* describes the value of the material in question as myth or significant fable; see Suid. *μῦθος* λόγος ψευδής, εἰκονίζων τὴν ἀλήθειαν. Cf. Plat. *Tim.* 22 C, *τοῦτο μύθου μὲν σχῆμα ἔχον λέγεται, τὸ δ' ἀληθές ἐστι*. See under *μῦθος*. But it is more than doubtful whether there is any reference in 1 Tim. i. 4 to allegorical explanations of heathen myths in a Christian sense. There is no trace of any such treatment of heathenism in the early Christian centuries, and the light tone of this passing reference to such a phenomenon would be inexplicable. Seeing, however, that in Tit. i. 14 *Ἰουδαῖκοι μῦθοι* are mentioned, and that *γενεαλογίαι* in Tit. iii. 9 are named in combination with *μάχαι νομικαί*, just as the *Ἰουδ. μῦθ.*, i. 14, side by side with *ἐντολαὶ ἀνθρώπων*, it may fairly be supposed that the expression designates a mode of treatment of early Israelitish history, of the Mosaic documents, similar to that of heathen fables, and that we have here a condemnation of the Jewish philosophy presented by Philo. The phrase *μῦθοι κ. γενεαλ.* does not put Israelitish history and the Mosaic records as on a par with heathen fables of gods and heroes, but compares the allegorical treatment of the one with that of the other.

Γνώμη, ἡ, substantival for the verbal concept *τὸ γινῶναι*, the discerning. The usage disposes itself according as the thing meant be knowing in general or knowing in any particular case. When the subject is discernment, or the power of discernment in general, the word is synonymous with *νοῦς*, but not perfectly identical with this, inasmuch as *γνώμη* includes the direction of the subject to some object, or the determining

of the subject by some object, *i.e.* discernment as it bears upon conduct, and therefore frequently in combination with βουλή. Νοῦς, γνώμη, and βουλή differ as *to think, to judge, and to will*, γνώμη having a somewhat closer affinity with βουλή than with νοῦς. (I.) In general, (a) **capacity of judgment, faculty of discernment**, so far as conduct is determined thereby; thus in the contrast between γνώμη and σῶμα, *e.g.* Xen. *Mem.* i. 3. 14, οὔτε γὰρ βοὺς ἂν ἔχων σῶμα, ἀνθρώπου δὲ γνώμην, ἡδύνατ' ἂν πράττειν ἢ ἐβούλετο; Thuc. i. 70. 6, and often. (b) **Power of judgment, judgment, insight**, synon. with νοῦς, σύνεσις, φρόνησις. Cf. Aristotle, *Eth. Nicom.* vi. 12, λέγομεν γὰρ γνώμην καὶ σύνεσιν καὶ φρόνησιν καὶ νοῦν ἐπὶ τοὺς αὐτοὺς ἐπιφέροντες γνώμην ἔχειν καὶ νοῦν ἤδη καὶ φρονίμους καὶ συνετοὺς. *Ibid.* c. 11, ἡ δὲ καλουμένη γνώμη καθ' ἣν εὐγνώμονας καὶ ἔχειν φαμέν γνώμην, ἡ τοῦ ἐπιεικοῦς ἐστὶ κρίσις ὀρθή. Chap. 12, καὶ ἡ σύνεσις καὶ ἡ γνώμη περὶ τὰ πρακτά. Thus in Wisd. vii. 15, ἐμοὶ δὲ δῶν ὁ θεὸς εἰπεῖν κατὰ γνώμην; cf. ver. 17, αὐτὸς γὰρ μοι ἔδωκε τῶν ὄντων γνώσιν ἀψευδῆ. Ecclus. vi. 23, ἄκουσον τέκνον καὶ δέξαι γνώμην μου, καὶ μὴ ἀπαναίνου τὴν συμβουλίαν μου. In 1 Cor. i. 10, ἵνα τὸ αὐτὸ λέγητε πάντες καὶ μὴ ἡ ἐν ὑμῖν σχίσματα, ἦτε δὲ κατηρτισμένοι ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ νοῷ καὶ ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ γνώμῃ, it is clear that νοῦς and γνώμη while connected are nevertheless to be distinguished. The distinction cannot be that of the organ (νοῦς) and its function (γνώμη), nor can it be that between *thinking* and *willing*, for νοῦς does not so much signify *thinking*, but in this connection *consciousness, mind, opinion*. Accordingly we must so regard it that in γνώμη direction to a certain object determines the thought, whereas νοῦς emphasizes opinion as a whole, therefore = *way of thinking and judgment*. By virtue of this directing to an object, γνώμη denotes (c) **opinion, intention, direction of will**, as *e.g.* Thuc. uses τῆς αὐτῆς γνώμης εἶναι to denote the essence of party, and often combines γνώμη and ἔργον, *e.g.* vi. 17. 3, οὔτε λόγου μίαν γνώμην ἀκροᾶσθαι οὔτε εἰς τὰ ἔργα κοινῶς τρέπεσθαι. Hence τὴν γνώμην ἔχειν πρὸς τι, *to be inclined to something*. Hence also equivalent to **will**, compare *e.g.* Ezra vii. 23, πᾶν ὃ ἐστὶν ἐν γνώμῃ θεοῦ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ γινέσθω. So Rev. xvii. 23, οὗτοι μίαν γνώμην ἔχουσιν. Ver. 17, ὁ θεὸς ἔδωκεν εἰς τὰς καρδίας αὐτῶν ποιῆσαι τὴν γνώμην αὐτοῦ, καὶ ποιῆσαι μίαν γνώμην. As the word here does not mean the forming of a decision, the expression should not, with Wetstein, be likened to γνώμην ποιεῖσθαι, in which case the infinitive, or ὥς with the participle, must have followed. Hence the transference was easy (II.) to the use of γνώμη in the concrete, where, according to the connection, it signifies *will, pleasure, conclusion, determination, judgment, proposal, consent*, etc. Compare Dem. x. 59, εἰ μὲν ὑμεῖς ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐκ μιᾶς γνώμης Φίλιππον ὁμύνησθε. Plut. *Cam.* 10, τῇ βουλῇ τὸ δημοτικὸν εἴλοντο πάντες ἐκ μιᾶς γνώμης δικτάτορα τὸ πέμπτον Κάμιλλον, and the expressions κατὰ γνώμην, *according to wish* (2 Macc. ix. 20), παρὰ γνώμην, and others. (a) **Pleasure, purpose, decision**, Thuc. i. 53. 2, εἰ ὑμῖν γνώμη ἐστὶ κωλύειν ἡμᾶς ἐπὶ Κέρκυραν πλεῖν; ii. 86. 3, γνώμην ἔχοντες μὴ ἐκπλεῖν; cf. lxxxv. 1, ἐδόκει αὐτοῖς. Thus in Acts xx. 3, ἐγένετο γνώμης (Rec., Lachm., Tisch. 7, γνώμη) ὑποστρέφειν. So in the LXX. as a rule = עֲשׂוּ עִצָּה, τίθεναι γνώμην, in the Book of Ezra, where alone the word occurs, except in

Dan. ii. 14, 15; Ps. lxxxiii. 3; *e.g.* Ezra iv. 19, 21, v. 3, 5, 9, 13, and often. Compare Dan. ii. 13 as parallel with δόγμα. It stands for *will* in general only in Ezra vi. 14, vii. 22. (b) **Judgment, conviction, opinion**, in the sense of δοκεῖν, but not like the German *Ansicht* with the accessory notion of purely subjective opinion. Thus in 1 Cor. vii. 25, περὶ τῶν παρθένων ἐπιταγὴν κυρίου οὐκ ἔχω, γνώμην δὲ δίδωμι ὡς ἡλεημένος ὑπὸ κυρίου πιστὸς εἶναι; cf. ver. 40, κατὰ τὴν ἐμὴν γνώμην δοκῶ δὲ καὶ γὰρ πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἔχειν. 2 Cor. viii. 10, γνώμην δίδωμι; compare ver. 8, οὐ κατ' ἐπιταγὴν λέγω. The apostle thus designates his *judgment*, or the counsel which he gives, and which he expects will be recognised, without desiring absolutely to command it; it is not a mere *proposal* which he puts before the Church (Heinrici), for which we should have γνώμην εἰσφέρειν, εἰσηγεῖσθαι, προθεῖναι, or possibly ἀγορεύειν, εἰπεῖν, but never δίδοναι; this last can only denote the delivery of a judgment, counsel, implying acquiescence as the result. Compare Philem. 14, χωρὶς δὲ τῆς σῆς γνώμης οὐδὲν ἐθέλησα ποιῆσαι, ἵνα μὴ ὡς κατ' ἀνάγκην τὸ ἀγαθὸν σου ἢ ἀλλὰ κατὰ ἐκούσιον. Polyb. iii. 21. 7, ἄνευ τῆς αὐτῶν γνώμης πεπράχθαι τοῦτο τοῦργον; xxi. 8. 7, ἄνευ τῆς ἐκείνου γνώμης βεβαιῶσαι τὰς ὁμολογηθείσας συνθήκας. It is clear that γνώμη always implies or relates to a judging, deciding discernment, that, as Aristotle says, it has to do περὶ τὰ πρακτά. Any historical arrangement of the usage must obviously start from the application of the word in the concrete, in particular cases.

Γνώστης, ου, ό, one that knows, unused in profane Greek; only in Plut. *Flam.* iv. 3, γνώστην δὲ τῆς πίστεως παρείχοντο καὶ βεβαιωτήν = γνωστήρ, witness. In the LXX. 1 Sam. xxviii. 3, 9; 2 Kings xxi. 6, xxiii. 24 = 'נָבִי, knower, prognosticator, diviner. Besides, further, Susannah 42, θεὸς ό τῶν κρυπτῶν γνώστης; compare the N. T. καρδιογνώστης, which occurs neither in profane Greek nor in the LXX.; see καρδιά. In the N. T. Acts xxvi. 3, γνώστην σε ὄντα πάντων τῶν κατὰ Ἰουδαίους ἐθῶν τε καὶ ζητημάτων.

Διαγινώσκω, literally to know one from the other. Hom. *Il.* vii. 424, ἐνθα διαγινῶναι χαλεπῶς ἦν ἄνδρα ἕκαστον, to recognise each man among the corpses on the battlefield. Hence of discriminating knowledge, both to distinguish one thing from another, to recognise it, accurately to know and to distinguish it as different from some other thing. Connected with this is the use of the verb to denote judicial decisions and conclusions. (I.) To perceive, clearly, discriminatingly to discern. Xen. *Cyr.* v. 1. 4, τὸ πρῶτον οὐ διέγνωμεν αὐτὴν χαμαὶ τε γὰρ ἐκάθητο καὶ αἱ θεραπείαι πᾶσαι περὶ αὐτὴν καὶ τοίνυν ὁμοίαν ταῖς δούλαις εἶχε τὴν ἐσθῆτα. Plat. *Ion.* 540 E, εἰ καὶ τοὺς εὐκίθαρίζοντας διεγίνωσκες. Thuc. i. 91. 3, πρὸς διαγινώσκοντας . . . τά τε σφίσιν αὐτοῖς σύμφορα, καὶ τὰ κοινά. Polyb. vi. 46. 10, κατὰ μηδένα τρόπον ἂν δύνασθαι διαγινῶναι, περὶ ὅποτέρας ποιεῖται τὴν διήγησιν. So in the LXX. = גָּן, Deut. ii. 7, viii. 2; Prov. xiv. 33. (II.) To distinguish, *e.g.* Plat. *Conv.* 186 C; Xen. *Mem.* iii. 1. 9; Dem. xviii. 127, γ (sc. συνέσει καὶ παιδείᾳ) τὰ καλὰ καὶ τὰ αἰσχροὶα διαγινώσκειται. Thus

it does not occur in biblical Greek. (III.) **To decide.** Thuc. i. 53. 4, ἐπὶ διεγνωσμένην κρίσιν καθιστώμεθα. Xen. Hell. v. 3. 25, ἡ πόλις ἐπιτρέπει Ἀγησιλάῳ διαγινῶναι τὰ ἐν Φλιούντι ὅπως αὐτῷ δοκοίη, Ἀγησίλαος δὲ οὕτως ἔγνω. Pol. xxii. 7. 5, δέκα πρεσβεύοντας ἐξαποστελοῦσι τοὺς ὑπὲρ πάντων τῶν ἀμφισβητουμένων ταῖς πόλεσιν διαγνωσόμενους, who should give decision upon all disputed points. So in Acts xxiv. 22, διαγινώσομαι τὰ καθ' ὑμᾶς, *I will determine your matter* (i.e. between Paul and his accusers); xxiii. 15, ὡς μέλλοντας διαγινώσκειν ἀκριβέστερον τὰ περὶ αὐτοῦ. One might be tempted, especially considering the ἀκριβ. added, to take διαγιν. here as meaning *to inquire* (Schleusner, "to set on foot a legal inquiry"). But διαγιν. never signifies this, not even in the passage cited by Pape from Plato, *Legg.* vi. 668 C, μὴ γὰρ γινώσκων τὴν οὐσίαν, τί ποτε βούλεται καὶ ὅτου ποτὲ ἔστιν εἰκὼν ὄντως, σχολῇ τὴν γε ὀρθότητα τῆς βουλήσεως ἢ καὶ ἀμαρτίαν αὐτοῦ διαγινώσεται. This passage should be more properly classed under (I.). Even in later Greek, to which Pape appeals, there is no sanction for this rendering. Yet ἀκριβέστερον διαγιν. could hardly be applied to a forensic decision, nor is this the reference here. The words in Acts xxiii. 15 are to be compared not with xxiv. 22, but with xxii. 30. The Sanhedrim were to give a more exact decision, τὸ τί κατηγορεῖται ὁ Παῦλος ὑπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων, and it is concerning this that ἀκριβέστερον διαγιν. is affirmed. (IV.) **To determine, to conclude.** Thuc. i. 118. 3, τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις διέγνωστο λελύσθαι τὰς σπονδὰς; cf. i. 87. 4, ἡ δὲ διαγνώμη αὕτη τῆς ἐκκλησίας τοῦ τὰς σπονδὰς λελύσθαι. So in the LXX. Num. xxxiii. 56 = פקד, Piel, which in 2 Sam. xxi. 5 is = παραλογίζεσθαι, in Isa. xiv. 24 = βουλεύειν. In the Apocrypha only in this sense, Judith xi. 12; 2 Macc. iii. 23, ix. 15, xv. 6, 17.

Διάγνωσις, ἡ, (I.) discernment, e.g. Plut. *Gryll.* 990 A, τῆς τροφῆς. So also in medical works of the discernment of diseases. (II.) **Distinguishing,** Plut. *Sull.* ix. 7, ὅ τῶν αἰτίων καὶ μὴ διάγνωσις οὐκ ἦν, *made no difference.* In like manner, *Coriol.* xx. 5. (III.) **Decision, Dem.** xviii. 7, παρασχὼν ἐάντων ἴσον καὶ κοινὸν ἀμφοτέροις ἀκροατὴν οὕτω τὴν διάγνωσιν ποιήσεται περὶ πάντων. Josephus, *Ant.* iii. 4. 1, ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐν ἀξιώματι τὴν περὶ τούτου διάγνωσιν ἐπαινοῖουσιν. Thus in Acts xxv. 21, τηρηθῆναι αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ διάγνωσιν. Once in the Apocrypha, *Wisd.* iii. 18, οὐχ ἔξουσιν . . . ἐν ἡμέρᾳ διαγνώσεως παραμύθιον, of the last tribunal. Compare Moeris, ed. Pierson, p. 125, where, however, the remark is incorrect that the word is used by Plutarch also in this sense. So far as it can be discovered, Plutarch used διάγνωσις only in the sense (I.), and in his writings διαγινώσκειν occurs only in the senses *to discern, to conclude*, nowhere in the sense *to decide*.

Καταγινώσκω, to perceive something concerning one, to observe, to discern, usually in a bad sense, and hence more definitely, **to discern something against one, to incriminate him, to condemn,** this last more frequently than the first. Suid. καταγινῶναι ἰδίως ἐπὶ

διαβολῇ καὶ πονηρίᾳ λέγουσιν Ἀθηναῖοι. Usually with the genitive of the person, and the accusative of the guilt or punishment; sometimes also, and especially in later writers, with the accusative of the person and genitive of the thing. The passive, however, of the condemned person, which also occurs often, like the neuter passive, of the known punishment (against Krüger, § 52. 4. 4), is not to be traced to this latter construction (against Sieffert on Gal. ii. 11), but to the fact that in Greek the remoter object of the active may appear as the subject of the passive; compare Krüger, § 52. 4. 1; Kühner, § 378. 7. In later writers, *e.g.* Dion. Hal., Aelian, and others, for καταγιν. τινὸς θάνατον we find also τινὰ θανάτῳ. The word is rare in biblical Greek. (I.) To take notice of one, to learn by observing him, to look one through and through (sometimes in a good sense, *to know him thoroughly*). Prov. xxiii. 11, σοφὸς παρ' ἐαυτῷ ἀνὴρ πλούσιος, πένης δὲ νοήμων καταγινώσεται αὐτοῦ, $\Psi\text{P}\text{H}$, *searches him out*. (II.) To discern against one, to condemn him, to reject him, opposed to δικαιοῦν; Deut. xxv. 1, ἐὰν . . . κρίνωσι καὶ δικαιώσωσι τὸ δίκαιον καὶ καταγινῶσι τοῦ ἀσεβοῦς = $\Psi\text{P}\text{H}$. Eccus. xiv. 2, μακάριος οὗ κατέγνω ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ. Test. xii. Patr., Sim. 3, οὐ καταγινώσκει τῶν ἀγαπόντων αὐτόν, *Ibid.* Benj. 6, πρὸς τὸ μὴ καταγινωσθῆναι ὑπὸ θεοῦ καὶ ἀνθρώπων. So in the N. T. 1 John iii. 20, ἐὰν καταγινώσῃ ἡμῶν ἡ καρδιά. Ver. 21, ἐὰν ἡ καρδιά ἡμῶν μὴ καταγινώσῃ ἡμῶν. Cf. Plut. *Dion.* xlvi. 1, καταγινόντες ἐαυτῶν ἔφυγον. In the sense *to accuse of, to charge with*, it does not occur in biblical Greek, not even in Gal. ii. 11, ὅτε δὲ ἦλθεν Κηφᾶς εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτῷ ἀντίστην, ὅτι κατεγνωσμένος ἦν. It is not the passive that tells against this sense of the word here (Sieffert), cf. Herod. vi. 2, but the rule that the object of the accusation is never wanting when καταγιν. stands in this sense, and the fact that Paul would hardly refer to a mere accusation against Peter. In ver. 12 we have not an accusation, but the offence which formed the basis of κατεγνωσμένος εἶναι. Accordingly, καταγιν. must here be rendered = *to be condemned*. The absence of the condemning subject seems difficult to explain, for we cannot suppose it to be either the Gentile Christians of Antioch, nor Peter's own contradictory behaviour, nor Peter's conscience. Peter's contradictory behaviour is the basis, not the subject, of the condemnation, and Paul speaks to the conscience of Peter in order to quicken it. But the difficulty disappears when we remember that the word is not κατέγνωστο, but κατεγνωσμένος ἦν. The pluperfect would denote the fact of a condemnation already past; κατεγνωσμένος ἦν denotes the position of one condemned; compare Kühner, § 353. 3. 3; Winer, xlv. 5; Krüger, § 56. 3. 1. Peter was one against whom condemnation had already been pronounced, *i.e.* one who was expecting his punishment. Compare Plut. *Aprophth.* 188 B, μέλλοντας ἀποθνήσκειν κατακρίτου γεγονότος. *De Fluv.* 1150 A, κατορύσσουσι δὲ κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν γραῦν κατάκριτον. Plato, *Legg.* vi. 785 A, γεγράφθω δὲ ὀφληκῶς, ἕως ἂν ζῇ ὅπου πᾶς ὁ βουλόμενος αὐτὰ ἀναγινώσεται. Buddaeus, *Comment. ling. Gracc.*, Basil, 1556, p. 166, rightly puts κατεγνωσμένος on a par with κατάδικος, ὑπόδικος, κατάκριτος, ὀφλῶν, ὀφληκῶς = *obnoxius e re iudicata*; μὴ ἐκτετικῶς τὴν καταδίκην. Upon the ground of the offence named in ver. 12, Peter, in the eyes of

Paul, stands as one *κατεγνωσμένος*. The question, therefore, as to the condemning subject becomes quite unimportant; if it be started, there is but one answer, namely, the gospel, Gal. i. 6, ii. 2, 17. In the sense *to despise, to esteem as naught*, in which the word is synonymous with *καταφρονεῖν*, and often is joined with it in Polybius, it does not occur in biblical Greek, except, perhaps, in the difficult and corrupt (either in the MS. or by translation) passage in Ecclus. xix. 5, *ὁ εὐφραινόμενος καρδίᾳ καταγνωσθήσεται* (Luth.). Nevertheless, *καρδία* (though not in keeping with the parallelism) may be combined with *καταγν.*, and would in this case be explained like 1 John iii. 20, 21.

Ἀκατάγνωστος, ον, only in biblical and patristic Greek = not to be condemned, not lying under condemnation, 2 Macc. iv. 47, *οἵτινες εἰ καὶ ἐπὶ Σκυθῶν ἔλεγον, ἀπελύθησαν ἂν ἀκατάγνωστοι τούτοις θάνατον ἐπέκρινε*. In the N. T. Titus ii. 8, *λόγον ὑγιῆ ἀκατάγνωστον*. The combination with *λόγος* is difficult, because the synonyms *ἀνεπίλημπος, ἀκαταγόρητος, ἀνέγκλητος, ἀνεπίκλητος*, and so on, are applied only to persons, and hence Bengel and others take *ἄσπιλον ἀνεπίλημpton* in 1 Tim. vi. 14, not with *ἐντολήν*, but with the subject. On the other hand, however, the accusative, often used in profane Greek in attributive conceptions, is very rare in the N. T.; compare Heb. ii. 17, and the accusative with the passive, 1 Tim. iv. 2, vi. 5; Gal. vi. 6; Heb. x. 22; but the Greek of the pastoral Epistles is more akin to profane Greek than that of the N. T. writings generally, except Luke, Acts, and Hebrews. This only tells against this rendering that the Greek exegesists construe *ἀκαταγν.* as an adjective qualifying *λόγος*; cf. Cram. *Caten.* on Titus ii. 8, *λόγος . . . μηδεμίαν τοῖς ἐναντίοις προσέχων λαβήν*. Theophyl. *λόγον ὀρθόδοξον μηδὲν ἐπιλήψιμον ἔχοντα*.

Συγγνώμη, ἡ, from *συγγινώσκειν, to discern together with one*, Xen. *Cyr.* vii. 2. 27; Thuc. viii. 24. 5, *i.e. to agree with*, then = *to grant*, and indeed to recognise, to discern, to examine, 2 Macc. xiv. 31; as well as to allow, to grant, to admit, and especially to concede, 4 Macc. viii. 20. Compare *συγγνωστός, may receive forgiveness*, Wisd. vi. 7 (with the unusual genitive of the subject *ἐλέου*, instead of the usual genitive of the object); *συγγνωμονεῖν*, 4 Macc. v. 12. The substantive *συγγνώμη* is as rare in biblical Greek as the verb. It signifies usually (I.) *forbearance, forgiveness*, Ecclus. Prol. and iii. 13, *ἐὰν ἀπολείπη σύνεσιν συγγνώμην ἔχε*. Very seldom (II.) in the sense *indulgence, permission*, as in 1 Cor. vii. 6, *τοῦτο δὲ λέγω κατὰ συγγνώμην οὐ κατ' ἐπιταγήν*. It signifies the opposite, not of interdict, but of command. It need not be as Paul had written in ver. 2, for it may also be otherwise, namely, as suggested in ver. 7, where *θέλω* is not = *ἐπιτάσσειν* or *παραγγέλλειν*, any more than *συγγνώμη* here is = *γνώμη* in ver. 25. Here, therefore, it is not so correct to render it *permission, licence, leave*, as from *indulgence, from consideration*. Aristotle, *Nicom. Eth.* vi. 11, *ἡ γνώμη . . . ἡ τοῦ ἐπιεικοῦς ἐστὶ κρίσις ὀρθή . . . τὸν γὰρ ἐπιεικῆ μάλιστα φαμεν εἶναι συγγνωμονικὸν καὶ ἐπιεικὲς τὸ ἔχειν περὶ ἑνια συγγνώμην. ἡ δὲ συγγνώμη γνώμη ἐστὶ κριτικὴ τοῦ ἐπιεικοῦς ὀρθή, ὀρθὴ δ' ἡ τοῦ ἀληθοῦς*. iii. 1, *τῆς ἀρετῆς δὴ περὶ πάθη καὶ*

πράξεις οὔσης καὶ ἐπὶ μὲν τοῖς ἐκουσίοις ἐπαίνων καὶ ψόγων γινομένων, ἐπὶ δὲ τοῖς ἀκουσίοις συγγνώμης, ἐνίοτε δὲ καὶ ἐλέου. vii. 7, ἔτι ταῖς φυσικαῖς μᾶλλον συγγνώμῃ ἀκολουθεῖν ὀρέξεσιν. Dem. xix. 238, τὸ “συγγνώμῃ ἀδελφῷ βοηθεῖν” προσειληφότες.

Γνωρίζω, fut. γνωρίσω, 1 Sam. x. 8; Dan. v. 15, 17; John xvii. 26; Eph. vi. 21; Col. iv. 7; Attic γνωριῶ, 1 Sam. xiv. 12, xvi. 3; Jer. xvi. 21; Ezek. xliii. 11, xliv. 23; Col. iv. 9; not from γνώριμος, but formed in the same manner as this; cf. the Latin *gnarus*, and derived from the root γνω (γνῶναι, γνῶμη). It occurs in two seemingly opposite meanings, to know, or to be acquainted with, and to make known, this last prevailing only in later Greek. That both meanings are much akin to each other is shown by the passive γνωρίζεσθαι, *notum esse*, to become known, i.e. to be known, and *notum fieri*, to become acquainted with, see (I.) and (II.). It may probably be traced back to an intransitive meaning of γνῶσις, no longer found in linguistic usage, to exercise γνῶσις, to confirm or to effect γνῶναι, by virtue of which γνωρίζειν, like other words of the same structure, passes from the intransitive to the transitive; cf. ὑβρίζω, πλουτίζω.—Γνώριμος, known, befriended, very rare in biblical Greek; in the LXX. besides 2 Sam. iii. 8 (= עֲרִיב, elsewhere rendered ἐταῖρος, συνεταῖρος), only in Ruth ii. 1, iii. 2; Prov. vii. 4 = עֲרִיב, of relations; in the Apoc., on the contrary, = acquainted with, Ecclus. xx. 2; Bar. vi. 16, γνώριμοί εἰσιν οὐκ ὄντες θεοί; 4 Macc. v. 3, πολλοῖς γν. = befriended.

(I.) To acknowledge, to recognise, e.g. Plato, *Lach.* 181 C, γνῶριζε καὶ ἡμᾶς . . . ὅπως ἂν διασώζητε καὶ ὑμεῖς τὴν ἡμετέραν φιλίαν; cf. what precedes, χρῆν μὲν οὖν καὶ πρότερόν σε . . . ἡμᾶς οἰκείους ἡγεῖσθαι. So Prov. iii. 6, πᾶσαις ὁδοῖς σου γνῶριζε τὴν σοφίαν ἵνα ὁρθοτομῇ τὰς ὁδοὺς σου = γν. Symmachus, Job iv. 16, οὐκ ἐγνώρισα τὸ εἶδος; LXX. οὐκ ἐπέγνων. So also in the only N. T. passage under this head, Phil. i. 22, τί αἰρήσομαι οὐ γνῶρίζω. Elsewhere in the N. T. it is = to make known; but this is no reason for retaining this meaning here as Meyer does, explaining it “I refrain from pronouncing,” which gives no sense; γν. never means to pronounce or decide. Even in O. T. Greek γν. usually has the meaning given under (II.), and yet in Prov. iii. 6, Job xxxiv. 25, and Symm. Job iv. 16, xxxv. 15, it signifies to know, to acknowledge; so also Prov. xv. 10, παιδεία ἀκάκου γνωρίζεται ὑπὸ τῶν παριόντων, where the LXX. have mistaken the Hebrew text. To become acquainted with, Plut. *Thest.* xxx. 4, τὸν Θησέα . . . τότε πρῶτον ὄφει γνωρίσαι τὸν Ἑρακλέα. To know, Dem. xxxv. 6, οὐδ’ ὅπωςτι οὖν ἐγνώριζον τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τούτους. Plut. *Crass.* xxviii. 4, οἱ Κράσσον εὖ καὶ Κάσσιον ἀπ’ ὄψεως ἐγνώριζον. So Job xxxiv. 25, ὁ γνωρίζων αὐτῶν τὰ ἔργα; cf. vv. 23, 24 = נָבַר, Hiphil. The passive to become known, Dem. lx. 7; to be known, to be acknowledged, e.g. τὰ γνωριζόμενα μέρη τῆς γῆς, Pol. ii. 37. 4, iii. 1, 4, opposed to ἀγνοεῖσθαι, Pol. iii. 36. 3. Lucian, *Tim.* 5, ἐπειδὴ πένης διὰ ταῦτα ἐγεγόνην, οὐκέτι οὐδὲ γνωρίζομαι πρὸς αὐτῶν οὐδὲ προσβλέπουσιν κ.τ.λ.—II. To make known, to make acquainted with. Antiattic ed. Bekker, lxxxvii. 28, γνωρίσαι ἀντὶ τῷ ἐτέρῳ γνώριμα ποιῆσαι. Instanced by only one passage in Attic Greek, Aesch. *Prom.* 487, κληδόνας πε δυσκρίτους

ἐγνώρισε αὐτοῖς. As to Aristotle, Bonitz, *index Arist. s.v.*, rightly avoids attributing this use of the word to him, even in the places cited by Pape, *Rhet.* i. 1; *Anal. pr.* ii. 16, where it stands only as in *Top.* 4, as elsewhere in Aristotle in a sense synonymous with γινώσκειν, γνῶσιν λαμβάνειν, μαυθάνειν, εἰδέναι. On the other hand, in Plutarch it often occurs in this sense side by side with its other meaning, e.g. *Fab. Max.* xxi. 3, ἡ γυνὴ . . . γνωρίζει τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτῷ; cf. 2, λανθάνειν τὸν ἀδελφὸν οἰομένης ἐκείνης. *Cal. maj.* i. 2, εἰωθότων δὲ τῶν Ῥωμαίων τοὺς ἀπὸ γένους μὲν δόξαν οὐκ ἔχοντας ἀρχομένους δὲ γνωρίζεσθαι δι' αὐτῶν καινοὺς προσαγορεύειν ἀνθρώπους. *Anton.* lxxii. 2, γνωρισθεῖς μὲν ἐν Ῥώμῃ διὰ Τιμαγένους. *Arat.* xlv. 1, ταῖς πόλεσιν ἐντυχεῖν καὶ γνωρισθῆναι τοῖς Ἀχαιοῖς. *Quaest. rom.* 35 (273 B), γνωρισθεῖσαν τούτῳ. Also in *Athen.* xii. 55 (539), ὁ Περσῶν βασιλεὺς ἀθλοθετῶν τοῖς τὰς ἡδονὰς αὐτῷ γνωρίζουσι, "who make him acquainted with new lusts." Elsewhere it can be proved to have this sense only seldom in profane Greek. But in biblical Greek this is the sense most frequent, and in the LXX. it is the word mainly used to render the Hiphil of ידע, which is otherwise rendered by διδάσκειν, διαμαρτύρεσθαι, δηλοῦν, ἀναγγέλλειν; and occasionally by other words. Together with ἀποκαλύπτειν, φανεροῦν, and δηλοῦν it ranks among the terms expressive of divine revelation. While ἀποκαλ. and φανερ. = נִגַּח, are equivalent to *to bring out to view*, γνωρίζειν and δηλοῦν (the latter very seldom), *to bring to knowledge, to make known*; ἀποκαλ. and φανερ. signify the presentation or realization of the thing, γνωρίζειν effects the information or knowledge and understanding thereof; compare Rom. xvi. 26, μυστηρίου χρόν. αἰών. σεσιγημένου φανερωθέντος δὲ νῦν διὰ τε γραφῶν προφ. κατ' ἐπιταγὴν τοῦ αἰωνίου θεοῦ εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη γνωρισθέντος. Compare Ps. xxxix. 5, γνώρισόν μοι κύριε τὸ πέρας μου ἵνα γινῶ τί κ.τ.λ.; Jer. xi. 18, γνώρισόν μοι καὶ γνώσομαι; Ezek. xx. 11, ἐγνωρίσθην τῷ σπέρματι οἴκου Ἰακώβ καὶ ἐγνώσθην αὐτοῖς ἐν γῇ Αἴγ. It is thus synonymous also with διδάσκειν, Ezek. xlv. 23; Ps. xxv. 4. Except in Ex. xxi. 36; Ruth iii. 3; 1 Sam. vi. 2, xiv. 12; Dan. ii. 15; Ezra iv. 14, v. 10; Neh. viii. 12; Hos. viii. 4; Ps. xxxii. 5, it stands in the LXX. of prophetic disclosures, 1 Sam. x. 8, xxviii. 15; interpretation of dreams, τὴν σύγκρισιν τοῦ ἐνυπνίου, Dan. ii. 5, 30, iv. 3, 4, v. 7, 8, 15, 17, vii. 16; chiefly, with God as the subject, of divine communications, prophecies of His will, concerning His command, τὸν νόμον, Ps. lxxvii. 5; τὰ νόμιμα, Ezek. xliii. 11; δικαιώματα, Ezek. xx. 5; cf. Neh. viii. 12, ix. 14, τὸ σάββατον, parallel with ἐντολὰς καὶ προστάγματα καὶ νόμον ἐνετειλῶ. Ps. xxv. 5, τὰς ὁδοὺς τοῦ κυρίου. Ps. ciii. 7; Prov. xxii. 19; Ps. cxliii. 10, ὁδὸν ἐν ᾗ πορεύσομαι. Ps. xvi. 5, ὁδὸν ζωῆς. Of divine disclosures with reference to His purpose or the future, 1 Sam. xvi. 3; 2 Sam. vii. 21; 1 Kings i. 27; Dan. ii. 28, 29, ἃ δεῖ γενέσθαι; compare viii. 19, τὰ ἐσόμεθα ἐπ' ἐσχάτων. Ps. xcvi. 2, τὸ σωτήριον αὐτοῦ, and finally of God's self-affirmation, whereby He is revealed in His power and glory; Ps. lxxvii. 15, τὴν δυνάμιν σου. So likewise Jer. xvi. 21; Ps. cvi. 9, τὴν δυναστείαν αὐτοῦ; lxxxix. 12, τὴν δεξιάν σου. Ezek. xx. 5, ἐγνωρίσθην τῷ σπέρματι. Ἰακ. = יַעֲקֹב יְיָ 3 Macc. ii. 6, τὸν θρασὺν Φαραὼ . . . ποικίλαις καὶ πολλαῖς

δοκιμάσας τιμωρίαις ἐγνώρισας τὴν σὴν δυναστείαν ἐφ' αἷς ἐγνώρισας τὸ μέγα σου κράτος. (Aq. Job xxxviii. 12, ἐγνώρισας τῷ ὀρθρῷ τόπον αὐτοῦ; Ps. xxv. 14, τὴν συνθήκην αὐτοῦ γνωρίσει αὐτοῖς.)

Accordingly it stands in the N. T., save in Col. iv. 7, 9, Eph. vi. 21, 2 Cor. viii. 1, mainly of the revelation of God's saving purpose, and of the apostolic activity; the latter, 1 Cor. xii. 3, xv. 1; Gal. i. 11; 2 Pet. i. 16; of divinely communicated tidings, Luke ii. 15; of God's saving purpose, τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ, Eph. i. 12, iii. 3, 5, 10, vi. 19; Col. i. 27; Rom. xvi. 26; of God's making His power known, Rom. ix. 22, 23; of Christ's work in revealing, John xv. 15, πάντα ἃ ἤκουσα παρὰ τοῦ πατρός μου ἐγνώρισα ὑμῖν. xvii. 26, ἐγνώρισα αὐτοῖς τὸ ὄνομά σου καὶ γνωρίσω. For Luke ii. 17, see διαγνωρίζω. Acts ii. 28 is quoted from Ps. xvi. 11.—The passive in Rom. xvi. 26, Phil. iv. 6, of communications made to God, τὰ αἰτήματα ὑμῶν γνωριζέσθω πρὸς τὸν θεόν; cf. Ps. xxxii. 5; Hos. viii. 4. In the LXX. the passive, Ex. xxi. 36; Ezek. xx. 5; Ruth iii. 3; for this last place, compare Plut. *Aral.* lxvi. 2, above.

Ἀναγνωρίζω, to recognise again; but the passive, Gen. xlv. 1, ἀνεγνωρίζετο τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς αὐτοῦ, and Acts vii. 13, ἀνεγνωρίσθη Ἰωσ. τοῖς ἀδ. (γῆν, Hithpael), answers to an active with the signification, to make known again; see γνωρίζω (II.).

Διαγνωρίζω, to know by distinguishing; but in Luke ii. 17, from γνωρίζω (II.) = to make known through a district, to spread abroad the tidings, διεγνώρισαν περὶ τοῦ ῥήματος (Rec., Tisch. 7, whereas Lachm., Tisch. 8 read ἐγνώρισαν).

Γλώσσα. Γλώσσασι or γλώσσα denotes the charisma or power of speaking to God in a manner above and different from that of ordinary life. That the expression γλώσσασις or γλώσση λαλεῖν—the latter used only of individuals, 1 Cor. xiv. 2, 4, 13, 14, 19, 27; compare ver. 26, γλώσσαν ἔχει, but the plural of many and also of individuals, 1 Cor. xiv. 5, 6, 18—arises out of the signification of "tongue" as denoting "power of speaking," and not as signifying "language," and therefore refers to the ability and not to the practice, is clear from 1 Cor. xiv. 9, οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς διὰ τῆς γλώσσης ἐὰν μὴ εὐσημον λόγον δώτε, πῶς ἡγνωσθήσεται τὸ λαλούμενον, as compared with ver. 6, ἐὰν ἔλθω πρὸς ὑμᾶς γλώσσασις λαλῶν, τί ὑμᾶς ὠφελήσω ἐὰν μὴ ὑμῖν λαλήσω ἢ ἐν ἀποκαλύψει κ.τ.λ. (Compare also the διὰ γλώσσης ἐτέρας side by side with χεῖλη in Isa. xxviii. 11.) The transit to γλώσσα in a physiological sense, ver. 9 (cf. Aristotle, *Hist. Anim.* v. 9, διάλεκτος φωνῆς τῇ γλώττῃ διάρθρωσις. *Anim. Gen.* v. 7, φωνή . . . τοῦ λόγου ὕλη), would not be possible if in ver. 6 the word meant the thing spoken. According to vv. 18, 19, πάντων ὑμῶν μᾶλλον γλώσση λαλῶ· ἀλλὰ ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ θέλω πέντε λόγους τῷ νοῦ μου λαλήσαι . . . ἢ μυρίους λόγους ἐν γλώσσῃ; compare ver. 14, ἐὰν γὰρ προσεύχομαι γλώσσῃ, τὸ πνεῦμά μου προσεύχεται, ὁ δὲ νοῦς μου ἄκαρπός ἐστιν; ver. 15, προσεύξομαι τῷ πνεύματι, the γλώσσα or the πνεῦμα in it is as dependent on the λαλεῖν as is the νοῦς. The expression cannot therefore have been derived from that feature of

the oracle, which adopted the use of old, unusual, and newly-formed words attributed to God, and, like all strange expressions requiring explanation, called γλώσσαι; see Bekker, *Anecd. Gr. (anti-Attic.)* lxxxvii. 12, γλώττας τὰς τῶν ποιητῶν ἢ ἄστινας ἄλλας ἐξηγούμεθα. As to the thing itself, see the three dissertations of C. A. Lobeck, *De dialecto mystica*, Königsberg 1825, practically adopted and revised in his *Aglaophamus*, ii. 3. 8, p. 834 sqq. His opinion seemed quite in keeping with the representation of a language of the gods mentioned in Homer, Pindar, and Hesiod, and of which the Pythia must have availed herself,—a representation taken note of by later writers also. See further upon this in Lobeck, in the second of his dissertations, and *Aglaoph. l.c.* p. 854 sqq. The analogy of the mantic ecstasy, to which 1 Cor. xii. 3 refers, favoured by the relation between the μάντις and the προφήτης who had to take up and examine his utterances, and the necessity of an ἐρμηνευτὴς γλωσσῶν, seems to be quite in keeping with this. So at first Bleek, *Stud. u. Krit.* 1829, pp. 5, 538, 1830, p. 45; and of late, Heinrici on 1 Cor. p. 378. Thus the speaking with tongues of the early Church would be regarded as a revival and purifying of the phenomenon of a past heathendom, and as thus designated accordingly. The heathen phenomena were no longer known; cf. the treatise of Plutarch, *Cur Pythia nunc non reddat oracula carmine*, *Mor.* 394 sqq., but (it is argued) the later term, *techn. γλώσσαι* (but not γλώσσαις λαλεῖν) kept its ground; an expression, however, which included all unusual utterances old or new, idiotisms, barbarisms, and the like. While, however, it cannot be denied that such an analogy exists, it is utterly improbable that the Christian Church, in which the expression arose, could, in the very first age of its antagonism with heathendom, have regarded this phenomenon appearing within it as an *analogon* wrought by the Divine Spirit with the old heathen oracle; least of all, that Christians could have named it according to such an analogy. And yet the mode of expression γλώσση or γλώσσαις λαλῶν afterwards is said to have been ratified and supported by this reference. It is conclusive against this, first, that the γλώσσαι of the oracles and the gods were invariably single words only or phrases, differing indeed from the language of common life, but certainly in part grown upon its soil, and in part moulded after its form; expressions unusual indeed, designating the thing referred to from a different, a special, perhaps a higher point of view; the utterance as a whole was not the utterance of a strange language, but in spite of the identity of language became, through these unusual expressions, mysterious and dark. The γλώσσαις λαλεῖν, on the contrary, was not a speaking in the usual idiom, with the meaning hidden from the congregation by strange words chosen to denote the main points,—which might be regarded only as a new phraseology still within the idiom; it was, according to 1 Cor. xiv. 2, 9, 16, quite incomprehensible, directed not like the oracles to men, but to God, edifying not the congregation, but only the speaker himself. 1 Cor. xiv. 21–25, especially vv. 22, 23, are decisive on this point. It is not the speaking with tongues, moreover, but the ἀποκάλυψις and προφητεία that answer to the phenomena spoken of in the profane sphere. Besides, the narrative of

Acts ii. 3 sqq. (x. 46, xix. 6) is conclusive against this supposed analogy. For though it may be argued, concerning the origin of the expression, that the Epistles to the Corinthians were written before the Book of the Acts, and that thus the expression first sprang from Gentile-Christian soil; in any case, the narrative in the Book of the Acts presents to us the view which was taken of the phenomenon, and according to this narrative the expression is clearly connected with *γλώσσα* = *tongue*; compare Mark xvi. 17, *γλώσσαις λαλήλουσιν καιναῖς*; Isa. xxviii. 11, *הִנֵּנִי יִצְחָק וְיִשְׂרָאֵל בְּלִשָּׁנָם*. Thus *γλώσσαις λαλεῖν* must have been the original expression from which was derived the singular *γλώσση λαλεῖν*, as referring to a single person; cf. *γλώσση προσεύχεσθαι*, xiv. 14; *γλώσσαν ἔχειν*, xiv. 26; *γλώσσαι* is the original expression for the gift, to speak with tongues of a new world; compare 1 Cor. xiii. 1, *ἐὰν ταῖς γλώσσαις τῶν ἀνθρώπων λαλῶ καὶ τῶν ἀγγέλων*, where the apostle supposes a speaking with tongues of a higher kind, which, nevertheless, is as nothing without love. From the plural, the use of the singular in this manner first arose, 1 Cor. xiv. 2, 4, 9, 13, 14, 19, 26, 27; *γένη γλωσσῶν*, 1 Cor. xii. 10, 28, refers perhaps to a manifoldness of the gift which excluded interpretation by learning, and made that *ἐρμηνεία*, which became possible as a charisma, necessary in every case; cf. ver. 10, chap. xiv. 13. But more probably the expression denotes nothing more than that other phrase not elsewhere used in Paul's writings, *ἕτεραι γλώσσαι*, *γλ. καιναί*, in order to give prominence to the difference from ordinary speaking. For the literature upon the subject, in addition to the books already named, see the references in Heinrici, and Wendt on Acts ii., who starts from the signification *tongue*, not *language*.

Ἑτερόγλωσσος in Polybius and Strabo = *of other language, of foreign speech*, and indeed Pol. xxiv. 9. 5, *πλείστοις ἀλλοφύλοις καὶ ἑτερογλώττοις ἀνδράσι χρησάμενος* = *of various languages*, men differing in language from each other (Josephus, *Ant.* i. 4. 3); Strabo, viii. 333; Aquila, Ps. cxiv. 1, *ἀπὸ λαοῦ ἑτερογλώσσου*; LXX. *ἐκ λαοῦ βαρβάρου*; Symmachus, *ἐκ λ. ἀλλοφώνου*, *יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּלִשָּׁנָם*. In the N. T. 1 Cor. xiv. 21, *ἐν ἑτερογλώσσοις καὶ ἐν χεῖλεσιν ἐτέρων λαλήσω κ.τ.λ.*; from Isa. xxviii. 11, instead of the partially mistaken translation of the LXX., *διὰ φαυλισμὸν χειλέων, διὰ γλώσσης ἐτέρας*. The parallelism with *ἐν χεῖλεσιν ἐτ.* shows that Paul regarded *γλώσσα* as = *tongue*, therefore = *other tongued*.

Γυμνότης, *ητος*, *ή*, bareness, nakedness, as the word appears only in biblical and later Greek; Rom. viii. 35; 2 Cor. xi. 27; Deut. xxviii. 48. Figuratively in the same moral sense as *γυμνός*; Rev. iii. 18, *συμβουλεύω σοι ἀγοράσαι . . . ἱμάτια λευκά ἵνα περιβάλῃ καὶ μὴ φανερωθῇ ἡ αἰσχύνη τῆς γυμνότητός σου* (cf. Rev. xix. 8; Job xxix. 14; Isa. lxi. 10).

Δεισιδαίμων, *ό*, *ή*, synon. with *θεοσεβής*, Xen. *Cyr.* iii. 3. 58 = *God-fearing, religious*, originally gives expression to a strong sense of dependence upon divine power, designating one who is very anxious for the divine favour, or who is expecting

recompense, whereas *θεοσεβής*, like *εὐσεβής*, includes indeed the sense of dependence, but only as it manifests itself in *reverence*; see *εὐσέβεια*. This feature already appears in Xen. *Cyr.* iii. 3. 58, οἱ δὲ θεοσεβῶς πάντες συνεπήχθησαν μεγάλη τῇ φωνῇ (cf. 59, ὁ παιὼν ἐγένετο). ἐν τῷ τοιούτῳ γὰρ δὴ οἱ δεισιδαίμονες ἦττον τοὺς ἀνθρώπους φοβοῦνται. This explains its first appearance in a good sense, Xen. *Ages.* xi. 8, ἀεὶ δὲ δεισιδαίμων ἦν, νομίζων τοὺς μὲν καλῶς ζῶντας οὕτω εὐδαίμονας, τοὺς δὲ εὐκλεῶς τετελευτηκότας ἤδη μακαρίους. But already in Aristotle, *Pol.* v. 11, it is to be observed that the word passes over to denote a more superstitious bearing, the prince must always appear as *διαφερόντως σπουδάζων τὰ πρὸς τοὺς θεούς*, ἦττον τε γὰρ φοβοῦνται τὸ παθεῖν τι παράνομον ὑπὸ τῶν τοιούτων, ἐὰν δεισιδαίμονα νομίζωσιν εἶναι τὸν ἄρχοντα καὶ φροντίζειν τῶν θεῶν, καὶ ἐπιβουλεύουσιν ἦττον ὥς συμμάχους ἔχοντι καὶ τοὺς θεούς· δεῖ δὲ ἀνευ ἀβελτηρίας φαίνεσθαι τοιούτον. The word appears first in these places, and is unknown in better Greek generally; compare Zezschwitz, *Prof. Graec.* p. 59, "Bernhardy very acutely notes the appearance of the word *δεισιδαιμονία* as a turning-point in the history of national life. It indicates a wavering between unbelief and pusillanimity, such as characterized the time of the *Ochlocracy*." Hence in later Greek in a bad sense of superstitious fear (Acts xvii. 22); Antoninus vi. 30, *θεοσεβής χωρὶς δεισιδαιμονίας*; cf. Wytttenbach, *Animadv. in Plut. Mor.* ii. pp. 276-280; Hottinger in Wieland's *New Att. Museum*, ii. 1. 85 sqq.; Schmidt, *Eth. der A. Griech.* ii. 64 sqq.

Δεισιδαιμονία, ἡ, *fear of the gods*; in Polyb. vi. 56. 7, it answers to the Latin *religio*, καί μοι δοκεῖ τὸ παρὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀνθρώποις ὀνειδιζόμενον, τοῦτο συνέχειν τὰ Ῥωμαίων πράγματα, λέγω δὲ τὴν δεισιδαιμονίαν; on the other hand, in xii. 24. 5, ἐνυπνίων καὶ τεράτων καὶ μύθων ἀπιθάνων καὶ συλλήβδην δεισιδαιμονίας ἀγεννοῦς καὶ τερατείας γυναικῶδους ἐστὶ πλήρης, like *δεισιδαιμονεῖν* ix. 19. 1, x. 2. 9, in a condemnatory or contemptible sense as = *superstition*; compare Plutarch's treatise *περὶ δεισιδαιμονίας*, 2, ἡ δὲ δεισιδαιμονία πάθος ἐκ λόγου ψευδοῦς ἐγγεγεννημένον. Theoph. *Char. Eth.* 16; Acts xxv. 19, ζητήματα δέ τινα περὶ τῆς ἰδίας δεισιδαιμονίας εἶχον. It indicates how remote Josephus was from the spirit of biblical Greek, that in *Ant.* x. 3. 2 he speaks of *περὶ τὸν θεὸν δεισιδαιμονία*.

Δέω, *to be necessary, to be obliged, to need*, connected with *δέω*, *to bind* ("hence its taking the accusative," Curtius, 234). In the middle, *to be necessary for oneself, to need, to desire eagerly*.

(I.) Active, (1) in personal construction, *to need, to be in want of*, e.g. Plato, *Polit.* 277 D, παραδείγματος . . . καὶ τὸ παράδειγμα αὐτὸ δεδέκεν. Usually πολλοῦ, ὀλίγου *δέω*, *I am far from*, or *I am very near*, etc. Plato, *Theaet.* 167 B; Plut. *Ad princ. inerud.* 5 (782a), ὀλίγου *δέων* εἰπεῖν. More rarely, and specially in later writers, also with the acc., e.g. Plato, *Men.* 71 A, τοσοῦτον *δέω* . . . εἶδέναι. Plut. *Mor.* v. 2, ὀλίγον *ἐδέησεν ἐκπεσεῖν*. In this personal construction it occurs nowhere in biblical Greek; sometimes in Philo. (2) Usually impersonally in profane Greek, *δεῖ*, *it is necessary, it behoves*; only once in Homer, *Il.* ix. 337, who elsewhere always uses *χρή*; from which

δεῖ differs only in being more frequently used of decrees of fate, yet also like *χρή*, of necessity either of duty, of circumstances, or of propriety. It always denotes a being bound or obliged to do something, a necessity in the nature of things, not so much personal obligation (ὀφείλειν) as a *necessity* making itself felt, an unavoidable, urgent compulsory *must*. Hence Bengel explains the apparently different and remote significations of what must needs be and what is proper; 1 Cor. xi. 10, ὀφείλει *notat obligationem*, δεῖ *necessitatem*; *illud morale est, hoc quasi physicum, ut in vernacula*, we ought and we must. In biblical Greek it occurs in the LXX. only in Isa. xxx. 29 (לִּהְיוֹת) and Job xv. 3 (parallel with ὄφελος); Dan. ii. 28, 29, ἃ δεῖ γενέσθαι = אֲשֶׁר יִהְיֶה; a little oftener in the Apocrypha, but comparatively often in the N. T., where besides δεῖ we have also the forms δέη, Matt. xxvi. 35, Mark xiv. 31; δέιν, Luke xviii. 1, Acts xxv. 24, xxvi. 9; ἔδει, Matt. xviii. 33, xxv. 27; John iv. 4; often in Luke, Acts, Hebrews; δέον, Acts xix. 36; 1 Pet. i. 6 (τὰ μὴ δέοντα, 1 Tim. v. 13). It usually appears with the acc. and infinitive, also with the infinitive only; in Paul's writings, ὃ δεῖ, Rom. viii. 26, xii. 3; ἣν ἔδει, Rom. i. 27. The construction with the gen. of the thing or the dative of the person does not occur. It stands (a) *of decrees of fate*, answering to its use especially in Herodotus (viii. 53. 1, ἔδεε γὰρ κατὰ τὸ θεοπρόπιον πᾶσαν τὴν Ἀττικὴν τὴν ἐν τῇ ἡπείρῳ γενέσθαι ὑπὸ Πέρσῃσι. Without such an addition in ii. 161. 1; iv. 79. 1; v. 33. 92; vii. 6. 64; ix. 109. 1; also in later writers, e.g. Arrian, *An.* ii. 3. 6), especially of events in the gospel history, of that which must occur according to the divine counsel or the word of Scripture or of prophecy (cf. *ἵνα πληρωθῇ*). Luke xxii. 37, τὸ γεγραμμένον δεῖ τελεσθῆναι; xxiv. 44, δεῖ πληρωθῆναι πάντα; Acts i. 16, ἔδει πληρωθῆναι τὴν γρ. So in Matt. xvi. 21, xvii. 10, xxiv. 6, xxvi. 54; Mark viii. 31, ix. 11, xiii. 7, 10; Luke ix. 22, xvii. 25, xxi. 9, xxii. 7, xxiv. 7, xxvi. 46; John iii. 14, xii. 34, xx. 9; Acts ix. 16, xvii. 3; Rev. i. 1, iv. 1. In like manner of *divine appointment, determination, or law*, which must be maintained or accomplished, Mark xiii. 10; Luke iv. 43; John x. 16; Acts iii. 21, iv. 12, ix. 16, xiv. 22, xix. 21, 23, xxvii. 24; 1 Cor. xv. 25, 53; 2 Cor. v. 10; Rev. x. 11, xi. 5, xiii. 10, xvii. 10. (b) *Of that which time and circumstances demand or bring about*, Matt. xxvi. 35; Mark xiv. 31; Luke xii. 12, xiii. 33, xix. 5; John iv. 4; Acts xix. 36, xxvii. 21, 26; 2 Cor. xi. 30, xii. 1; Eph. vi. 20; Col. iv. 4; Heb. ix. 26; 1 Pet. i. 6. (c) *Of duty, or of the obligation which office and calling involve*, Matt. xxv. 27; Luke ii. 49, xi. 42; John iii. 7, 30, ix. 4, x. 16; Acts v. 29, ix. 6, xvi. 30, xx. 35; 1 Thess. iv. 1; 2 Thess. iii. 7; 1 Tim. iii. 2, 7, 15; 2 Tim. ii. 24; Tit. i. 7, 11; Heb. ii. 1, xi. 6; 2 Pet. iii. 11. (d) *What belongs to one, or is becoming*, Matt. xviii. 33, xxiii. 23; Mark xiii. 14; Luke xi. 42, xiii. 14, 16, xv. 32; John iv. 20, 24; Acts i. 21, xv. 5, xix. 36, xxi. 22, xxiv. 19, xxv. 10; Rom. i. 27, viii. 26, xii. 3; 1 Cor. viii. 2, 2 Cor. ii. 3; Col. iv. 6; 1 Tim. v. 13; 2 Tim. ii. 6.

(II.) Δέομαι, to be regarded not as passive, but middle, as = *to be obliged, to be in want of, to need, to desire, for oneself*. The future δεήσομαι does not occur in biblical Greek,

but in its stead *δεηθήσομαι*, which belongs to later Greek, Job v. 8, ix. 15; the aorist *έδεήθην*, perfect *δεδέημαι*, 1 Kings viii. 60. This construction of tenses seems to be the basis of the form given by Lachmann in Luke viii. 38, *έδέειτο* instead of *έδέετο*, which occurs in the MSS. of Job xix. 16; Attic *έδείτο*, Gen. xxv. 21; cf. Lobeck, *Phryn.* 220; Buttmann, p. 48. (a) **To need**; in this sense, neither in the LXX. (concerning Ps. xxii. 25, 26, see *δέησις*) nor in the Apocrypha—not even in the places cited by Wahl, Ecclus. xxx. 30; Wisd. xvi. 25; 4 Macc. ii. 8 (where, *e.g.*, *προσδέομαι* occurs in the sense *to need in addition*, and once in the sense *to ask for*). It is in keeping with this that the derivatives *δέησις*, *δέημα*, *δεητικός*, even in profane Greek, answer only to the meaning *to ask*. (b) **To desire, to pray**; in biblical Greek almost exclusively of prayer or request. In the LXX. usually for *נָחַ*, Hithpael, and *הָלַח*, Piel, occasionally also for *הָלַח*, *נָחַ*, *שָׁח*, Hiphil, *נָחַ*, Hithpael, *הָלַח* *אֲשַׁח*, *נָחַ*, *שָׁח*.

Δέησις seems not to occur in profane Greek in the sense *need*; in the place usually cited for this, Plato, *Eryx.* 405, it is joined with *έπιθυμία* = *desire or longing*, *έν έπιθυμία και δέησει, έν έπιθυμίαις και δήσεσιν είναι*. It is therefore very improbable that it has this meaning (*need*) in Ps. xxii. 25, *τῇ δέησει τοῦ πτωχοῦ* = *נָחַ*. The rendering is not probably a misunderstanding of the Hebrew word on the part of the LXX. as is usually supposed, but a bending or particularizing of the idea of poverty to that of desire or prayer (not *cry*, Del., *et al.*) by means of the Greek word; cf. Aristotle, *Rhet.* ii. 7, *δέσεις είνσιν αἱ όρέξεις, και τούτων μάλιστα αἱ μετά λύπης τοῦ μὴ γιγνομένου*. In Plato the word appears (besides the place already cited) only in the sense *prayer, request*; cf. Aristotle, *Pol.* i. 9, *κατά τὰς δέσεις αναγκαῖον ποιείσθαι τὰς μεταδόσεις*, and it signifies not the prayer of need, but more strongly of destitution and utter want. In the LXX. it is usually = *נָחַ*, *שָׁח*, likewise *נָחַ*, of complaint; further, with *εύχή, προσευχή* = *הָלַח*, and occasionally = *הָלַח*, *שָׁח*, *הָלַח*, *שָׁח*, *et al.*

Προσδέομαι, (a) **to be in want of besides**, for enlargement or support, usually with the genitive; cf. *προσδεῖ, it is, moreover, necessary thereto*, Dem. *Ol.* i. 19; Plato, *Phil.* 64 B. *προσδεῖσθαι* several times in Plato, *e.g.* *Phileb.* 20 E, *δεῖ γάρ εἵπερ πότερον αὐτῶν εἰσὶ τὰγαθόν, μηδὲν μηδενὸς προσδεῖσθαι*. Suidas, *προσδεῖσθαι και ένδεῖσθαι διαφέρει τὸ μὲν γάρ δηλοῖ ὀλίγων τινῶν κτήσιν, τὸ δὲ παντελῇ ἀπορίαν τοῦ ὅλου δηλοῖ*. Often in Xenophon; not in Demosthenes; often in Plato, Aristotle, Plutarch, Polybius. In Aristotle it stands in opposition to *αὐταρκείν*. The element of addition may fall into the background, but never wholly disappears; cf. *Pol.* vi. 13. 6, *εἴ τις ιδιώτης ἢ πόλις τῶν κατὰ τὴν Ἰταλίαν διαλύσεως ἢ έπιτιμήσεως ἢ βοηθείας ἢ φυλακῆς προσδεῖται, i.e.* if they cannot accomplish it alone. So also in the only place in the LXX. Prov. xii. 8, *τιμὴν έαντῷ περιτιθεῖς και προσδεόμενος ἄρτου, רֶחֶק* = *and has not bread enough*. So also in Ecclus. iv. 3, xi. 12; compare *ἀπροσδεής*, 1 Macc. xii. 9. In the N. T. Acts xvii. 25, *οὐδὲ ὑπὸ χειρῶν ἀνθρωπίνων θεραπεύεται προσδεόμενός τινος*, in the strict sense. It is a word borrowed from the Greek philosophy, expressing the truth uttered in Ps. l. 9 sqq.,

Isa. xl. 13 sqq., and elsewhere; cf. Plato, *Tim.* 34 B, δι' ἀρετὴν αὐτὸν (θεὸν) αὐτῷ δύναμενον ξυγγίγνεσθαι καὶ οὐδενὸς ἐτέρου προσδεόμενον, γνῶριμον δὲ καὶ φίλον ἱκανῶς αὐτὸν αὐτῷ. Aristotle, *Eth. Eud.* vii. 12, ὁ μετ' ἀρετῆς εὐδαίμων . . . ἱκανὸς αὐτῷ συνεῖναι· μάλιστα δὲ τοῦτο φανερόν ἐπὶ θεοῦ· δῆλον γὰρ ὡς οὐδενὸς προσδεόμενος οὐδὲ φίλου δεήσεται. *Metaph.* ix. 4, οὐδὲ προσδεῖται οὐθενὸς τὸ τέλειον. *Eth. Nicom.* ix. 8. Hence it was transferred to the Alexandrine Judaic philosophy, yet in Philo (against Dähne, *Jüd. Alexandr. Rel. Phil.* p. 120 sqq.) the word answers rather to the concrete representation of Scripture than to this abstract sense, e.g. Philo, *De opif. m.* x. 22, μηδενὸς προσδεόμενος ἄλλου· πάντα γὰρ θεῷ δυνατά. *Ibid.* iii. 13; cf. ἀπροσδεής as an epithet applied to God, 2 Macc. xiv. 35; 3 Macc. ii. 9, ἡγίαςας τὸν τόπον τοῦτον εἰς ὄνομά σου τῷ τῶν ἀπάντων προσδεῖ. Josephus, *Ant.* viii. 4. 3, ἀπροσδεῆς γὰρ τὸ θεῖον ἀπάντων, underlying the thought that we cannot give God a recompense for His goodness. Aristeas, p. 122, ed. Hawerk., follows the sense of the Greek philosophy, ὁ θεὸς ἀπροσδεής ἐστὶ καὶ ἐπιεικής—the pattern of a king's duty, to be master of himself, and not to need anything; yet the ἐπιεικής indicates the Bible idea. Thus also Acts xvii. 25 follows the sense of Ps. l. 9 sqq., the genitive τινος being neuter, not masculine. Compare Clemens Rom., *ad Cor.* i. 52, ἀπροσδεής, ἀδελφοί, ὁ δεσπότης ὑπάρχει τῶν ἀπάντων, οὐδὲν οὐδενὸς χρήζει εἰ μὴ τὸ ἐξομολογεῖσθαι αὐτῷ. For other passages, see Wetstein.—(b) In the sense *to ask still in addition*, the word occurs in Ecclus. xiii. 3.

Δοχή, ἡ, reception, entertainment, banquet; very seldom in profane Greek. Plut. *Mor.* 1102, is unmeaning as the text now runs, and besides this, we can only cite *Athen.* viii. 348 F, for this meaning. Once in Plato, *Tim.* 71 C = vessel or receptacle. LXX. = *קַבֵּץ*, Gen. xxi. 8, xxvi. 30; Esth. i. 3, v. 4, 5, 8, 12, 14; elsewhere = πότος. Apocrypha, 1 Esdr. iii. 1. In the N. T. Luke v. 29, xiv. 13.

Ἀναδέχομαι, to undertake, to take up, to take upon oneself, a burden, work, etc. 2 Macc. vi. 19, τὸν μετ' εὐκλείας θάνατον μᾶλλον ἢ τὸν μετὰ μύσους βίον ἀναδεξάμενος. Thus also we must understand Heb. xi. 17, ὁ τὰς ἐπαγγελίας ἀναδεξάμενος—"he who had taken up, undertaken," not merely "received;" ἀναδέχομαι implies the seizing or laying hold upon that which is presented; and with this appropriation of the promises on his part, Abraham's conduct in offering up Isaac seems to stand in contradiction. Plut. *Cic.* xliii. 6, of the taking upon oneself of an inheritance, ἄχρι οὗ Καῖσαρ ὁ νέος . . . παραγενόμενος τὸν τε κλῆρον ἀνεδέξατο τοῦ Καίσαρος ἐκείνου. Eurip. *Iph. Taur.* 818, καὶ λούτρ' ἐς Ἀῶλιν μητρὸς ἀνεδέξω πάρα; Also = *to undertake to do something*, with following infinitive, 2 Macc. viii. 38. With personal object, τινά = *to undertake for some one, to become surety for him, τινός τινι*. Not thus used in biblical Greek; compare ἐκδέχομαι. In Acts xxviii. 27, ἀναδεξάμενος ἡμᾶς . . . φιλοφρόνως ἐξένισε, it is employed instead of the usual ὑποδέχ. = *to receive hospitably*; cf. Ael. Var. *hist.* iv. 9, ὑπεδέξατο αὐτοὺς εὖ μάλα φιλοφρόνως. Plut. *Cat. min.* li. 1, ἀναδ. τὸ ἄγος εἰς τὴν πόλιν, cannot be taken as similar.—Not in the LXX.

Ἀποδέχομαι, with the passive aorist ἀπεδέχθην, 2 Macc. iii. 9, iv. 22, Acts xv. 4 (where Lachm., Tisch. 8 read παρεδέχθησαν), and the verbal adj. ἀποδεκτός and ἀποδεκτέος = to accept, to take along with; literally, to accept from, to receive from; but the fundamental meaning of δέχ. so asserts itself that the preposition serves simply to strengthen the idea. (a) τινά, to receive one, 2 Macc. iii. 9, iv. 22; Pol. xxii. 24. 6; thus, however, more rarely. As a rule, the word denotes a mental state and conduct, to behave towards one not with reserve but cordially, with recognition, corresponding with its use (b) to denote recognition, approval, confirmation, of a word, a doctrine, etc. Cf. Plato, *Prot.* 323 C, πάντ' ἄνδρα ἀποδέχονται περὶ ταύτης τῆς ἀρετῆς ξύμβουλον. Xen. *Mem.* iv. 1. 1, οὐ μικρά ὠφέλει τοὺς εἰωθότας τε αὐτῷ συνεῖναι καὶ ἀποδεχομένους ἐκείνους; Sturz, *qui sequuntur illius disciplinam*. It denotes this bearing to a person in various forms, 2 Macc. iii. 35, xiii. 14 = to treat friendly. Luke viii. 40, ἀπεδέξατο αὐτὸν ὁ ὄχλος, ἦσαν γὰρ πάντες προσδοκῶντες αὐτόν = to welcome. So also Acts xv. 4, xxi. 17. In Luke ix. 11, οἱ δὲ ὄχλοι ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ καὶ ἀποδεξάμενος ἐλάλει αὐτούς = to receive friendly, not to repel; compare Acts xxviii. 30, xviii. 27 = to receive with recognition. With a thing as its object = to acknowledge; Plut. *De poet. Aud.* iii. (p. 18 B), μήτε ἀποδέχεσθαι ὡς ἀληθές μήτε δοκιμάζειν ὡς καλόν. Thus in Acts xxiv. 3, ἀποδεχόμεθα μετὰ πάσης εὐχαριστίας. (Cf. Philo, *Leg. ad Caj.* ii. 589. 37, τῆς προνοίας ὑμᾶς ἀποδέξεται; in profane Greek, usually with the genitive of the person and acc. of the thing.) Acts ii. 41, τὸν λόγον, to assent to the word, to give it entrance within them. Plato, *Theaet.* 162 E, ἃ ἂν οἱ πολλοὶ ἀποδέχονται ἀκούοντες, λέγετε ταῦτα. *Phaed.* 91 E. *Pol.* xxv. 7. 2, διὰ τὸ δοκεῖν τὴν δωρεὰν ἀξίαν εἶναι χάριτος ἀσμένως ἀπεδέξαντο τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν. In the N. T. only in Luke's writings. Not in the LXX.

Ἀποδοχή, ἡ, almost exclusively in later Greek = recognition, acknowledgment, approval, and, indeed, willing, ready acknowledgment, e.g. *Pol.* i. 5. 5, πᾶς ὁ συνεχῆς λόγος ἀποδοχῆς τυγχάνει παρὰ τοῖς ἀκούουσιν, preceded by παραδοχῆς ἀξιωθῆναι καὶ πίστεως. ii. 56. 1, of an historian, παρ' ἐνίοις ἀποδοχῆς ἀξιούται. Polybius often joins it with πίστις, e.g. i. 43. 4, vi. 2. 13. With the corresponding 1 Tim. i. 15 and iv. 9, πιστὸς ὁ λόγος καὶ πάσης ἀποδοχῆς ἄξιος, cf. *Pol.* viii. 13. 2.

Ἀποδεκτός, ἡ, ὄν, also ἀπόδεκτος, see (b). (a) What deserves approval or recognition, Plut. *adv. Stoic.* 6 (1061 A), ποῦ γὰρ αἰρετὸν ἢ πῶς ἀποδεκτὸν ὃ μὴ ἐπαινεῖν μήτε θαυμάζειν ἄξιόν ἐστιν; This form appears but seldom, and only in later Greek; we find the form τέος oftener in Plato, e.g. *Legg.* ii. 668 A, τοῦτον ἀποδεκτέον τὸν λόγον. (b) In the N. T. 1 Tim. ii. 3, τοῦτο γὰρ καλὸν καὶ ἀπόδεκτον ἐνώπιον τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ. Ver. 4, τοῦτο γάρ ἐστιν ἀπὸδ. ἐνώπ. τ. θ., thus equivalent to δεκτὸς εὐπρόσδεκτος in the sense of the perf. part. passive, and therefore here proparoxiton; see προσδέχομαι.

Διαδέχομαι (a), to receive (from another or former possessor), e.g. Plato, *Rcp.*
N

ix. 576, ἔφη διαδεξάμενος τὸν λόγον. Polyb. ix. 28. 8, διεδέξατο παρ' αὐτοῦ τὴν ἀρχὴν Ἀλέξανδρος; iv. 2. 7, τὴν ἐν Συρίᾳ διεδέδεκτο βασιλείαν. Lucian, Diod. Sic., Dion. Hal., Josephus. Thus in the only places in the N. T. Acts vii. 45, ἣν (σκήνην τοῦ μαρτυρίου) καὶ εἰσήγαγον διαδεξάμενοι οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν. Cf. Philo, *de vit. Mos.* i. 2. 113. 49, παρὰ πατέρων καὶ προγόνων τὴν ζήτησιν ἄλυστον διαδεξάμενοι.—(b) With personal object = *to follow upon one, to succeed*, Strabo, Polyb., *et al.* So 2 Macc. ix. 23; 2 Chron. xxxi. 12. Figuratively, Wisd. vii. 30, τοῦτο (sc. φῶς) διαδέχεται νύξ. But xvii. 20, εἰκὼν τοῦ μέλλοντος αὐτοὺς διαδέχεσθαι σκότους, must be explained according to *a*, “an image of that darkness which should receive them;” compare Herod. iv. 1, τοὺς Σκύθας ἐξεδέξατο οὐκ ἐλάσσων πόνος. 2 Macc. x. 28, ἀνατολῆς διαχεομένης, is considered a better reading than διαδεχ.—(c) *To relieve, to redeem*, in Xen. with the dative, afterwards with the accusative, 2 Macc. iv. 31, of the deputy or governor; compare διάδοχος, xiv. 26, iv. 29. Without mention of the person, Xen. *Anab.* i. 5. 2, διαδεχόμενοι, who relieve one another. So perhaps 1 Chron. xxvi. 18.

Διάδοχος, ὁ, a few times in the LXX. and Apocrypha = *substitute*, 2 Chron. xxvi. 11; 2 Macc. xiv. 26, iv. 29. *Successor*, Eccus. xlvi. 1, xlviii. 8. Thus in Acts xxiv. 27. With a special meaning, 1 Chron. xviii. 17, 2 Chron. xxviii. 7, they who follow the king, *i.e.* stand next in rank to him.

Εἰσδέχομαι, *to take into, to receive into, to gather*, with the gen. or the acc. εἰς τι, ἐν τινι. LXX. = רָצַב, with ἀνθροῖζειν, συνανθρ. (also sometimes ἐκδέχ., συνάγειν). Ezek. xxii. 20, with mention of the whither with εἰς and ἐν, Hab. ii. 5, πρὸς τινα, otherwise chiefly with mention of the whence, ἐκ, Ezek. xi. 17, xx. 34, 41; Zech. x. 10. Without this specification, Jer. xxiii. 3; Hos. viii. 10; Micah iv. 6; Zeph. iii. 19, 20; Zech. x. 8, usually of the restoration of Israel (compare especially Micah iv. 6 and Zeph. iii. 19, τὴν ἀπωσμένην εἰσδέχομαι). In the N. T. only in 2 Cor. vi. 17, εἰσδέχομαι ὑμᾶς; compare the preceding ἐξέλθατε, the reception is therefore a reception into the house of God as the Father's house; cf. ver. 18. The expression, as ἐξέλθ. shows, refers to the prophetic language above cited, and combines Isa. lii. 11 with Zeph. iii. 20. That the word means not *to accept*, but *to admit, to gather*, see Wisd. xvi. 17; 2 Macc. iv. 22; Micah iv. 6; Zeph. iii. 19. And accordingly in Lev. xxii. 19, 21, we are not to read the verbal adj. εἰσδεκτον, but εἰς δεκτόν.

Ἐνδέχομαι, (*a*) *to take in, to accept*, hence *e.g. believingly to receive, to approve, to assent to, to admit*, *e.g.* Plato, *Tim.* 69 A, καθ' ὅσον . . . μετασχεῖν ἀνθρωπίνῃ φύσιν ἀθανασίας ἐνδέχεται. (*b*) Used in particular impersonally ἐνδέχεται, *it is admitted, allowed, it is possible*, Thuc., Plato, Xen., etc. Thus in the few passages of biblical Greek, Luke xiii. 33, οὐκ ἐνδέχεται προφήτην ἀπολέσθαι ἔξω Ἱερ. Further τὸ ἐνδεχόμενον, 2 Macc. xi. 18 = *what is possible; ἐνδεχομένως, according to ability*, 2 Macc. xiii. 26.

Ἐκδέχομαι, (a) *to take or receive from another* (also without the force of the preposition), *to receive*, e.g. Herod. i. 7. 2, ii. 166, παῖς παρὰ πατρός ἐκδεκόμενος, having received, i.e. learned from its father. Thus we explain Ecclus. vi. 32, ἐὰν ἀγαπήσῃς ἀκούειν ἐκδέξῃ. Cf. xviii. 14 and xxxv. 14, ἐκδ. παιδείαν, *to accept chastisement*. 3 Macc. iii. 22, οἱ δὲ τοῦναντίον ἐκδεχόμενοι, they took the opposite way; cf. Pol. xxxviii. 2. 5, βελτίον ἐκδέχ. τὸ γεγονός, and often. Plut. *de audit.* 7 (41 B). Isa. lvii. 1, οὐδεὶς ἀνὴρ ἐκδέχεται τῇ καρδίᾳ, בְּ-לֵב בָּשָׂר. Hence *to accept*, as equivalent to *to guarantee*, Gen. xliii. 9, ἐγὼ ἐκδέχομαι αὐτόν, ἐκ χειρός μου ζήτησον αὐτόν; xlv. 32; Ps. cxix. 122 = בָּרָא; compare ἀναδέχασθαι, but this signifies to accept the pledge of another.—Also *to accept* a person or thing, Hos. ix. 6; Micah ii. 12; Nahum iii. 18 = יָצַח (see εἰσδέχ.), 3 Macc. v. 26. With a thing as subject, Herod. iv. 1. 2; Pol. i. 65. 2, ἐξεδέξατο πόλεμος ἐμφύλιος Ῥωμαίους. Plut. *Pomp.* 35, μακρὰς αὐτὸν ἐκδεχομένης ἀνύδρου οδοῦ. Hos. viii. 7, ἡ καταστροφή αὐτῶν ἐκδέξεται αὐτά = יָצַח. From this obviously springs the meaning (b) *to expect, to wait for* (to receive something as following therefrom), Soph. *Philoct.* 123, σὺ μὲν μένων νῦν κείνον ἐνθάδ' ἐκδέχου. Elsewhere only in later Greek, and rarely; Pol. iii. 65. 3, ἐξεδέχετο τοὺς ἀπολιμμένους ἄνδρας; xx. 4, 5, οὐκ ἐκδεξάμενοι τὴν τούτων παρουσίαν. Plut. *Mar.* 17, τὸν τῆς νίκης καιρόν; *ibid.* 24. This is the only sense of the word in the N. T. John v. 3 (Rec.); Acts xvii. 16; 1 Cor. xi. 33, xvi. 11; Heb. x. 13; Jas. v. 7; 1 Pet. iii. 20, Rec. (Lachm., Tisch. ἀπεξεδέχ.). For Heb. x. 13, ἐκδεκόμενος ἕως, compare Dion. Hal. *Ant.* vi. 67, ἐκδ. ἕως ἂν γένηται.

Ἐκδοχή, ἡ, (a) *a taking over, receiving, apprehension, succession*. (b) *Expectation*, Heb. x. 27, φοβερά ἐκδοχὴ κρίσεως. Not thus used in profane Greek.

Προσδέχομαι. The use of this verb is peculiar in Ex. x. 17, προσδέξασθε οὖν μου τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἔτι νῦν = מִנְחָה תִּקַּח יְהוָה מִנִּי כֹהֵן, where the LXX. perhaps took the meaning *to be to bear with*; compare δλεθρον, Plato, *Phileb.* 15 B; τὴν ἀρπαγὴν, Heb. x. 34; but it may also be rendered = *to receive favourably*, i.e. *to forgive*, though there is no other instance of this. Connected with the signification *to receive, to accept*, is the rendering of נָחַ by προσδέχ. (as well as by δέχομαι and εὐδοκεῖν) in the LXX., with God as its subject (except in Lev. xxvi. 43; 2 Chron. xxxvi. 21), denoting His gracious acceptance of the object of His choice, Isa. xlii. 1, and specially of His acceptance of a sacrifice, Hos. viii. 13; Amos v. 22; Mal. i. 10, 13 (compare ver. 8); and of the offerer, Ezek. xx. 40, 41, xliii. 27; in the Apocrypha, Wisd. iii. 6; Ecclus. vii. 9; 2 Macc. i. 26 (= נָחַ, Ex. xxxvi. 3). Closely akin as it is in meaning with εὐδοκεῖν, there is this difference, that it does not give that prominence to its object which εὐδοκεῖν does; but the affinity appears from Micah vi. 7, where, like εὐδοκεῖν, it is construed with ἐν, προσδέξεται ὁ κύριος ἐν χιλιάσιν κριῶν. As a *term. tech.* in this sense it has not passed into the N. T., nor has the verbal adj. πρόσδεκτος (not προσδεκτός; cf. Kühner, i. 415; Krüger, xxii. 5. 7), Prov. xi. 20, xvi. 15 (where Aquila reads εὐδοκία; Symm. xi. 20, θέλημα); Wisd. ix. 12; besides δεκτός we find only εὐπρόσδεκτος.

Ἑποδέχομαι, *to receive*, especially of the reception of a guest or one craving protection; not in the LXX.; Tob. vii. 8; 1 Macc. xvi. 15; 4 Macc. xiii. 16, οὕτως θανόντας ἡμᾶς Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ ὑποδέχονται καὶ πάντες οἱ πατέρες ἐπαινέσουσι (cf. Luke xvi. 9). So in the N. T. Luke x. 38, xix. 6; Acts xvii. 7; Jas. ii. 25.

Δοκέω, *to wait for, to expect*, in the perf. part. middle, Hom. *Il.* xv. 730. Elsewhere only in the compounds προσδοκέω in Herod., also προσδοκέω, the form of δοκέω in παραδοκέω. Compare δοκέω, *to lie in wait for*. As to its connection with δέχομαι, see Curtius, 133, Schenkl, Passov, Pape. Primarily it is = *to find oneself in the condition or exercise of δέχεσθαι*.

Προσδοκέω, imperf. προσεδόκουν, in Ps. cxix. 166, according to the Alex. text, but the Vatican reads προσεδόκων; cf. Acts xxviii. 6, *to wait, to expect*, a post-Homeric word, denoting generally *tension of feeling with regard to the future*, without any more definite qualification of joyous expectation, or the contrary, of hope or fear. Biblical usage has no special peculiarities; it is rare in the LXX. = תִּקַּו, Lam. ii. 16; תִּקַּו, Ps. civ. 27, cxix. 166; also in Deut. xxxii. 2, a false explanation of the figure there used, and Ps. lxix. 21, where the LXX. have read תִּקַּו instead of תִּקַּו. Symmachus has it in Ps. xxxix. 8 (where the LXX. read ὑπόστασις, Aquila παραδοκία). Symm. and Theodotion have it in Ps. cxix. 95, where the LXX. read ὑπομένω, which with the LXX. is the usual rendering for תִּקַּו. Often in the Apocrypha and the N. T., especially in Luke's writings. With the accus. Wisd. xii. 22; 2 Macc. xv. 8, 20; 3 Macc. v. 24; Matt. xi. 3, xxiv. 50; Luke i. 21, vii. 19, 20, viii. 40, xii. 46; Acts x. 24, xxvii. 33; 2 Pet. iii. 12, 13, 14; followed by the aor. infin. Acts iii. 5; 2 Macc. xii. 44; by the future inf. 2 Macc. vii. 14; with the acc. and infin. Acts xxviii. 6. Without object, Luke iii. 15.

Προσδοκία, ἡ, Thucydides, Xen., Plato, etc. = *expectation*, LXX. Ps. cxix. 116 = תִּקְוָה (cxlvi. 5 = ἐλπίς). Gen. xlix. 10 = תִּקְוָה (Aquila, σύστημα). Symmachus in Job xiv. 19 = תִּקְוָה, LXX. ὑπομονή. In the Apocrypha, Wisd. xvii. 14 (Fritzsche, προσδοσία). Ecclus. xl. 2; 2 Macc. iii. 21, v. 41, 49. In the N. T. only in Luke xxi. 26, ἀπὸ φόβου καὶ προσδοκίας τῶν ἐπερχομένων. Acts xii. 11.

Δῆμος, ὁ, *people*, of the population of some one territory or district as a whole, *community*; hence in the Attic = the people gathered in ἐκκλησία, assembly of the people in the exercise of their rights, for counsel or action; then δῆμοι, of the several divisions of the Athenian community. Hence the rendering by the LXX. of תְּהָמָה by δῆμος, for the most part in the plural; in the singular only of a single תְּהָמָה, Neh. iv. 13, ἔστησα τὸν λαὸν κατὰ δήμους. Also rendered φυλή, συγγένεια, πατριά, and occasionally otherwise. In the N. T. only in the Acts; Acts xii. 22, of the people assembled before Herod in Caesarea; xvii. 5, προάγειν εἰς τὸν δῆμον; xix. 30, εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὸν δῆμον; xix. 33, ἀπολογεῖσθαι τῷ δήμῳ, the people gathered together to deliberate upon public matters.

Παρεπίδημος, *on, present anywhere for a short time among others as a stranger, residing in a place as a sojourner*, not as one who has settled down. Polyb. xxxii. 22. 4, κάλλιστον θέαμα πᾶσι τοῖς Ἑλλήσι τοῖς παρεπιδήμοις, of Greeks sojourning a short time in Rome, but who did not (cf. § 6) reside there. Cf. xxxiii. 14. 2, ποιούμενος δὲ τὴν παρεπιδημίαν μετὰ τερατείας ἅμα καὶ κακουργίας ἐνεχρόνιζε. Compare the verb παρεπιδημεῖν, xxvii. 7. 3; xxx. 4. 3, οὐ μὴν τοῖς γε παρεπιδημοῦσιν, οὔτε τοῖς ἐκεῖ μένουσι τῶν Ἑλλήνων οὐδαμῶς ἤρεσκεν. In the LXX. only twice = צָרִיף, Gen. xxiii. 4, Ps. xxxix. 13, side by side with צָרִיף = πάροικος, παρεπίδ. emphasizing the homelessness; see πάροικος. The same combination in 1 Pet. ii. 11, and παρεπ. again, 1 Pet. i. 11, ἐκλεκτοὶ παρεπίδημοι διασποράς, of the Christians living scattered among the ἔθνη, who, as the people of God (ii. 10), have their home and inheritance elsewhere (i. 4). See the same thought in Heb. xi. 13, ὁμολογήσαντες ὅτι ξένοι καὶ παρεπίδημοί εἰσιν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, which the writer borrows from Gen. xxiii. 4.

Ψευδοδιδάσκαλος, *ó, a false teacher, i.e. one who claims to be a teacher, but is not*; compare ψευδάδελφος, ψευδαπόστολος, ψευδιερεύς (Josephus, *Ant.* ix. 6. 12), ψευδοπροφήτης, ψευδεπίσκοπος, ψευδόχριστος, ψευδόθεος. Ψεῦδος in these connections has also a reference to work undertaken, as in ψευδόδοξος, ψευδόλογος, ψευδοκατήγορος; almost always, however, where the word to which it is prefixed denotes a clearly defined conception, it is this which the ψεῦδος negatives; compare in profane Greek ψευδοδείπνον, Aesch. *Fr.* 272; ψευδόθυρον, Cic. *in Ver.* ii. 20. 50; ψευδοκλητεία, Dem. liii. 15. 17. And thus in 2 Pet. ii. 1, ἐγένοντο δὲ καὶ ψευδοπροφῆται ἐν τῷ λαῷ, ὡς καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσονται ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι, οἵτινες παρεισάξουσιν αἵρέσεις κ.τ.λ., where παρεισάξ. (compare Gal. ii. 4, παρεισάκτους ψευδαδέλφους) refers to the fact that they claimed or assumed the position of a διδάσκαλος, *i.e.* not merely of one who teaches anything, but of a διδάσκαλος in the N. T. sense, a teacher of the saving truths of Christianity, whose duty is not merely the proclamation, but the progressive confirmation of it, and deeper instruction therein. Compare the characteristic of the ψευδοδιδασκαλίαι in Polyc. *Phil.* vii. 2, μεθοδεύειν τὰ λογία τοῦ κυρίου πρὸς τὰς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας.

Δίκαιος and its derivatives answer in the LXX. to צַדִּיק and its derivatives, and is used in a forensic sense, צַדִּיק being correlative with צָרָף, צָהֵר, and denoting not moral purity or faultlessness in itself, but this as answering to what is normally right. The word has reference to action and conduct in social life, Lev. xix. 36; Deut. xxiv. 13, xxv. 15; Ezek. xlv. 10. It is essentially a religious conception, and thus it differs from the profane use of the word. Conduct in social life, as subject to the judgment of God, is estimated and described by δίκαιος and צַדִּיק in the Scriptures. Hence arises the view, unknown in the profane sphere, that no one among men is righteous, but yet that they are righteous who so submit themselves to God as to pray for and to expect divine help and deliverance from the judgment of that very righteousness of God which judges the world and puts wicked doers to shame. Compare Ps. cxliii. 1, 2, אֲנִי צָדִּיק וְלֹא אֶשְׁכַּח מִן הַצָּדִיקִים וְלֹא אֶשְׁכַּח מִן הַצָּדִיקִים וְלֹא אֶשְׁכַּח מִן הַצָּדִיקִים.

בְּמִשְׁפָּט אֶת־עַבְדְּךָ בִּי לֹא־יִצְדָק לִפְנֶיךָ בְּלִחִי. The suppliant alternates in his appeal to his own and to God's righteousness, *e.g.* Ps. vii. 9, 18, xxxv. 24, 28, lxxi. 2; cf. Ps. xxv. 9 with vv. 2, 7. It is clear that the conception is still forensic, for God's righteousness which is appealed to is the righteousness manifested in judgment upon sinners; cf. Ps. cxxx. 3, 4, אִם־עֲוֹנוֹת הִשְׁמַרְתָּה אֲדֹנָי מִי־עֹמֵד: בְּרִעְמוֹךְ הִפְלִיחָה לְמַעַן הוֹרֵא. Still, as the suppliant appeals to his own righteousness, he has a righteous cause; and as God's righteousness is his refuge, he relies upon God to do him justice, Ps. vii. 9, xciv. 14, 21, cxxix. 4, cxl. 13, 14, cxlvi. 7 sqq. This appears strikingly in the Book of Job, the Psalms, and the second part of Isaiah. Job does not deny his sinfulness, Job ix. 2, xiv. 4. Yet he expects God to recognise his righteous cause, xiii. 18, xvi. 20, 21, xvii. 8, 9, which, indeed, He does, xlii. 7. We find the same thing in Ps. lxxiii. as compared with Jer. xii. 1 sqq. The righteousness of the man who appeals to God's righteousness for help, and hopes therein, is not moral faultlessness, sinlessness, but his relation to God, his fear of God, and his hope in Him, Ps. xxxiii. 5, xxxvi. 11, 12, ciii. 17, cxii. 1 sqq., cxlv. 17 sqq., lii. 8, 9, lxix. 7, xci. 14, 15, cf. ver. 8, by virtue of which there is no deceit in his heart, but acknowledgment of his sin, Ps. xxxii. 2, 11, xl. 11 sqq., li. 16, lxv. 5, lxix. 6, 7, submission to God's judgment, Ps. lxxxix. 33 sqq., cxviii. 15–18, cxxxv. 14, and entire reliance upon God's word and promise. In contrast with the righteous stands the man who trusts not in God, but in his riches and in his own desires, Ps. lii. 8, 9. The fear of God and reliance upon Him, and upon His promise and choice—this is the righteous cause of the persecuted and oppressed, whether his sufferings come from his own people or from Israel's enemies, Ps. ix. 5, 14, xxxvii. 39, cxxv. 3. Thus God's righteousness helps the righteous cause, and is the refuge of the poor and righteous, Ps. ciii. 6, cxxv. 3, cxxix. 4, cxl. 13, 14, cxli. 1, 2, 11, and the asserting of God's righteousness is at the same time the outgo of His grace and compassion, Ps. cxii. 4, cxvi. 5, cxviii. 15–19, xcvi. 11, 12. Nay, even the forgiveness of sins comes from the righteousness of God; cf. Ps. li. 16, ciii. 11, 12, 17. For though the sufferer's own cause is one of sin and guilt, he so relates himself to God's cause, bears ignominy (Ps. lxix. 6) for God's sake, whom he fears and to whom he commits himself, that in spite of his own guilt he prays, "Let not those who hope in Thee be put to shame in me," and against his enemies, "Let them not come into Thy righteousness;" cf. Ps. lxix. 7, 28, cf. Ps. xxv. 2 sqq. Hence it may be understood why God's righteousness is said not to be praised in the realm of the dead, Ps. lxxxviii. 11–13, cxv. 17, 18; cf. xvii. 10, cxvi. 8, 9. God's righteousness is both the judgment and deliverance of His people, whose sin and unfaithfulness demand judgment, but whose prayer brings deliverance; cf. Ps. l. 4–6, 15, 21 sqq. By His condemning and right-producing righteousness, God discerns between His people and the nations, Ps. xciii.–xcix. God leads on the righteous cause to victory, and thus He is faithful to His promises, and blends faithfulness to His promise and covenant with righteousness, Ps. lxxxix., xciv. 14. Righteousness prevails before God, both human righteousness and divine; the fear of God and hope waiting upon Him on man's part,

prevail as human righteousness, and the deliverance of those who hope in Him, of His "Inheritance" in accordance with His covenant and name, prevail as righteousness on God's part. This runs throughout the Psalter, the prayers in which, even the most personal, must not be regarded as merely individual; cf. Ps. li. 20, 21.

Thus the religious conception becomes *soteriologic*, one of deliverance, which finds its fullest expression in the second part of Isaiah. Israel is a sinful people, Isa. xliii. 26, xlvi. 1, liii. 11, lvii. 12, lviii. 12, lix. 4; his righteousness is "a spider's web," lix. 5, 6, and "a filthy garment," lxiv. 5. Hence God's judgments go forth upon His people, who as little regard the righteous among them as the hand of God stretched out against them. They are sunk in idolatry; there are but few who have not forsaken the Lord, nor forgotten His holy mountain. Yet in the face of their oppressors Israel's cause is righteous, and when they have been sufficiently humbled, and have received double for their sins, its righteousness will be revealed, Isa. xl. 1 sqq., li. 17 sqq., liv. 7-14, lvii. 15 sqq., lxi. 1. They will be saved from their enemies, *i.e.* will be justified through the righteousness of God, who works right for His people. Though Israel's oppression is a judgment from God, Israel's oppressors have done wrong, Isa. xlix. 24 sqq., li. 21. The same righteousness of God, which protects the righteous cause of the עֲבָדֵי יְהוָה, Isa. xli. 10, cf. ver. 2, is also the salvation of the forsaken yet forgiven people, liv. 14, 17, "Every weapon that is formed against thee shall fail, and every tongue which appears in judgment against thee thou shalt condemn;" this is the inheritance of the servants of Jehovah, יְהוָה יִצְדָּקֵם בְּאֵתֵי נְאֻם־יְהוָה. Thus it is as Flacius says (*Clavis Scr. s.v. justitia*), "Educere aut proferre dicitur Deus justitiam nostram, cum causas nostras et nos ipsos ab oppressoribus liberat ac victores facit cumque sic nobis testimonium innocentiae et justitiae coram orbe terrarum tribuit," cf. Jer. li. 10; the righteousness of God is benigna Dei liberatio ab oppressoribus nostris nos vindicans. Compare the Syriac זָכָא, vicit, immunis, impunis fuit, evasit, justificatus est; זָכָא, victor, immunis; זָכָא, justificatus, impunis; זָכָא, victor, innoxius, purus, innocens; זָכָא, victoria, innocentia; זָכָא, victor, justificans, opp. reus, debitor fuit,—victus, profligatus, spe victoriae frustratus est; Castelli, *Lex. Syr.* ed. J. D. Michaelis. But the exposition in Isaiah goes a step farther. Israel's righteousness is brought about by redemption, for he is in the right who has God for him. Isa. lx. 21, יְהוָה בְּלִים צְדִיקִים. Isa. liii. 11, xlv. 8, 13, 19, 23-25, xlvi. 12, 13, lviii. 8, lx. 17, lxi. 3, 10, lxii. 1, lxiii. 4. Compare, moreover, יְהוָה צְדִיק, Jer. xxiii. 6, xxxiii. 16; also Hos. ii. 19, x. 12; Mal. ii. 4. Also compare צְדִיקָה = ἐλεημοσύνη in the LXX. Deut. vi. 25, xxiv. 13; Ps. xxiv. 5, xxxiii. 5, ciii. 6; Isa. i. 27, xxviii. 17, lix. 16; Dan. ix. 16 = εἰλεος, Isa. lvi. 1.

Thus the declarations in Gen. xv. 6, Isa. xxviii. 16, Hab. ii. 4, are not isolated, but are the comprehensive and culminative expression of a view distinctive of the O. T. for which Paul employs the words δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ, and which he rightly describes as μαρτυρουμένη ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν, revealed in the εὐαγγέλιον, which answers to the ἐπαγγελία, Rom. iii. 21, and God is δίκαιος καὶ δικαιοῦν τὸν ἐκ πίστεως or τὸν

ἀσεβῆ, iii. 25, iv. 5. The explanatory link for the heathen world, as is evident from the prophetic exposition itself, lies in the thoroughly forensic character of the word, the transference of which from the social to the religious sphere (or its change from a social into a religious conception) presented no difficulties to the understanding of those who were cognizant of God's judgment and the claims of repentance.

In the Apocrypha δικαιοσύνη is naturally retained in its religious sense; cf. the designation of characters as δίκαιοι, Wisd. x. 6, 10, 13; Ecclus. xlv. 17; and ὁ δίκαιος answers to צַדִּיק in the writings of the Chockmah, Wisd. ii. 12, 18; Tob. xiii. 13; Ecclus. ix. 16, *et al.*; and the designation of God as ὁ κύριος τῶν δικαίων, Tob. xiii. 13. But Greek influence appears in the combination of δικαιοσύνη with the other so-called cardinal virtues, ἀνδρεία, σωφροσύνη, and φρόνησις, Wisd. viii. 7; 4 Macc. i. 18 (τῆς σοφίας ἰδέαι), cf. vv. 4, 6; and in the disappearance of the forensic element, cf. Wisd. xv. 3, τὸ γὰρ ἐπίστασθαί σε ὁλόκληρος δικαιοσύνη. It may also be attributed to Greek influence that δικαιοσύνη in the Book of Tobit appears as a social virtue, and is limited to the exercise of pity, a limitation which, though akin with Deut. xxiv. 12, 13, Prov. xii. 10, is alien to the Scripture view; cf. Tob. xii. 8, ἀγαθὸν προσευχῇ μετὰ ἡσυχίας καὶ ἐλεημοσύνης καὶ δικαιοσύνης; xiv. 11, ἴδετε τί ἐλεημοσύνη ποιεῖ καὶ δικαιοσύνη ῥύεται; xiv. 9, τήρησον τὸν νόμον καὶ τὰ προστάγματα καὶ γενοῦ φιλελεήμων καὶ δίκαιος; cf. Dan. iv. 24, צַדִּיק = ἐλεημοσύνη; Ezek. xviii. 19, 21 = ἔλεος. This is akin to the employment of צַהֵר, צָהֵר, to be pure, innocent, just, as supplementary to צַדִּיק, the post-biblical term, *techn.* for the biblical צַדִּיק of human rectitude in a forensic and religious sense; צָהֵר, the justified, acquitted, as opposed to צָהֵר, guilty, condemned; צִיּוֹן, of the divine justification; צִדִּיק, uprightness, desert, merit, claim, and reward; cf. Weber, *System. der altsynag. paläst. Theol.* cap. 19, § 59; *Der Begriff der Sechuth*, p. 267 sqq. Answering to this is the frequent limitation of צַדִּיק, צְהִרָה, to kindness, alms. This limitation has no connection with the soteriologic import of God's righteousness in the O. T., which is retained even in the Apocrypha, but the Messianic salvation is referred to as God's administration in harmony with His prescience, thus Wisd. xii. 15, 16, ἡ γὰρ ἰσχὺς σου δικαιοσύνης ἀρχὴ καὶ τὸ πάντων σε δεσπόζειν πάντων φείδεσθαι ποιεῖ; ver. 17, ix. 3, xv. 1, μακρόθυμος καὶ ἐλέει διοικῶν τὰ πάντα; 2 Macc. i. 24, θεὸς δίκαιος καὶ ἐλεήμων. Tob. xiii. 6, 13. Like the Isaianic צַדִּיק, parall. צִדִּיק, to denote salvation, δικαιοσύνη is used in Wisd. xiv. 7 of the ark of Noah, εὐλόγηται γὰρ ξύλον, δι' οὗ γίνεται δικαιοσύνη, and Bar. v. 2, περιβαλοῦ τὴν διπλοῖδα τῆς παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ δικαιοσύνης, where the reference to Isa. lxi. 3, 10, is too obvious to admit of the δικ. here being rendered *riches* (Fritzsche).

Δικαιοῖω. Its use in profane Greek—(a) to esteem as right and fair, syn. ἀξιῶν, with following inf., Hrdt. i. 89. 1, ἐπεῖτε με θεοὶ ἔδωκαν δοῦλόν σοι, δικαιοῖω εἴ τι ἐνορέω πλέον, σημαίνει σοι; 133. 1, ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ πλέω δαῖτα τῶν ἄλλων δικαιοῖωσι προτιθέσθαι; iii. 148. 2, λαβεῖν μὲν διδόμενα οὐκ ἐδικαίω; vi. 86. 1, οὐ δικαιοῖω τῷ

ἐτέρῳ ἄνευ τοῦ ἐτέρου ἀποδιδόναι ; ii. 172. 2 ; 181. 1 ; iii. 36. 1 ; 42. 1 ; 79. 2 ; 118. 2 ; 142. 3 ; 148. 2 ; iv. 186 ; vi. 15 ; 82. 1 ; 138. 2 ; viii. 126. Thuc. i. 140. 2 ; ii. 41. 2 ; 61. 3, ἐν ἴσῳ οἱ ἄνθρωποι δικαιοῦσι τῆς τε ὑπαρχούσης δόξης αἰτιᾶσθαι ὅστις μαλακίᾳ ἐλλείπει κ.τ.λ. ; lxxvii. 4, δικαιοῦντες τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἀμύνεσθαι οἷσπερ καὶ οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι ὑπῆρξαν ; iv. 64. 2. Soph. *Philoct.* 781, πλοῦς οὐριός τε κεῦσταλῆς, ὅποι ποτὲ θεὸς δικαιοῖ χῶ στόλος πορσύνεται. Hence also according to the connection, *to desire, to require, to will* ; Hrdt. vi. 73, οὔτε οἱ Αἰγινῆται . . . ἐδικαίουν ἔτι ἀναβαίνειν ; Thuc. v. 105. 1, οἷδεν γὰρ ἔξω τῆς ἀνθρωπείας τῶν μὲν ἐς τὸ θεῖον νομίσεως τῶν δ' ἐς σφὰς αὐτοὺς βουλήσεως δικαιοῦμεν ἢ πράσσομεν ; Soph. *Oed. R.* 6, ἀγὼ δικαίων μὴ παρ' ἀγγέλων ἄλλων ἀκούειν αὐτὸς ὧδ' ἐλήλυθα ; *Oed. Col.* 1350, δικαίων ὥστ' ἐμοῦ κλύειν λόγους ; *Trach.* 1244 ; Dion Hal. *Ant. Rom.* iii. 10, δικαιοῦντες ἑκατέρου τὴν αὐτοῦ πόλιν ἄρχειν τῆς ἐτέρας ; *ibid.* τοῦ δὲ Λατίνων ἔθους . . . ἡγεῖσθαι δικαιοῦμεν . . . κατὰ τὸν κοινὸν ἀνθρώπων νόμον, ὃν ἡ φύσις ἔδωκεν ἅπασιν, τῶν ἐκγόνων ἄρχειν τοὺς προγόνους ; Plut. *Ages.* xxiii. 3, ἡνάγκασεν ἐμμεῖναι πάντας οἷς ὁ Πέρσης ἐδικαίωσε ; *Rompr.* xxiii. 4, αὐτοὶ μὲν γὰρ καὶ ἐνταῦθα πρωτεύειν ὡς ἐκεῖ δικαιοῦσι. Dio Cass. xxxvii. 27. 36, lii. 2, τὸ σὺν τό τε κοινὸν προιδέσθαι ἐδικαίωσα ; liv. 9, ἀκριβῶς ἀρκεῖσθαι τοῖς ὑπάρχουσιν ἐδικαίου ; liv. 15.—(b) *To judge*, Thuc. v. 26. 2, τὴν ξύμβασιν εἴ τις μὴ ἀξιώσει πόλεμον νομίζειν οὐκ ὀρθῶς δικαιοῦσι ; iv. 122. 3, εἶχε δὲ καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια περὶ τῆς ἀποστάσεως μᾶλλον ἢ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ἐδικαίου. Dio Cass. xlii. 33, τῶν μὲν τά, τῶν δὲ τὰ δικαιοῦντων. Plut. *de fort.* 2 (*Mor.* 97 F), εἰ τὰ τῆς εὐβουλίας ἔργα τῆς τύχης δικαιοῦμεν εἶναι. More definitely = *to recognise as right and good*, Hrdt. ix. 42, τούτου δὲ οὕτω δικαιοῦντος ἀντέλεγε οὐδεὶς, ὥστε ἐκράτεε τῇ γνώμῃ ; cf. xli. 2, δοκέειν πολλῶ κρέσσονα εἶναι. Eur. *Suppl.* 526, νεκροὺς θάψαι δικαίῳ. Plut. *Thes.* xvii. 2, δικαίων μὴ ἀμελεῖν ἀλλὰ κοινωνεῖν τῆς τύχης ταῖς πολίταις. *Romul.* v. 2, δικαίων ἐμμένειν τοῖς ὀρισθεῖσι ; *de solert. animal.* 36 (984 F), δικαιοῦσας μετασχεῖν ἧς συναίτιος ἔδοξε γεγονέναι τελευτῆς. Dio Cass. liv. 15, πολλάκις γὰρ καὶ ἰδίᾳ καὶ κοινῇ τῆς ἱερωσύνης ταύτης ἀξιούμενος, οὐκ ἐδικαίωσε ζῶντος τοῦ Λεπίδου λαβεῖν αὐτήν. Hence = *to confirm, to justify, and = to decide*. The first in Plat. (*Gorg.* 484 B) *Legg.* iv. 714 E, ἔφαμεν ποῦ κατὰ φύσιν Πίνδαρον ἄγειν δικαιοῦντα τὸ βiaiότατον, Schleierm. “justifying the strongest,” but Ast, *annotatt. in Gorg.* τὸ βiaiότ. adverbially, ex suo jure agens violentissime. Dio Cass. liv. 24, οὕτω δὲ τά τε ὅπλα κατέθεντο καὶ τῷ Πολέμῳ παρεδόθησαν, ἣ τε γυνὴ ἡ Δύναμις συνήκησεν αὐτῷ τοῦ Αὐγούστου δηλονότι ταῦτα δικαίασαντος. With this meaning it is used as *vox media* in Aesch. *Agam.* 393, κακοῦ δὲ χαλκοῦ τρόπον τρίβῳ δὲ καὶ προσβολαῖς μελαμπαγῆς πέλει δικαιοθεῖς.—In the sense *to decide*, it stands, Thuc. ii. 71. 3, coll. 2, εἰν οἰκεῖν αὐτονόμους καθάπερ Πανσανίας ἐδικαίωσεν. Next we find it (c) *to condemn, to punish*, right asserting itself in judgment and recompense, “quemadmodum gallico sermone dicimus *faire justice de quelqu'un*,” Schweighaeuser, *lex. Herod.* ; compare the German “Jem. sein Recht anthun,” “es geschieht ihm sein Recht.” For this transference, cf. Plut. *Quaest. graec.* xiv. (294 C), ἐδικαίωσε τὸν μὲν Ὀδυσσεῖα μεταναστῆναι καὶ φεύγειν, of judgment by arbitration. *Brut.* xlv. 4, Μεσσήλας . . . ἐδικαίου πληγαῖς κολασθέντας ἐπὶ σκηνῆς γυμνοὺς ἀποδοθῆναι τοῖς

στρατηγοῖς τῶν πολεμίων. *Cal. maj.* xxi. 4, τοὺς δ' ἄξιον εἰργάσθαι τι θανάτου δόξαντας ἐδικαίου κριθέντας ἐν τοῖς οἰκέταις πᾶσιν ἀποθνήσκειν, εἰ καταγνωσθεῖεν. In the sense *to censure, to punish*, it occurs occasionally in Herod.: i. 100, εἴ τινα πυνθάνοιτο ὑβρίζοντα, τοῦτον ὅπως ματαπέμφαιτο κατ' ἀξίην ἐκάστου ἀδικήματος ἐδίκαιεν; iii. 29, v. 92. 4, from an oracle, δικαίωσει Κόρινθον. It is rare, however, in this sense in Attic Greek, but frequent in later Greek. Josephus seems not to use it, only δικαίωσις, *Ant.* xviii. 9. 1, οἱ δ' ἐφ' ὕβρει τὴν δικαίωσιν λογιζόμενοι. Philo uses δικαιοῦν very seldom, and not in this sense; Plutarch only the passive once, *De vera num. vind.* 22 (565 B), κολαζομένους ἐπιδὼν ἐκείνους καὶ ὀφθεῖς δικαιοῦνται πόγυν χρόνον κ.τ.λ. But it occurs often in Dio Cassius and sometimes in Aelian, and as=*to find guilty*, Dio Cass. lii. 26, ἐκείνον δὲ πάντες δικαίωσουσιν;=*to condemn, to punish*, not only of decision or destiny, but of the punishment of death; the active in liii. 13, τὴν τε στρατιωτικὴν στολὴν φοροῦντας καὶ ξίφος, οἷς γε καὶ στρατιώτας δικαίωσαι ἔξεστιν, ἔχοντας; xxxviii. 11, lii. 24, τούτους μὲν γὰρ αὐτοὶ ἐκείνοι δικαιοῦντων; liv. 15, ἄλλους μὲν τινὰς ἐδικαίωσε, parall. ἀποκτείναι; liv. 19, συχνοὺς μὲν ἔξω τι τῶν τεταγμένων πράττοντες δικαίων ἐλύπει, συχνῶν δὲ καὶ φειδόμενος; lvi. 4, ζηλώσαντες μὲν πάντες ἂν ἀπόλοιτο, μισήσαντες δ' ὑμᾶς ἂν δικαιοῦσαι; lxxi. 28. Suidas cites from 16 B, οὐ μέντοι πάντα ὑμῖν θανατώσω, ἀλλ' ὀλίγους μὲν οὖς καὶ συνείληφα ἤδη, δικαιοῶσω, τοὺς δὲ ἄλλους ἀφήμι. The passive=*to be condemned*, i.e. *to be put to death*, xxxvii. 12, 41, ἕτεροι δὲ τῶν λανθανόντων μηνύσει Λουκίου Οὐεττίου . . . ἐλεγχόμενοι ἐδικαιοῦντο; xl. 3, xli. 28, xliii. 24, οὗτος μὲν οὖν διὰ ταῦτα ἐδικαιώθη, i.e. after he πρὸς τιμωρίαν παρεδόθη; li. 8, it is said of a certain Turullius, ὃν ὁ καῖσαρ ἀπέκτεινε, that he was executed on the island Cos, ἐδικαιώθη. It does not strictly denote the punishment of death in xlix. 12, τῶν δὲ πόλεων αἱ μὲν ἐκούσiai αὐτῷ προσχωρήσασαι συγγνώμης ἔτυχον αἱ δ' ἀντάρασαι ἐδικαιώθησαν, but evidently only occasionally; cf. lv. 14, αἱ τιμωρίαι τῶν δικαιομένων, parall. συναπόλλυσθαι. See also δικαίωσις. In Aelian once with θανάτῳ, *Var. hist.* v. 18, τὸ ἀναίτιον βρέφος ἀναλύοντες τῆς καταδίκης, τὴν αἰτίαν μόνην ἐδικαίωσαν θανάτῳ=*to punish with death*; once absolutely, xiv. 7, ἐπαίοντο καὶ ἐδικαιοῦντο. For the meaning *to punish* Suidas cites a fragment, δικαιοῦσαν καταδικάζουσιν. ὑπὲρ δὲ τούτων τὴν Ἄρτεμιν μηνύσαι καὶ μετελθεῖν δικαιοῦσαν αὐτοὺς τῆς γῆς ἀγῶνι.— (d) δικαιοῦν τινα=*to justify a person, to maintain the right of*. Dio Cass. xlvi. 46, ὡς μὴ δικαιοῦντος τοῦ Ἀντωνίου αὐτόν. Polyb. iii. 31. 9, ἐξ ὧν καὶ τὸν ἐλεήσοντα καὶ τὸν συνοργιζόμενον, ἔτι δὲ τὸν δικαιοῦντα . . . εὐρεῖν ἔστιν

Δικαιοκρισία, ἡ, a judgment which renders justice, which produces right, δικαίως κρίνει, not = δικαία κρίσις, which corresponds with right; cf. δικαιοκρίτης = ὃς δικαίως κρίνει, Lob. *Platyn.* 601. The word occurs only in biblical and patristic Greek, and only seldom; δικαιοκρίτης in the Alexandrine Hephæstion (about the middle of the 2nd century) and in 2 Macc. xii. 41, πάντες οὖν εὐλογήσαντες τοῦ δικαιοκρίτου κυρίου τὰ κεκρυμμένα φανερά ποιούντος. *Orac. Sibyll.* iii. 704, υἱοὶ θεοῦ . . . εὐφραινόμενα ἐπὶ τούτοις οἷς δώσει κτίστης, ὁ δικαιοκρίτης τε μονάρχος, with reference to the protection of

God's children, 705 sqq. Δικαιοκρισία only occurs in the *Quint. interpr.*, Hos. vi. 5, where the LXX. read καὶ τὸ κρίμα μου ὡς φῶς = 𐤒𐤓𐤕𐤓𐤕𐤓. *Test. XII. Patr. Levi*, 3, ἐν τῇ δικαιοκρισίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ (i.e. εἰς ἐκδίκησιν ἀνόμων). *Ibid.* 15, λήψεσθε ὄνειδος καὶ αἰσχύνην αἰώνιον παρὰ τῆς δικαιοκρισίας τοῦ θεοῦ. In the N. T. Rom. ii. 5, κατὰ τὴν σκληρότητά σου . . . θησαυρίζεις σεαυτῷ ὀργὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὀργῆς καὶ δικαιοκρισίας τοῦ θεοῦ, where it not only serves to strengthen ὀργῆς, but (compare vv. 6, 7) refers to the day of wrath as a day in which God (speaking after the manner of the O. T.) executes justice for the righteous by the punishment of the ungodly; cf. 2 Thess. i. 5 sqq. (where Ephr. and others read δικαιοκρισίας instead of δικαίως κρίσεως), and see δικαιοκρίτης. Punitive vindication of righteousness is not (as Ritschl assumes, *Rechtfert. u. Versöhn.* ii. 115) excluded. Compare Justin Mart. *Quaest. gentil. ad Christ.* 213 D, κατὰ τοὺς πιστεύοντας τῶν νεκρῶν τὴν ἀνάστασιν τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ δικαιοκρισίᾳ καὶ ἀποθνήσκομεν καὶ ἀναζωοποιούμεθα

Ἀδίκημα, τος, τό, wrong, injustice; of the single act, in the LXX. with a social reference = 𐤁𐤓𐤕, 𐤓𐤕𐤕, 𐤓𐤕𐤕; it stands for 𐤓𐤕𐤕 in the social sense, Gen. xxxi. 36; Ex. xxii. 9; Prov. xvii. 9; in a religious sense, Lev. xvi. 16; for 𐤓𐤕 also in the religious sense, Isa. lix. 12; Jer. xvi. 17; Ezek. xiv. 10; in a social sense, 1 Sam. xx. 1. In the Apocrypha only in a social sense, Ecclus. x. 6, xxviii. 2; Baruch vi. 54. In the N. T. used (a) socially, Acts xviii. 14, xxiv. 20; (b) religiously, Rev. xviii. 5, ἐκολλήθησαν αὐτῆς αἱ ἁμαρτίαι ἄχρι τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἐμνημόνευσεν ὁ θεὸς τὰ ἀδικήματα αὐτῆς.

Ἀντίδικος, ὁ (LXX. in Isa. li. 36, also ἦ), one who raises a legal accusation against another, accuser, opponent. Plato, *Phaedr.* 161 C, ἐν δικαστηρίοις οἱ ἀντίδικοι τί δρῶσιν; it refers not only to legal claims that are personal, cf. Xen. *Apol.* 10, κατηγορήσαν αὐτοῦ οἱ ἀντίδικοι ὡς οὗς μὲν ἡ πόλις νομίζει θεούς, *ibid.* 25, but conflicting parties are designated ἀντίδικοι, Plato, *Legg.* 937 B, τῶν ἀντιδίκων ἑκάτερον. LXX. Jer. l. 34, κρίσιν κρινεῖ πρὸς ἀντιδίκους αὐτοῦ, a paraphrase for 𐤒𐤓𐤕𐤓𐤕𐤓 𐤒𐤓𐤕. Jer. li. 36, κρινῶ τὴν ἀντιδικόν σου καὶ ἐκδικήσω τὴν ἐκδίκησίν σου = 𐤒𐤓𐤕𐤓𐤕𐤓 𐤒𐤓𐤕𐤕. Isa. xli. 11, οἱ ἀντίδικοί σου = 𐤒𐤓𐤕𐤓𐤕𐤓, parallel with οἱ ἀντικείμενοί σοι. 1 Sam. ii. 10, κύριος ἁσθενῇ ποιήσει τὸν ἀντιδικὸν αὐτοῦ = 𐤒𐤓𐤕; compare Ps. li. 6. In Prov. xviii. 17 it stands for 𐤓𐤕. Compare ἀντιδικεῖν, Judg. vi. 31, according to Cod. A, but B has δικάζειν, others ἀντιδικάζειν. Judg. xii. 2, ἀντιδίκων, according to A, but B has μαχητής. Esth. viii. 11, τοῖς ἀντιδίκοις αὐτῶν καὶ τοῖς ἀντικειμένοις αὐτῶν. The word is not used in the LXX. for an enemy generally; thus in profane Greek only in the poets, e.g. Aesch. *Ag.* 41, Πριάμου μέγας ἀντίδικος Μενέλαος ἀναξ; and even here not vaguely = enemy, but = antagonist, he who is in strife with him. This use, at any rate, is only poetical, as in Ecclus. xxxiii. 7 (xxxvi. 9), ἐγειρον θυμὸν καὶ ἔκχεον ὀργὴν, ἔξαρον ἀντιδικὸν καὶ ἔκτριψον ἐχθρόν, where it denotes the adversary of Israel, whom God will judge. Thus accordingly in the N. T. 1 Pet. v. 8, ὁ ἀντίδικος ὑμῶν διάβολος, it stands in the same sense, that in which the devil is designated κατήγωρ, therefore in a forensic sense, as in Matt. v. 25; Luke xii. 58, xviii. 3.

Συνδοξάζω, (a) once in Aristotle, *Pol.* v. 9, νόμοι συνδεδοξασμένοι ὑπὸ πάντων, therefore = *to recognise in common with*, referred to the subject. Elsewhere (b) only in Rom. viii. 17, and in patristic Greek in the other sense *to extol jointly*, but with reference to the object; Theodoret, *H. E.* iv. 3, συνεδόξαζαν αὐτὸ (τὸ πνεῦμα) τῷ πατρὶ καὶ τῷ υἱῷ ἐν τῇ μιᾷ τῆς ἁγίας τριάδος πίστει. Rom. ii. 5 = *to glorify together*; see δοξάζω.

Δόκιμος, ον, *acceptable*, that is, *fit for recognition*, not only what may be approved, but *what is universally approved* (compare estimable, noticeable, wonderful), **approved**; cf. Krüger, § 41. 11. 16; used as a *term. techn.* of good, fully approved, genuine, current coin (*Gen.* xxiii. 16, see below); compare *Plut. adv. Kolot.* 22 (1126 D), ἐν πυρὶ τὸν Παρμενίδου λόγον ὥσπερ χρυσὸν ἀκήρατον καὶ δόκιμον παρέσχε. *Cur Pythia*, etc., 24 (406 B), ἀμοιβῇ γὰρ ἔοικε νομίσματος ἢ τοῦ λόγου χρεία, καὶ δόκιμον μὲν αὐτοῦ τὸ σύνηθές ἐστι καὶ γνώριμον, ἄλλην ἐν ἄλλοις χρόνοις ἰσχὺν λαμβάνοντες. But it is used so frequently of persons that it cannot have been borrowed figuratively from coins; the designation of coin as δόκιμος must be regarded as a special application of the word, just as, e.g., δοκιμαστής denotes the scrutineer or assayer of the mint (*Plato, de Virt.* 378 D, περὶ τὸ χρυσίον καὶ τὸ ἀργύριον εἰσὶν ἡμῖν δοκιμασταί); the usage of δοκιμάζειν, however, is different. The notice in Moeris (ed. Pierson), p. 54, ἀργυρογνώμονες ἀττικῶς, δοκιμασταὶ ἐλληνικῶς, leads to the conclusion that the employment of δόκιμος to denote genuine coin was a later and derived use of the word. As an epithet of persons, δόκιμος denotes the general recognition in which they stand, therefore **recognised, approved**, for which Plato commonly has εὐδόκιμος. *Herod.* ii. 162. 2, iii. 135. 1, vii. 118, τῶν ἀστῶν ἀνὴρ δόκιμος ὁμοῖα τῷ μάλιστα; iii. 143, ἐὼν ἐν τοῖσι ἀστοῖσι δόκιμος; vii. 117, δόκιμον ἐόντα παρὰ Ξέρξῃ, and often. *Xen. Ages.* i. 24; *Hell.* iii. 4. 15, ὅστις παρέχοιτο ἵππον καὶ ὄπλα καὶ ἄνδρα δόκιμον . . . ἔξεσται αὐτῷ μὴ στρατεῦσθαι. *Cyr.* i. 6. 7, ὅπως ἂν αὐτός τε καλὸς καὶ ἀγαθὸς δοκίμως γένοιτο. So also in *Plato. Plut. Romul.* xxviii. 1, ἄνδρα τῶν πατρικίων γένει πρῶτον ἦθει δὲ δοκιμώτατον, and often in *Plut.* combined with κράτιστος, ἄριστος, μέγιστος, e.g. *De exilio* 14 (605 B), καὶ γὰρ νῦν οἱ δοκιμώτατοι καὶ κράτιστοι ζῶσιν ἐπὶ ξένης. Also in Aristotle, *Pol.* iii. 4, πολίτου δοκίμου ἢ ἀρετὴ τὸ δύνασθαι καὶ ἄρχειν καὶ ἄρχεσθαι καλῶς, where we need not suppose the meaning to be *probus*; cf. *de mundo*, 6, ἔξω δὲ τούτων ἄνδρες οἱ πρῶτοι καὶ δοκιμώτατοι διεκεκόσμητο.

While Philo uses the word in the sense *respected, approved*, *De opif. m.* i. 30. 19, τιμᾶται δὲ καὶ παρὰ τοῖς δοκιμώτατοις τῶν Ἑλλήνων καὶ βαρβάρων, *de Jos.* ii. 69. 49, and more rarely as = *genuine*, e.g. σφραγίς (the place quoted in *Steph. Thesaurus*, from *De mundo*, to the effect that the world is δόκιμος σφραγίς τοῦ θεοῦ, is not to be found there), it occurs in the LXX. only in connection with its use regarding coin, *Gen.* xxiii. 16, ἀργύριον δόκιμον = כֶּסֶף, **current**, for which in 2 Kings xii. 4 we have ἀργύριον συντιμήσεως. In *Zech.* xi. 13 = כֶּסֶף; 2 *Chron.* ix. 17, χρυσίον δ. = כֶּסֶף; 1 *Kings* x. 18

= רָפִיז; 1 Chron. xxviii. 18, xxix. 4 = רָפִיז, *refined*; compare Symm. Ps. xviii. 33, ῥῆσις τοῦ κυρίου δόκιμος; LXX. τὰ λόγια κυρίου πεπυρωμένα. This last passage shows that δόκιμος, clearly signifying *recognised*, and therefore *genuine*, obtained the signification *tried*, being akin to the use of δοκιμάζειν as synonymous with πυροῦν (see δοκιμάζω); and this might happen all the more readily because δοκιμή, derived from δοκιμάζειν, δοκιμεῖν, has the meaning *verification, proof*; for the fact of this transference, compare δοκίμιον = δοκιμεῖον.

This explains the N. T. and specially the Pauline use of the word. (a) Rom. xiv. 18 it occurs as in profane Greek = **approved, recognised**, εὐάρεστος τῷ θεῷ, δόκιμος τοῖς ἀνθρώποις. 2 Cor. xiii. 7, οὐχ ἵνα ἡμεῖς δόκιμοι φανώμεν. (As to the thing meant, see Prov. xvi. 1.) The simple dative, without ἐν or παρά (see above), is accounted for by the parallelism with εὐάρ. τῷ θεῷ. In profane Greek it occurs once, Pind. *Nem.* iii. 10, ἄρχε δ' οὐρανοῦ πολυνεφέλα κρέοντι θύγατερ δόκιμον ὕμνον. But in 2 Tim. ii. 15, σπουδάσον σεαυτὸν δόκιμον παραστήσαι τῷ θεῷ, the dative is not to be joined with δόκ., but with παραστ., and δόκιμος stands here absolutely, as = (b) **Recognised, approved**, thus in the remaining passages. The interchange of meanings is apparent in Rom. xvi. 10, ἀσπάξασθε Ἀπελλὴν τὸν δόκιμον ἐν Χριστῷ, whose Christian character has found general recognition, and who thus as a Christian has approved himself in his fellowship with Christ. Jas. i. 12, μακάριος ἀνὴρ ὃς ὑπομένει πειρασμόν, ὅτι δόκιμος γενόμενος λήμψεται τὸν στέφανον κ.τ.λ., where a connection with the signification of δοκιμάζειν as syn. with πειράζειν is clear; not, however, implying a derivation from δοκιμάζειν, but only a transference from the one meaning to the other. That the meaning here is still *approval* or *acknowledgment* is evident from the λήμψεται κ.τ.λ.; cf. also 2 Cor. x. 18, οὐ γὰρ ὁ ἑαυτὸν συνιστάντων, ἐκεῖνός ἐστιν δόκιμος, ἀλλὰ ὃν ὁ κύριος συνίστησιν. In 1 Cor. xi. 19, δεῖ γὰρ καὶ αἰρέσεις ἐν ὑμῖν εἶναι ἵνα οἱ δόκιμοι φανεροὶ γένωνται ἐν ὑμῖν, the word is clearly equivalent to *genuine*. Compare ἀδόκιμος, 2 Cor. xiii. 5.

Ἀδόκιμος, *on, what is worth nothing, finds no approval, therefore what is or is to be rejected*. It is, like δόκιμος, used regarding coins and the precious metals, see (in contrast with ἐντιμος) Plato, *Legg.* v. 742 A, τὸ νόμισμα κτητέον αὐτοῖς μὲν ἐντιμον, τοῖς δὲ ἄλλοις ἀνθρώποις ἀδόκιμον. Plut. *De amicor. mult.* 3 (94 D), ὥσπερ νομισμάτων ἀδοκίμων ἐλεγχομένων. The fundamental idea in the word is *worthlessness*, not *spuriousness*, *spurious* is a secondary meaning; cf. Polyb. vi. 45. 4, ἧς (sc. τοῦ διαφόρου ἐντιμότητος) εἰς τέλος ἀδοκίμου παρ' αὐτοῖς ὑπαρχούσης, *quum apud illos omnis pecuniae autoritas esset adempta*. Hence we find it applied figuratively to people, Plut. *De pueror. educ.* 7 (4 C), οἵτινες πρὶν δοκιμάσαι τοὺς μέλλοντας διδάσκειν . . . ἀνθρώποις ἀδοκίμοις καὶ παρασήμοις ἐγχειρίζουσι τοὺς παῖδας. But the word is not to be regarded, any more than is δόκιμος, as used thus only figuratively. It signifies in the widest sense **whatever finds or deserves no approval or recognition**, according to the connection, e.g. = *unrenowned*, Herodian vii. 7. 5, ἐπιλεχθέντων ἀνδρῶν ἐκ τε τῆς συγκλήτου αὐτῆς καὶ τοῦ ἱππικοῦ

τάγματος οὐκ ἀδοκίμων, *or* = *to be rejected*, Polyb. vi. 25. 8, ἀδοκίμου τῆς χρείας οὕσης ταχέως μετέλαβον τὴν Ἑλληνικὴν κατασκευὴν τῶν ὅπλων. Plut. *de primo frig.* 17 (952 D), ἀδοκίμὸν τινα παντελῶς τοῦτον καὶ ἄτοπον ἀπορρίψας τὸν λόγον Ps. Dem. xxv. 36; *e.g.* also of the untrustworthy representations of writers who seek after gain. Polyb. xvi. 14. 9, ἀδοκίμους ποιοῦσι τὰς αὐτῶν συντάξεις. Cf. Joseph. *c. Ap.* ii. 33. 1, ἀδοκίμοι σοφισταί. In Xen. *Rep. Lac.* iii. 3, it is equivalent to *dishonourable, ignoble*, ὡς μὴ ἀποδειλιάσαντες ἀδόκιμοι παντάπασιν ἐν τῇ πόλει γένοιτο.

In biblical Greek this word, which indeed does not occur often in the classics (*e.g.* only once in Xen., not at all in Herod., Aristotle, and others), is used but rarely; in the LXX. only twice = *spurious*, ἀργύριον ἀδ., Prov. xxv. 4, Isa. i. 22, where in ver. 25 we have *ὁστράκινον*. In the N. T., excepting Heb. vi. 8, only in a few places in Paul's Epistles; (a) = *to be rejected, reprobate*, Rom. i. 28, καθὼς οὐκ ἐδοκίμασαν τὸν θεὸν ἔχει ἐν ἐπιγνώσει παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς εἰς ἀδόκιμον νοῦν; compare Polyb. vi. 25. 8, above quoted. There is no need of Wetstein's strained explanation, *Deus tradidit eos in mentem improbam, plumbeam, inidoneam quae id quod mentis est ageret*; God's rejection corresponds as a punishment to the corruptness or baseness of their νοῦς; compare διεφθαρμένοι κατεφθαρμένοι τὸν νοῦν, 1 Tim. vi. 5; 2 Tim. iii. 8; also Lyeurg. *adv. Leocr.* 213 in Lamb. Bos, *Exercit. Philol.*, and after him in Tholuck *in loc.* In like manner, 1 Cor. ix. 27, μήπως ἄλλοις κηρύξας αὐτὸς ἀδόκιμος γένωμαι. (b) *What does not verify itself, spurious*, with the same transference of meaning as *δόκιμος*. Thus 2 Cor. xiii. 5, ἑαυτοὺς πειράζετε εἰ ἐστὲ ἐν τῇ πίστει, ἑαυτοὺς δοκιμάζετε ἢ οὐκ ἐπιγνώσκετε ἑαυτοὺς ὅτι Χρ̄ς Ἰς ἐν ὑμῖν; εἰ μήτι ἀδόκιμοί ἐστε; see vv. 6–8. So likewise 2 Tim. iii. 8, ἀδόκιμοι περὶ τὴν πίστιν = *spurious*; Titus i. 16, βδελυκτοὶ ὄντες καὶ πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἀδόκιμοι. The signification *good for nothing, incapable*, nowhere occurs, not even in Polyb. vi. 25. 8, ἀδοκίμου τῆς χρείας οὕσης, which is not = ἀδόκιμος πρὸς χρείαν. This meaning is inadmissible, both here and in Heb. vi. 8, γῇ . . . ἀδόκιμος καὶ κατάρας ἐγγύς. Ἀδόκιμος is *what does not stand the test* (what is mere sham, *spurious*), what does not verify itself, and therefore incurs rejection.

Δοκιμάζω, *to try, to examine, to test* in order to approval (literally, *to make approved*), Hesychius, δοκιμάσας κρίνας, ἐξετάσας. The purpose—recognition, approval—distinguishes it from πειράζω, which see. Xen. *Oecon.* ix. 15, ἐκέλευον . . . ἐξετάζειν τὸ σκεῦη, ὥσπερ ὁ φρούραρχος τὰς φυλακὰς ἐξετάζει καὶ δοκιμάζειν εἰ καλῶς ἕκαστον ἔχει, ὥσπερ ἡ βουλὴ ἵππους καὶ ἱππείας δοκιμάζει, καὶ ἐπαινεῖν δὲ καὶ τιμᾶν τὸν ἄξιον καὶ λοιδορεῖν κ.τ.λ. Hence connected with the meaning *to test* (Xen. *Mem.* i. 4. 1; iv. 8. 11), we have also the signification *to ratify by inquiry, to present as approved, to demonstrate, to adduce proof*, Xen. *Oecon.* vi. 8, ἐδοκιμάσαμεν ἀνδρὶ καλῶ τε καὶ ἀγαθῶ ἐργασίαν εἶναι κρατίστην γεωργίαν. *To acknowledge, to approve*, Xen. *Mem.* i. 2. 4; cf. the perf. part. pass. δεδοξασμένος, *proved = acknowledged*. In Attic usage it is specially a *term. techn.* for testing the qualifications of those chosen to an office in the

state, as to the legal requisites of birth, etc.; hence the perf. part. pass. in Xen., Plato, Dem., and others is = *elected to a public post*; Plato, *Legg.* vi. 765 C, οὗς ἂν καὶ ψῆφος ἡ τῶν δοκιμαζόντων δοκιμάσῃ· ἐὰν δέ τις ἀπεδοκιμασθῇ κ.τ.λ.; and it is even used of the reception of the ἔφηβοι among the men of full age in Athens, after testing their claim to citizenship, pass. = *to be pronounced of full age*. The fundamental idea is that of a proceeding having approval for its object, hence it is a syn. with ὑποδέχεσθαι, Plut. *Mor.* 18 B, μήτε ἀποδέχεσθαι τὸ θανατόμενον ὡς ἀληθές, μήτε δοκιμάζειν ὡς καλόν. Hence also, *e.g.*, in Plutarch opposed to κολλάζειν, and in Wisd. xi. 11 opposed to δικάζειν. We see, too, the relation of δοκιμάζειν in biblical Greek to its synonym there, πειράζειν; see πειράζειν.

It answers in the LXX. to בָּחַ, which is also rendered by ἐτάζω, ἐξετάζω, διακρίνω, and occasionally as = רָחַ and other words; the perf. pass. also = רָחַ, Niphal. The meaning *to test* is the prevailing one, at all events with reference mostly to a positive result, *e.g.* Ps. xvii. 3, xxvi. 2; Jer. xi. 20, xii. 3, xx. 12; Prov. xxvii. 31; Ps. cxxxix. 1, 21; but also with a negative issue, Ps. lxxx. 6, cf. xcv. 6, and when the result varies, Jer. xvii. 10, ἐγὼ κύριος ἐτάζων καρδίας καὶ δοκιμάζων νεφούς, τοῦ δοῦναι ἐκάστῳ κατὰ τὰς ὁδοὺς αὐτοῦ. Job xxxiv. 3, οὗς λόγους δοκιμάζει καὶ λάρυγξ γεύεται βρῶσιν; cf. Plato, *Tim.* 65 C, δοκιμεῖον τῆς γλώσσης. Longin. xxxii. 5, γλώσσα γεύσεως δοκίμιον. More frequently it is combined with the object χρυσίον, ἀργύριον; but this is rarer in profane Greek, though δοκιμαστής signifies *the assayer or scrutineer* of coin; cf. Aristotle, *Hist. An.* i. 6, τὰ νομίσματα πρὸς τὸ αὐτοῖς ἕκαστοι γνωριμώτατον δοκιμάζουσιν. Jer. ix. 7; Zech. xiii. 9; Ps. lxviii. 31; Prov. xvii. 3. Usually of God's testing men, but by no means invariably by sufferings. It has the signification *to recognise or approve* nowhere in the LXX., even in the passive, except Prov. viii. 10, χρυσίον δεδοκιμασμένον = *purified*; cf. Zech. xi. 13; Prov. xvii. 3. But in the Apocrypha it occurs in this latter sense as = *to ratify*, 2 Macc. i. 34, iv. 3; Ecclus. xxxi. 10, xlii. 9. Otherwise the usage of the Apocrypha does not differ from that of the LXX., and especially as used of divine testing, but with the idea of suffering more prominent, Ecclus. ii. 5, ἐν πυρὶ δοκιμάζεται χρυσὸς καὶ ἄνθρωποι δεκτοὶ ἐν καμίνῳ ταπεινώσεως. Ecclus. xxxi. 26, xxvii. 6; Wisd. iii. 5, 6, xi. 11. Of tempting God by men, as in Ps. xcv. 6, it occurs in Wisd. i. 4. For approval as the design of the testing, cf. Wisd. iii. 6, ὡς χρυσὸν ἐν χωνευτηρίῳ ἐδοκίμασεν αὐτοὺς καὶ ὡς ὀλοκάρπωμα θυσίας προσεδέξατο αὐτούς.

The usage of the word in the N. T., where it chiefly occurs in the Pauline writings, corresponds much more with that of profane Greek than with the LXX. (α) = *To examine, to test*, Luke xii. 56; 1 Cor. xi. 28, ἑαυτοὺς δοκιμάζετε. 2 Cor. xiii. 5; Gal. vi. 4; Phil. i. 10, τὰ διαφέροντα. Rom. ii. 28; Eph. v. 10, τί ἐστὶν εὐάρεστον τῷ κυρίῳ. Rom. xii. 2; 1 Thess. v. 21, πάντα δοκιμάζετε, τὸ καλὸν κατέχετε; cf. Plut. *Mor.* 18 B (see above). 1 John iv. 1, τὰ πνεύματα. Of testing for the diaconate, answering to Attic usage, 1 Tim. iii. 10, οὗτοι δὲ δοκιμαζέσθωσαν πρῶτον, εἰτα διακονείτωσαν

ἀνέγκλητοι ὄντες. Thus are to be explained the modes of expressions in 2 Cor. xiii. 5, ἐαυτοὺς πειράζετε—ἐαυτοὺς δοκιμάζετε· ἢ οὐκ ἐπιγινώσκετε ὅτι Χρ̄ς Ἰς ἐν ὑμῖν; εἰ μήτι ἀδόκιμοί ἐστε. 2 Cor. viii. 8, γνήσιον δοκιμάζων.—To put to the test, Luke xiv. 19 (Heb. iii. 9, from Ps. xcv. 9, see δοκιμασία). Of God's testing only in 1 Thess. ii. 4, τῷ δοκιμάζοντι τὰς καρδίας (see the passive under (b)). (b) = (By testing) to recognise, to approve, 2 Cor. viii. 22, ὃν ἐδοκιμάσαμεν ἐν πολλοῖς πολλάκις σπουδαῖον ὄντα. Rom. xiv. 22, ἐν ᾧ δοκιμάζει, where in combination with ἐν it answers to the signification to elect (see θέλειν, εὐδοκεῖν). Rom. i. 28, οὐκ ἐδοκίμασαν τὸν θεὸν ἔχειν ἐν ἐπιγνώσει = to verify, to prove by experience; compare 1 Pet. i. 7, χρυσίον δεδοκιμασμένον. 1 Cor. iii. 13, ὁποῖόν ἐστιν τὸ πῦρ αὐτὸ δοκιμάσει. And then analogous to its use in Attic Greek = to choose, to elect (compare above, 1 Tim. iii. 10), 1 Cor. xvi. 3, οὗς ἐὰν δοκιμάσητε. 1 Thess. ii. 4, δεδοκιμάσμεθα ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ πιστευθῆναι τὸ εὖ.

Δοκιμασία, ας, ἡ, examination, inquiry, especially in order to appointment to an office, see δοκιμάζω. Plato, Plut., and others. Not in the LXX.; in the Apocrypha only in Ecclus. vi. 21. In the N. T. only in Heb. iii. 9, ἐπείρασάν με ἐν δοκιμασίᾳ, instead of ἐπείρασαν . . . ἐδοκίμασαν in Ps. xcv. 9, clearly intended not to simplify the expression, but to define δοκιμασία, and to prevent the weakening of the πειράζειν by the asyndetic parallel employed, ἐδοκίμασαν; "by making proof of or testing me, they showed hostility towards me;" to secure an excuse for their apostasy, they sought to prove God unworthy of trust. (Rec. text ἐδοκίμασάν με.)

Ἀποδοκιμάζω, as the result of examination to reject, answering to the Attic use of δοκιμάζειν, to denote testing of qualification in one nominated to some office; see Plato, Legg. vi. 765 C, under δοκιμάζω. Lys. xiii. 10, εἴλεσθε ἐκείνον πρεσβυτέρῳ αὐτοκράτωρα ὃν τῷ προτέρῳ ἔτει στρατηγὸν χειροτονηθέντα ἀπεδοκίμασατε οὐ νομίζοντες εὐνοῦν εἶναι τῷ πλήθει τῷ ὑμετέρῳ. The emphasis rests upon the antithesis to the election of the object which would otherwise ensue. Later also = to put out of office or place, to reject, to disapprove, to refuse; in the LXX. = דָּנָה, side by side with ἐξουδενοῦν, ἀπωθεῖν, Ps. cxviii. 22; Jer. vi. 30, xiv. 19, μὴ ἀποδοκιμάζων ἀπεδοκίμασας τὸν Ἰούδαν καὶ ἀπὸ Σιών ἀπέστη ἡ ψυχὴ σου; vii. 28, parallel with ἀπωθέω in Wisd. xix. 4.—Jer. viii. 9, τὸν νόμον κυρίου = to turn away from, to refuse; cf. Xen. Mem. iv. 4. 14, νόμους πολλάκις αὐτοὶ οἱ θέμενοι ἀποδοκιμάσαντες μετατίθενται. Ecclus. xx. 20. In the N. T. Matt. xxi. 42; Mark xii. 10; Luke xx. 17; 1 Pet. ii. 7, from Ps. cxviii. 22; 1 Pet. ii. 4, with reference thereto. Further again, in Mark viii. 31, Luke ix. 22, xvii. 25, of the rejection of Christ, and Heb. xii. 17 of Esau's being refused.

Δοκιμή, ἡ (from δοκιμάζειν), the proving or testing, only once in profane Greek, in Dioscorus, a physician about the middle of the first century; elsewhere only in N. T. and

patristic Greek. In accordance with its derivation we can distinguish only the active and passive meaning (not, as before stated, the present and perfect), therefore = **testing, verification**. It occurs (a) in an active sense, 2 Cor. viii. 8, ἐν πολλῇ δοκιμῇ θλίψεως ἡ περισσεΐα τῆς χαρᾶς κ.τ.λ. So still in Georg. Sync. p. 27 D, πρὸς δοκιμὴν τῆς ἐκάστου πρὸς τὸν θεὸν προαιρέσεως. But it is more than *testing*; in the identity of the subject and object it is *proof*. (b) Passively, **verification**, the state of being proved, **authentication**. Thus in Rom. v. 4, ἡ δὲ ὑπομονὴ κατεργάζεται δοκιμὴν, ἡ δὲ δοκιμὴ ἐλπίδα. 2 Cor. ii. 9, ἵνα γινῶ τὴν δοκιμὴν ὑμῶν, εἰ κ.τ.λ.; xiii. 3, δοκιμὴν ζητεῖτε τοῦ ἐν ἐμοῦ λαλοῦντος Χοῦ, ὅς . . . δυνατεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν. So also 2 Cor. ix. 13, viii. 2.

Δοκίμιον, τό (from δοκιμή), a later form for δοκιμῆον, in Plut., Dion. Hal., Herodotus (in Plato, *Tim.* 65 C, the usual reading instead of δοκιμῆον) = **means of testing**, Dion. Hal. *Ars Rhet.* xi. 1, δεῖ δὲ ὥσπερ κανόνα καὶ σταθμὴν τινα καὶ δοκίμιον ὠρισμένον πρὸς ὃ τις ἀποβλέπων δυνήσεται τὴν κρίσιν ποιῆσθαι. Plut. *Apophth. Lac.* 15 (230 A), ἠρώτησεν εἰ δοκίμιον ἔχει, τινὲ τρόπῳ πειράζεται ὁ πολύφλος . . . ἀτυχία εἶπεν. Thus in Jas. i. 3, τὸ δοκίμιον ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως—as the manifold *πειρασμοί* of ver. 2 were to be regarded—κατεργάζεται ὑπομονήν. Compare Herodotus, ii. 10. 12, δοκίμιον δὲ στρατιωτῶν κάματος καὶ οὐ τρυφή. But in explaining 1 Pet. i. 7, τὸ δοκίμιον ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως πολυτιμότερον χρυσίου κ.τ.λ., it is to be remembered that *the means of testing* the gold is not only the touchstone or the fire, but the trace of the metal left upon the touchstone, the streak of melted gold. With this agrees the present part. pass. χρυσίου τοῦ ἀπολλυμένου διὰ πυρὸς δὲ δοκιμαζομένου.

Δούλη, ἡ, **female slave, maid-servant, maid**, in the LXX. = פִּדְיָה and פִּדְיָה, for which, however, παιδίσκη (more rarely θεραπαινά and οἰκέτις) is used. Δούλη is employed for the most part, where not the service rendered, nor the relation of service, but subserviency is meant, e.g. in addressing one of higher rank, Ruth ii. 13, iii. 9, ἡ δούλη σου; 1 Sam. i. 11, 16, 18, viii. 16, xxv. 24, 27; cf. Gen. xvi. 1, xxi. 10; Ps. cxliii. 3. Accordingly in Luke i. 38, ἰδοὺ ἡ δούλη κυρίου, ver. 48, ἐπέβλεψεν ἐπὶ τὴν ταπείνωσιν τῆς δούλης αὐτοῦ, in the sense of **self-submission**. As to Acts ii. 18, ἐπὶ τοὺς δούλους μου καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς δούλας μου . . . ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου (from Joel ii. 28, where in the Hebrew the suffix is wanting), the reference in the Hebrew is to the relationship of service to man, in order to show how extraordinary would be the outpouring,—a feature which is lost in the version of the LXX., which instead of this makes the relation one of service to God.

Καταδουλόω, a strengthened form of δουλόω = *to make a δοῦλος, to enslave, to subjugate*. In profane Greek rare in the active, Herodotus, vi. 109. 2, ἐν σοὶ νῦν ἐστὶ ἡ καταδουλώσαι Ἀθήνας ἢ ἐλευθέρας ποιήσαντα μνημόσυνα λιπέσθαι κ.τ.λ. Thuc. ii. 70. 2. Plut. *De vit. aer. al.* 3 (828 C), τὴν αὐτάρκειαν αἰσχυρόμενοι καταδουλοῦμεν ἑαυτοὺς ὑποθήκαις κ.τ.λ., but oftener in the passive = *to become enslaved, to be subjugated*.

Most frequently in the middle = **to make slaves to oneself**, Herod. Xen. Plato, Plut., and others. In the LXX. only once in the active, Jer. xv. 14, καταδουλώσω σε κύκλω τοῖς ἐχθροῖς σου. Elsewhere the middle, Ex. vi. 5; Ezek. xxix. 18 = רַבַּע, Hiphil, Ex. i. 14 = רַבַּע; Gen. xlvii. 21, and Jer. xv. 4 = רַבַּע, Hiphil, with a change of meaning inappropriate to the connection as if it had been רַבַּע. In the Apocrypha only in the middle, 1 Macc. viii. 10, 18; 3 Macc. ii. 6. In the N. T. only in 2 Cor. xi. 20, ἀνέχεσθε εἴ τις ὑμᾶς καταδουλοῖ, and Gal. ii. 4, οἵτινες παρεισήλθον κατασκοπῆσαι τὴν ἐλευθερίαν ἡμῶν ἣν ἔχομεν ἐν Χρῷ Ἰησοῦ, ἵνα ἡμᾶς καταδουλώσουσιν, where the Rec. text has καταδουλώσονται; Lachm. καταδουλώσονται. In consideration of 1 Cor. vii. 23, iii. 22, the middle only is admissible. This representation is, however, less prominent here than in 2 Cor. xi. 20, where the active is undisputed. The substitution of the middle for the active is explained by its predominant use in Greek, whereas Paul with nice discrimination employs the active = *to destroy for a person his Christian liberty*; cf. Gal. v. 1. (Though δουλείω is the usual word in the LXX. for רַבַּע, yet when what is meant is not the relationship but the conduct, not the service but the work, רַבַּע is sometimes rendered by ἐργάζεσθαι, e.g. Gen. ii. 5, 15; Ex. xx. 9, and often; and when it is used in a religious sense, it is as frequently rendered by λατρεύειν.) In like manner רַבַּע is more frequently rendered by עֲרֹגָה than by דְּוִלְיָה.

Ὁ φθαλμοδουλεία, ἡ, Tisch., Westcott, -ία, a word probably coined by Paul himself, occurring only in Eph. vi. 6, Col. iii. 22,—in the latter place in the plural; the sense is clear from the words added, ὡς ἀνθρωπάρεσκοι, therefore = *service rendered only so far as the ruling eye reaches*, which merely satisfies appearances, but is not done in fulfilment of God's will, ἐκ ψυχῆς, Eph. vi. 6, or ἐν ἀπλότῃ καρδίας, Col. iii. 22. It reminds us of 1 Sam. xvi. 7, but must not, as Chrysostom represents, be limited to *forced service* only performed when the commanding eye is there, ὁρῶμεν γὰρ πολλοὺς φόβῳ καὶ ἀπειλῇ πολλὰ ποιοῦντα. This is an additional element, named further on in Eph. vi. 7, μετ' εὐνοίας δουλείοντες τῷ κυρίῳ καὶ οὐκ ἀνθρ., this punctuation being more correct than the joining of μετ' εὐνοίας with what precedes. Cf. Col. iii. 23. Hence, too, the explanation of Theophyl. and Oecum. is inadequate, μὴ ὅταν πάρεσιν οἱ δεσπότες καὶ ὁρῶσιν ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀπόντων αὐτῶν. Cf. *Constit. Apost.* i. 299 A, μὴ ὡς ὀφθαλμόδουλος ἀλλ' ὡς φιλοδέσποτος.

Δουλαγωγέω, **to treat as a slave**, rare, and only in later Greek, from ἄγειν εἰς δουλείαν, side by side with which it appears in Diod. Sic., but differing from it as denoting condemnation, the leading back of a δούλος or δούλη into bondage, whereas ἄγειν εἰς δ. is = *to make a slave of*; cf. παιδαγωγός, ψυχαγωγός. Diod. Sic. xii. 24, τὸ μὲν πρῶτον χρήμασι διαφθεῖραι τὴν κόρην ἐπεβάλετο ὡς δ' οὐ προσεῖχεν ἐκείνη τοῦτω, ἐπαπέστειλε συκοφάντας ἐπ' αὐτὴν προστάξας ἄγειν εἰς δουλείαν τοῦ δὲ συκοφάντου φήσαντος ἰδίαν αὐτοῦ εἶναι δοίλην καὶ πρὸς τὸν ἄρχοντα καταστήσαντος δουλαγωγεῖν, προσαγαγὼν κατηγορήσεν ὡς δούλης. Thus it stands in a gloss on Gen. xliii. 17

(claimed by Schleusner as from Symmachus, but, on the contrary, see Field's *Hexapla in loc.*), κατηγορίαν ψευδῇ συστήσασθαι καθ' ἡμῶν καὶ κατατυραννῆσαι ἡμᾶς καὶ δουλαγωγῆσαι. Accordingly also in 1 Cor. ix. 27, ὑποπιάζω μου τὸ σῶμα καὶ δουλαγωγῶ = *to treat as a slave*; hence Luther renders it excellently = zähmen, *to tame*, to subjugate.

Δύναμαι, to be able, to have the power to, fut. δυνήσομαι. Aor. in the N. T. always ἡδυνήθην, and once (Tisch. ed. 8) ἡδυνάσθην in Mark vii. 24, a form which the Vatican MS. has in Matt. xvii. 16, and occurs in the LXX. Gen. xxx. 8; 2 Sam. iii. 11; 2 Chron. xxx. 3; Jer. xx. 7, Obad. 7; Tob. i. 15; 1 Macc. vi. 3; also ἐδυνάσθην, Neh. vii. 61, Ezra ii. 59, and Ex. xii. 39, in the Alex. MS. Whereas in the N. T. the augment is always η, the LXX. wavers between the form ἐδυνάσθην and ἡδυνάσθην, but not ἡδυνήθην. For the imperfect ἡδυν. prevails, but in the N. T. the MSS. waver between ἡδυνάμην and ἐδυνάμην; compare Buttmann, § 83. 5; Krüger, xxviii. 7. 1; Lobeck, *Phryg.* 359. Instead of δύνασαι for 2nd person sing. pres. indic., we find δύνῃ in Mark ix. 22, 23; Luke xvi. 2; Rev. ii. 2; and according to the Vatican MS. in Mark i. 40 also. This form seems not to appear in the LXX. as indic.; cf. Dent. xiv. 23; Job xxxiii. 5. In the LXX. the word is = לָבַי, but sometimes it stands not for any one word, but to express the sense, as in Job xxxii. 3; 2 Chron. xx. 38, etc.—(a) Relatively to *be able for something, to be in a position to, to be capable of*, usually with the aor. or present inf., the latter when continuous actions are referred to, Matt. vi. 24, vii. 18 (where B has the aor. inf.), ix. 15, xii. 34, xix. 12, etc., whereas the aor. inf. refers to an action complete in itself, e.g. Matt. iii. 9, v. 14, and usually after the preterite; cf. Winer, xlv. 7; Kühner, § 389. 7d.—Also with the accusative, Hom. *Od.* iv. 237, δύναται γὰρ ἅπαντα (Ζεὺς). Thus in Mark ix. 22; Luke xii. 26; 1 Cor. x. 13; 2 Cor. xiii. 8. Likewise in a moral sense = *to prevail on oneself, to be in a position*, e.g. Acts iv. 16, 20.—(b) Absolutely = *to be powerful*, but not thus in N. T. Greek. 1 Cor. x. 13 cannot be thus rendered, and in 1 Cor. iii. 2 the connection determines the ability treated of, whereas an absolute δύνασθαι would be meaningless. Moreover, in the LXX. it is rare; in 2 Chron. xxxii. 13, μὴ δυνάμενοι ἐδύναντο θεοὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν . . . σῶσαι, the participle answers to the Hebrew לָבַי לָבַי, and simply serves to strengthen the verb. But we have an instance in Jer. iii. 5, ἐποίησας τὰ πονηρὰ ταῦτα καὶ ἡδυνάσθης (Alex. ἡδυνήθης). So also Jer. xx. 7, ἐκράτησας καὶ ἡδυνάσθης. Also the combination answering to the Hebrew לָבַי, *to be victorious over, to prevail against*, δύνασθαι πρὸς τινα, Jer. i. 19, xxxviii. 5; Num. xiii. 31; δύν, τινι, Jer. xxxviii. 22, must be included here. Compare Xen. *Cyrop.* i. 2. 13. ὅσα φρονοῦντων τε ἤδη ἔργα ἐστὶ καὶ ἔτι δυναμένων. Plut. *An seni resp.* 18 (793 C), ἀκμάζων καὶ δυνάμενος ἀνὴρ, 26 (796 E) παρορμᾶν τοὺς δυναμένους. So Job xvi. 14, according to the Vat. MS., ἔδραμον πρὸς μὲ δυνάμενοι, רָבַבְנִי. Oftener it occurs absolutely in the sense *to have value or worth*, e.g. Plato, *Prot.* 326 C, οἱ μάλιστα δυνάμενοι. Thuc. i. 33. 3, ii. 97. 4, iv. 105. 1 = *to be influential*. In many places usually cited for the absolute

meaning, the connection shows the thing referred to, as *e.g.* Xen. *Anab.* iv. 5. 11.—*Δύναμις* in the LXX. is = לִּיָּה and כֹּחַ, sometimes also = נְבוֹנָה, כֶּחַ, עָז.

Προσεγγίζω, to come near to, Mark ii. 4, μὴ δυνάμενοι προσεγγίσει αὐτῷ, where Tisch. ed. 8, following *κ* and *B*, reads *προσενέγκαι*. In the LXX. Gen. xxxiii. 6, 7 and often = נָגַשׁ in Josh. iii. 4, and other places; = קָרַב in Ps. cxix. 150, in antithesis with μακρύνεσθαι. Rare in profane Greek, and only in later writers, *e.g.* Pol. xxxix. 1. 4. Transitivity = to approach, it occurs in Lucian, *Amor.* 53. From the Hebrew one might be tempted thus to render it in Lev. ii. 8, but the context in the Greek does not sanction this. In Ezek. xxii. 4, ἡγγισας τὰς ἡμέρας σου, the simple verb is = קָרַב, Hiphil. In Isa. xlvi. 13, ἡγγισα τὴν δικαιοσύνην μου = קָרַב, Piel. In Gen. xlvi. 10, 13, 2 Kings iv. 6, נָגַשׁ, Hiphil. In Ezek. xlii. 13, ἐν αἷς φάγονται ἐκεῖ οἱ ἱερεῖς . . . οἱ ἐγγίζοντες πρὸς κύριον τὰ ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων, τὰ ἅγ. is to be taken not with ἐγγίζονται, but with φάγονται. In the Apocrypha ἐγγίζω occurs transitively in Ecclus. xxxvi. 12, answering to קָרַב of the ministering priests. Ecclus. xxxvii. 30, ἡ ἀπληστία ἐγγεῖ ἕως χολέρας. Pol. viii. 6. 7, ἐγγίσαντες τῇ γῇ τὰς ναῦς. קָרַב, however, is more frequently rendered by προσάγειν and προσέρχεσθαι, and in Hiphil as a *term. techn.* by προσφέρειν, whereas קָרַב is rendered conformably by ἐγγύς and ἐγγίζειν. נָגַשׁ in Kal and Hiphil is rendered by προσέρχεσθαι and προσάγειν, as well as by προσεγγίζειν.

Ἐξεγείρω, to awaken from, to awake out of, to wake up, ἐκ τοῦ ὕπνου, Gen. xxviii. 16 and often; ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕπνου, Judg. xvi. 15, compare Isa. xli. 2, τίς ἐξήγειρεν ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν δικαιοσύνην; Jer. vi. 22, ἔθνη ἐξεγερθήσεται ἀπ' ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς; 1. 41; ἐκ τοῦ τόπου, Joel iii. 7; ἐκ νεφελῶν, Zech. ii. 13; Num. xxiv. 19. But usually without these limitations; cf. the combination ἐγείρειν καὶ ἐξεγείρειν = to waken and to wake up, strengthening the simple verb, Song ii. 7, iii. 5, viii. 4. In profane Greek, Herod., Xen., the Tragedians, Plato, Diod., and others. More frequent in the LXX. than ἐγείρειν, both = עָרַב in Kal, Niph., Piel, Hiphil; עָרַב in Kal and Hiph.; עָרַב, Hiphil, and occasionally other forms, and indeed ἐγείρειν more frequently than ἐξεγ. is = עָרַב; but ἐξεγ. is oftener = עָרַב and עָרַב. It usually occurs in the same combinations as ἐγ., most rarely in those named under IV., answering to עָרַב. Of the dead, Dan. xii. 2, πολλοὶ τῶν καθευδόντων ἐκ γῆς χώματι ἐξεγερθήσονται. Often τὸ πνεῦμά τινος, 1 Chron. v. 26; 2 Chron. xxxvi. 22; Ezra i. 1, 5; Hag. i. 14; Susan. 44. Τὸν θυμὸν τοῦ Ἀντιόχου, 2 Macc. xiii. 4.—In the N. T. only (a) 1 Cor. vi. 14, of the resurrection of the dead, ὁ δὲ θεὸς καὶ τὸν κύριον ἡγειρεν καὶ ἡμᾶς ἐξεγερεῖ (Lachm. ἐξεγείρει, B ἐξήγειρεν) διὰ τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ, where the interchange of the simple and the compound verb serves to give prominence to the certainty and assurance of our resurrection guaranteed by Christ's redemptive work.—(b) Rom. ix. 17, λέγει ἡ γραφὴ τῷ Φαραὼ ὅτι εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἐξήγειρά σε, עָרַבְתִּיךָ, where the LXX. has διετηρήθης, thus doubly weakening the Hebrew, putting the passive for the active, and the second person for the first, rendering עָרַבְתִּיךָ as = to let stand, instead of to make to stand, which indeed is a possible rendering (1 Kings xv. 4; Prov. xxix. 4), but

which unwarrantably weakens the boldness and life of the passage and injures the advancing climax; cf. Ex. ix. 8, 12, 15, in keeping with which *τινὸς* here must be = *to appoint*. On the same account it is not admissible to explain *ἐξεγείρειν* with Hofmann as = *to let one rise from sickness*, as *ἐγείρειν* (II.) is used. It is rather as in Zech. xi. 16, *ἐξεγείρω ποιμένα ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν*. Josephus, *Ant.* viii. 11. 1, βασιλεὺς γὰρ ἐξεγείρεται ὑπ' ἐμοῦ. The signification *instigare, incitare, sc. ad renitendum* (Grimm), obviously cannot with 2 Macc. xiii. 4 be given to the word.

Ἑθνικῶς, in the sense of the N. T. ἐθνικός, Gal. ii. 14, ἐθνικῶς ζῆν = *to live in a non-Israelitish manner, unfettered by the Jewish law*. See ἔθνος (II.). Diog. Laert. vii. 56, διάλεκτός ἐστι λέξις κεχαραγμένη ἐθνικῶς τε καὶ ἑλληνικῶς. Ἑθνικός occurs only in later Greek and not in the LXX., *belonging to the peoples, e.g.* Pol. xxx. 10. 6, ἐθνικαὶ συστάσεις. With the grammarians synonym. with βάρβαρος = *foreign*.

Εἶδωλον, τό, is in biblical Greek so clearly a *term. techn.* for the idols or false gods of the ἔθνη, that several words unknown in profane Greek have been formed from it,—εἰδώλειον, εἰδωλόθυτον, εἰδωλολάτρης, εἰδωλολατρεία (in patristic Greek, moreover, εἰδῶλιον, εἰδωλόδουλος, εἰδωλομανής, and others, *e.g.* Julian's name of scorn Εἰδωλιανός), and there is no trace of any analogous usage in profane Greek; the images of the gods were not called εἶδωλα, but ἀγάλματα, while εἰκόνες and ἀνδριάντες were the terms employed for statues and images of men. What was the thought underlying and prompting the introduction of this word as a *term. techn.*, and rendering possible its subsequent reception in the heathen Church? It cannot have been merely the wish to introduce a different word from ἀγάλματα, for in the few places where this word occurs in biblical Greek—Isa. xix. 3, xxi. 9; 2 Macc. ii. 2—it stands only for images of gods. Biblical and patristic usage, moreover, shows that εἶδωλον does not usually denote images, but the gods of the heathen generally. The possibility lay in the peculiarly limited usage of profane Greek, and the underlying thought was the special idea associated with εἶδωλον. The word is derived from εἶδεσθαι, like φεῖδωλος from φεῖδω (Doederlein, *Homer. Glossar.* 412), and is synonymous with εἰκών, ὁμοίωμα. But while εἰκών denotes what represents an object, be it image or model in relation to the image, and while ὁμοίωμα lays stress upon the likeness, εἶδωλον, akin to εἶδος, describes the image as **form, appearance**, and gives such prominence to this that nothing remains but the mere **appearance or seeming**; it denotes (α) the **form** which presents itself or represents something, Herod. vi. 58. 2, ὃς δ' ἂν ἐν πολέμῳ τῶν βασιλέων ἀποθάνῃ, τοῦτ' δὲ εἶδωλον σκενύσαντες ἐν κλίνῃ εὖ ἐστρωμένη ἐκφέρουσιν; i. 51. 3, γυναικὸς εἶδωλον χρύσειον, τὸ Δελφοὶ τῆς ἀρτοκόπου τῆς Κροίσου εἰκόνα. Thus while here = *image, form*, it is never used concretely of images of definite persons, but only to denote the *form* in general, woman's form, form in a posture; Polyb. xiii. 7. 2, ἣν γὰρ εἶδωλον γυναικεῖον . . . κατὰ δὲ τὴν μορφήν εἰς ὁμοιότητα τῇ τοῦ Νίβιδος γυναικὶ διαφόρως ἀπειργασμένον, in describing an instrument of torture. In the only place where it is used of images of

gods it denotes the representation of them with their emblems, etc., and therefore as allegorical figures, Polyb. xxxi. 3, 13-15, τὸ δὲ τῶν ἀγαλμάτων πλήθος οὐ δύνατον ἐξηγήσασθαι. πάντων γὰρ τῶν παρ' ἀνθρώποις λεγομένων ἢ νομιζομένων θεῶν ἢ δαιμόνων, προσέτι δὲ ἡρώων, εἰδῶλα διήγETO . . . καὶ πᾶσι τούτοις οἱ προσήκοντες μῦθοι κατὰ τὰς παραδεδομένας ἱστορίας ἐν διασκευαῖς πολυτελέσι παρέκειντο. Εἶπετο δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ Νυκτὸς εἰδῶλον καὶ Ἡμέρας, Γῆς τε καὶ Οὐρανοῦ καὶ Ἡοῦς καὶ Μεσημβρίας. From this it can be seen how εἰδῶλον stands (b) mainly in contrast with reality, denoting the image as a mere image as distinguished from the thing; cf. Xen. Mem. i. 4. 4, πότερί σοι δοκοῦσιν οἱ ἀπεργαζόμενοι εἰδῶλα ἄφρονά τε καὶ ἀκίνητα ἀξιοθαυμαστότεροι εἶναι ἢ οἱ ζῶα ἔμφρονά τε καὶ ἐνεργά; Convin. iv. 21. 22, ἡ μὲν αὐτοῦ ὄψις εὐφραίνειν δύναται, ἡ δὲ τοῦ εἰδῶλου τέρψιν μὲν οὐ παρέχει, πόθον δὲ ἐμποιεῖ. In this last passage, as also in Plato, Plutarch, it denotes the idea which one has of a thing, the image or representation which one makes to oneself of it as distinct from the reality, the image of this arising or present in the mind; cf. Plato, Sophist. 266 B, τούτων δέ γε ἐκάστων εἰδῶλα ἄλλ' οὐκ αὐτά, παρέπεται; Rep. ii. 382 C, τό γε ἐν τοῖς λόγοις μιμημά τι τοῦ ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ ἐστὶ παθήματος καὶ ὕστερον γεγονὸς εἰδῶλον, οὐ πάνυ ἄκρατον ψεῦδος; Phaedr. 276 A, τὸν τοῦ εἰδότος λόγον λέγεις ζῶντα καὶ ἔμψυχον, οὐ ὁ γεγραμμένος εἰδῶλον ἂν τι λέγοιτο δικαίως. This contrast with reality enables Plato to say, τελευτησάντων εἰδῶλα εἶναι τὰ τῶν νεκρῶν σώματα, Legg. xii. 959 A. Thus, too, images in dreams are εἰδῶλα καὶ σκιαί which have no reality. Plutarch, Mor. 581 F; cf. Galb. xxii. 5, φλάκκον μὲν οὖν Ὀρδεώνιον οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἢ σκιὰν ὄντα Γάλβα καὶ εἰδῶλον. Lucian, Dial. Mort. vi. 4, εἰδῶλον ἐκ νεφελῆς πλασάμενοι αὐτῇ σοι ὅμοιον. This fundamental meaning, a mere image, an unreal appearance, is stamped upon the word in the earliest and onwards to the latest Greek, as it is employed to denote (c) the shades of the dead, "the unreal and unconscious semblance or image of one who once was a real man" (Nägelsbach, Homer. Theol. vii. 16); Od. xi. 476, βροτῶν εἰδῶλα καμόντων; xxiv. 14, ἐνθα τε ναίουσι ψυχαί, εἰδῶλα καμόντων; Il. xxiii. 72. 104, ἡ ῥά τις ἐστι καὶ εἶν' Αἰῖδαο δόμοισιν ψυχὴ καὶ εἰδῶλον, ἀτὰρ φρένες οὐκ ἐνὶ πάμπαν. So often in the Tragedians, e.g. Soph. Ajax, 126; Lucian, Dial. Mort. xvi. 1, αὐτὸς μὲν γὰρ ὁ Ἡρακλῆς ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ τοῖς θεοῖς σύνεστι . . . ἐγὼ δ' εἰδῶλόν εἰμι αὐτοῦ; *ibid.* 5, καλῶς ἂν ταῦτ' ἔλεγες, εἰ σῶμα ἦσθα, νῦν δὲ ἀσώματον εἰδῶλον εἶ. Hence also used of ghosts, shades, Plut. Cim. i. 6, vi. 5; Them. xv. 1, ἕτεροι δὲ φάσματα καὶ εἰδῶλα καθορᾶν ἔδοξαν ἐνόπλων ἀνδρῶν κ.τ.λ., and often.

If the idea associated with εἰδῶλον is that of an unreal appearance as contrasted with the living reality, it may be seen why the LXX. chose the word to characterize the images which the ἔθνη and degenerate Israel served. For they were certainly images, false gods, which were estimated by this designation. The word answers mainly to עֲצָנִים (three times = γλυπτόν), 1 Sam. xxxi. 9; 1 Chron. x. 9; 2 Chron. xxiv. 18; Ps. cxiv. 12, τὰ εἰδῶλα τῶν ἐθνῶν ἀργύριον καὶ κρυσίον, ἔργα χειρῶν ἀνθρώπων, στόμα ἔχουσι καὶ οὐ λαλήσουσι κ.τ.λ.; cxxxv. 15; Isa. x. 11; Hos. iv. 18, viii. 4, xiii. 2, xiv. 9; Micah i. 7; Zeel. xiii. 2. In like manner = שִׁמְשֵׁם (usually = γλυπτόν), 2 Chron. xxxiii. 22; Isa. xxx. 22

= לִפְסֵף (elsewhere as a rule = גִּלְפֹּטֹן), Ex. xx. 4; cf. לִפְסֵף , Num. xxxiii. 52, 2 Chron. xxiii. 17 = לִפְסֵף , Gen. xxxi. 19, 34, 35. Further, it answers to לִפְסֵף , the contemptuous name for idols = *stocks* (often ἐνθύμημα , sometimes βδέλυγμα), Lev. xxvi. 30; Deut. xxix. 17; 2 Kings xvii. 12, xxi. 11, 20, xxiii. 24; Ezek. vi. 4-6, 13, viii. 10, xviii. 6, 12, xxiii. 39, xxxiii. 25, xxxvi. 18, 25, xxxvii. 23, xlv. 12; also = לִפְסֵף , *abomination*, 1 Kings xi. 5, 7, which is usually rendered βδέλυγμα . It is, moreover, used where in the Hebrew abstract terms occur denoting merely a characteristic of them, without direct reference to their being images that are worshipped; thus = לִפְסֵף (μάταιον , βδέλυγμα , χειροποίητον), Lev. xix. 4; 1 Chron. xvi. 26; Ps. xcvi. 7; Hab. ii. 18, εἰδωλα κωφά ; לִפְסֵף , Deut. xxxii. 11; Jer. xiv. 22, xvi. 18 (elsewhere μάταιον); לִפְסֵף , Num. xxv. 2; 1 Kings xi. 2, 8, 33; 2 Kings xvii. 33; Isa. xxxvii. 19. The principle which led the LXX. in this employment of the word cannot be more accurately expressed than in the words of 1 Chron. xvi. 26, $\text{πάντες οἱ θεοὶ ἐθνῶν εἰδωλα, καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν οὐρανὸς ἐποίησε}$ (Heb. לִפְסֵף), and therefore εἰδωλον designates false gods, the gods of the heathen, as *unreal nonentities*.

From this we see how it came to pass that this descriptive designation of false gods denoting their form and import became so decidedly a *term. techn.* as to supplant all other names. Γιλιπτόν , which is comparatively frequent in the LXX.—and is also in some degree a descriptive term in lieu of the intentionally avoided ἄγαλμα —occurs only rarely in the Apocrypha, 1 Macc. v. 68; Wisd. xiv. 16, xv. 13; βδέλυγμα , which estimates the thing but has a wider range, occurs in Wisd. xii. 23, xiv. 11; Eccclus. xlix. 2; 1 Esdr. vii. 13; μάταιον is still rarer, 3 Macc. vi. 10; add. Esth. iv. 8; cf. Wisd. xv. 8. The usual expression is εἰδωλον , to designate not merely the idol or image of the false god, Tob. xiv. 7, add. Esth. iv. 7, Bar. vi. 73, but the false gods themselves in their unreal nothingness, Wisd. xiv. 11, 12, 27, 29, 30, xv. 15; Eccclus. xxx. 19; Bel and the Dragon, iii. 5; 3 Macc. iv. 16. Compare the designation still unknown to the LXX. εἰδωλεῖον , 1 Esdr. ii. 10; 1 Macc. i. 47, x. 83; and εἰδωλόθυτον , 4 Macc. v. 1.

In the N. T. it is the only word used, and excepting Acts vii. 41, Rev. ix. 20, without special reference to images of the divinities. For we cannot suppose that 1 John v. 21, $\text{τέκνια, φυλάξατε ἑαυτὰ ἀπὸ τῶν εἰδώλων}$, has reference to these images and not primarily to the supposed divinities themselves. With Paul also, who alone employs the word (except in the places just cited), it is the same; he uses the word to describe the false gods of the ἔθνη as unreal nonentities. Thus only do his words attain their full force in 1 Cor. viii. 4, $\text{ὅτι οὐδὲν εἰδωλον ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ καὶ ὅτι οὐδεὶς θεὸς εἰ μὴ εἰς}$; x. 19, τὸ οὖν φημί ; $\text{ὅτι εἰδωλόθυτόν τι ἐστίν}$; $\text{ἢ ὅτι εἰδωλόν τι ἐστίν}$; the words following in ver. 20, $\text{ἀλλ' ὅτι ἂ θύουσιν, δαιμονίοις θύουσιν}$, are intended to deny, as the ἀλλά itself shows, that the εἰδωλα are anything; there is absolutely nothing real answering thereto, and instead of meeting in their offerings the divinities whom they would honour, instead of finding God they were really serving demons; but the apostle does not say that the divinities of the heathen are demons. He calls the gods $\text{τὰ εἰδωλα τὰ ἄφωνα}$ (xii. 2),

from whom the suppliants could receive no answer. 1 Thess. i. 9, ἐπεστρέψατε πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ἀπὸ τῶν εἰδώλων, might, if in profane Greek, be rendered "from the images of God to God Himself;" but in the light of biblical usage they mean, "from those which are not God, which are nothing, to God," and hence the addition which would not have been prompted by the profane thought, δουλεύειν θεῷ ζῶντι καὶ ἀληθινῷ.—Also in 2 Cor. vi. 16; 1 Cor. viii. 7; Rom. ii. 22. The remarkable fact that the expression became so quickly current among Gentile-Christian readers is owing to the circumstance that the word in itself has a meaning which renders it the most striking and admirable designation for heathen divinities according to their worth, or rather worthlessness.—Εἰδωλεῖον, τό, only in the O. T. Apocrypha (1 Esdr. ii. 10; 1 Macc. i. 47, x. 83), in the N. T. 1 Cor. viii. 10, and in patristic Greek = temple of a false god, heathen temple.

Κατεῖδωλος, ον, a peculiar word describing the δεισιδαίμων from a Christian point of view = wholly given up to the worship of unreal false gods (κατά for the purpose of strengthening, as in κατάδηλος), only in Acts xvii. 16, cf. ver. 22, and thence adapted here and there in patristic Greek.

Εἰδωλόθυτον, τό, properly an adj. 4 Macc. v. 1, κρέα εἰδωλόθυτα, flesh of animals offered to the gods, flesh of heathen sacrifices, in the N. T. a substantival without the superfluous κρέα, Acts xv. 29, xxi. 25; 1 Cor. viii. 1, 4, 7, 10, x. 19; Rev. ii. 14, 20. It is, like κατεῖδωλος, a substitute for the profane δεισιδαίμων, qualifying the profane ἱερόθυτον, which is now generally read in 1 Cor. x. 28, εἰάν τις ὑμῖν εἴπῃ· τοῦτο ἱερόθυτόν ἐστιν, μὴ ἐσθίετε. Also in patristic Greek.

Εἰδωλολάτρης, ον, ὁ, one who practises the worship of idols, like the subst. εἰδωλολατρεία only in the N. T. and patristic Greek, but not, it would seem, merely a condemnatory epithet of the heathen, e.g. in Eph. v. 5, πᾶς πόρνος ἢ ἀκάθαρτος ἢ πλεονέκτης ὃς ἐστὶν εἰδωλολάτρης (cf. 1 Sam. xv. 23), but with special reference (a) to a falling away from Him who is God to those which are nothing, whether this occur openly or secretly, consciously or unconsciously, 1 Cor. x. 7, μηδὲ εἰδωλολάτραι γίνεσθε, with reference to Ex. xxxii. 4, οὗτοι οἱ θεοὶ σου Ἰσραήλ. Thus also in 1 Cor. v. 11, εἰάν τις ἀδελφὸς ὀνομαζόμενος ἡ . . . εἰδωλολάτρης. Rev. xxi. 8, xxii. 15. As sin on the part of Christians is meant here, so (b) in 1 Cor. vi. 9 it stands for some special sins connected with heathen rites, οὔτε πόρνοι οὔτε εἰδωλολάτραι οὔτε μοιχοὶ οὔτε μαλακοὶ οὔτε ἀρσενικοῖτοι . . . βασ. τοῦ θεοῦ κληρονομήσουσιν; cf. ver. 11, καὶ ταῦτά τινες ἦτε. These last words make it impossible to take εἰδωλολ. in its general sense as = worshipper of idols. The position of the word in a list of sins of unchastity also indicates a special meaning. As εἰδωλόθυτον is the Scripture substitute for a profane concept, and κατεῖδωλος the biblical substitute for the profane δεισιδαίμων, the profane ἱερόδουλος probably answers to εἰδωλολάτρης, and nothing, perhaps, will better suit the connection than a reference to the ἱεροδούλοι; cf. 1 Pet. iv. 3; Gal. v. 20.

Εἰδωλολατρεία, ἡ, the heathen cultus in contrast with Christianity, 1 Cor. x. 14 ; Col. iii. 5. Ἀθέμιοι εἰδωλολατρεῖαι, in 1 Pet. iv. 3, are probably such forms of this as scorn all chastity and morals, such as the feasts of Bacchus, the Hieroduli, *et al.* In keeping with this is the combination ἀσέλγεια, εἰδωλολατρεία, φαρμακεία, Gal. v. 20 ; cf. Rev. xxi. 8.

Σύνοιδα, to know together with, to know in common with another, not anything, but some particular thing, something that affects this other, or affecting both ; used of witnesses and confederates, Soph. Ant. 264 sqq., ἡμεν δ' ἐτοῖμοι καὶ μύδρους αἶρειν χεροῖν καὶ πῦρ διέρπειν καὶ θεοὺς ὀρκωμοτεῖν τὸ μῆτε δρᾶσαι μῆτε τῷ ξυνειδέναι τὸ πρᾶγμα βουλευσάντι μῆτ' ἐργασμένῳ. But this usage does not rest upon a supposed fundamental meaning of the compound as = to know something by means of fellowship or connection with another, for συν signifies only in fellowship, and indicates not the source but the kind of knowledge. It is perfectly right when Straube (Jahn and Klotz, *Neue Jahrb. f. Philol. u. Pädag.* 5 suppl. 1837, S. 475) gives as the meaning of συνειδέναι, "scire una cum altero i.e. cum ipso rei de qua potissimum quaeritur auctore. Hoc autem 'scire' non cadit in eum qui fando rem accepit : neque enim ille pariter atque ipse auctor cognitam rem habet, sed in eum solum qui ipse rei quum fieret interfuit ;" the reason, however, is not that here given, it is that linguistic usage and the ordinary application of the word have fixed it to a special object and relation. Συνειδέναι is used regarding knowledge in common, because it concerns ear and eye witnesses and confederates. Hence συνειδέναι ἑαυτῷ = to be one's own witness, to be conscious to oneself.

Ἐλεεινός, ἡ, ὄν, Attic = worthy of pity, pitiable, full of misery ; not in the LXX. In the N. T. only in 1 Cor. xv. 19, Rev. iii. 17, in combination with ταλαίπωρος. The verb ἐλεέω is used in the higher sense to have mercy, in the prayer ἐλέησόν με, ἡμᾶς, Isa. xxxiii. 2, and often in the Psalms, e.g. Ps. vi. 3, ix. 14, xxv. 16, xxvi. 11, xxvii. 7, etc. ; and of the Messianic salvation in Isa. xiv. 1, liv. 8, lv. 7 ; Jer. xii. 15, xxx. 18, xxxi. 20, xlii. 12 ; Zech. i. 17 ; Isa. xlv. 23 (parallels λυτροῦν, δοξασθῆναι). The passive in Prov. xxi. 10 ; Isa. lv. 17 ; Hos. i. 6. It answers to the Hebrew נָחַם (sometimes rendered οἰκτεῖρω), נָחַם, Piel, with οἰκτεῖρω also, rarely to נָחַם, which is usually rendered by φείδομαι, sometimes נָחַם, which is usually rendered by παρακαλεῖν.

Ἐλεήμων, ον, compassionate, merciful, once in Homer, sometimes in Aristophanes, Aristotle, but otherwise rare both in Attic and later Greek, e.g. not in Xen., Thuc., Plato, Dem., Polyb., Plut. ; it is noteworthy that the corresponding adjectives οἰκτίρμων, φιλοικτίρμων, also occur but seldom, in later Greek we have oftenest συμπαθής. In the LXX. = נָחַם, often with οἰκτίρμων = נָחַם, from which it differs as thought and act from sensation ; both Hebrew expressions relate to God in the manifestation of His pardoning and saving grace ; compare the combinations with δίκαιος, Ps. cxii. 4, cxvi. 5 ; 2 Macc. i. 24 ; cf. Neh. ix. 17, 31, 32 ; Ex. xxii. 27, xxxiv. 6 ; Joel ii. 13 ; Jonah iv. 3. The

primary meaning of $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ is *stringere, to feel oneself strongly affected towards* (cf. Delitzsch on Ps. iv. 4). Ἐλεος gives expression to the love which underlies $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$, while $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ emphasizes the constraining power of love. Ἐλεος gives prominence to that element of $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ which becomes manifest in its exercise. Ἐλεήμων is also used of men, Prov. xi. 17, xx. 6 = $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$; compare ἀνελεήμων also of men, and only in Prov. v. 9, xi. 17, xii. 10, xvii. 11, xxvii. 4; ἀνελεημόνως, Job xxx. 21. In the Apocrypha only of God, Ecclus. ii. 11, οἰκτίρμων καὶ ἐλεήμων ὁ κύριος καὶ ἀφήσιν ἁμαρτίας καὶ σώζει ἐν καιρῷ θλίψεως, xlvi. 20 with ἅγιος; 1. 19; Tob. vi. 18, vii. 12; 2 Macc. viii. 29, xi. 9, xiii. 12; 3 Macc. v. 7, τὸν παντοκράτορα κύριον καὶ πάσης δυνάμεως δυναστεύοντα, ἐλεήμονα θεὸν αὐτῶν καὶ πατέρα . . . ἐπεκαλέσατο. In the N. T. only in Matt. v. 7, μακάριοι οἱ ἐλεήμονες· ὅτι αὐτοὶ ἐλεηθήσονται, and of Christ, Heb. ii. 17, ἵνα ἐλεήμων γένηται καὶ πιστὸς ἀρχιερεὺς . . . εἰς τὸ ἰλάεσθαι κ.τ.λ.

Ἐλεημοσύνη, ἡ, *compassion*, only in later Greek, and seldom there, differing from ἔλεος as action from sentiment; in the LXX. sometimes for $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$, Gen. xlvii. 29, Prov. iii. 3, xix. 22, xx. 28, xxi. 21, and also occasionally for $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$, Deut. vi. 25, xxiv. 13, Ps. xxiv. 5, xxxiii. 5; with κρίσις, as in Isa. xxviii. 17, compare Ps. ciii. 6; with κρίμα, as in Isa. i. 27.—Isa. lix. 16 (Symm. 1 Sam. xii. 7; Ps. xxxi. 2, li. 16); Dan. iv. 24 (in Jer. xvi. 5 the MSS. vary between οἰκτιρμούς and ἐλεημοσύνας) = $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$; in Isa. xxxviii. 18 = $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$. The word attains no special position in the LXX., it appears only now and then as synon. with ἔλεος, for the translator of Proverbs renders $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ only once by ἔλεος (xiv. 22); but it is to be observed that $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$, the import of which sometimes coincides with ἔλεος (see δικαιοσύνη), is oftener rendered by ἐλεημοσύνη than by ἔλεος (ἔλεος in Isa. lvi. 1; Ezek. xviii. 19, 21). This rendering of $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ by ἐλεημοσύνη is in keeping with the frequent use of the word in the Apocrypha, where it is applied to God, Ecclus. xvii. 29, with ἐξυλισμός; Bar. iv. 22, ἡλθέ μοι χαρὰ παρὰ τοῦ ἁγίου ἐπὶ τῇ ἐλεημοσύνῃ, ἣ ἤξει ὑμῖν ἐν τάχει παρὰ τοῦ αἰωνίου σωτῆρος ὑμῶν, where, according to O. T. usage, we should have expected δικαιοσύνη. Cf. Symm. Ps. xxxi. 2, li. 16; 1 Sam. xii. 7; Bar. v. 9, ἡγήσεται ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραὴλ . . . τῷ φωτὶ τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ σὺν ἐλεημοσύνῃ καὶ δικαιοσύνῃ τῇ παρ' αὐτοῦ = $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$. Tob. iii. 2, δίκαιος εἶ καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔργα σου καὶ πᾶσαι αἱ ὁδοὶ σου ἐλεημοσύνη καὶ ἀλήθεια; compare xiii. 6. This connection of the word with righteousness determines its use to express human compassion and the exercise of mercy, especially in its religious import; compare ἀντὶ ἁμαρτιῶν, Ecclus. iii. 14, 30, xvii. 22, xxix. 12, xxxii. 4, xl. 17, 24; Tob. iv. 10, 11, xii. 9, ii. 14, xii. 8, xiv. 11, ἐλ. καὶ δικ.; compare Tob. i. 2, 3. Further, Ecclus. vii. 10, xii. 3, xvi. 14; Tob. i. 16. As to its religious import and its source, compare the rendering of $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ by ἐλεημοσύνη, Deut. vi. 25, xxiv. 13; Dan. iv. 24. See δίκαιος, δικαιοσύνη.—In the N. T. accordingly the word is used religiously of the exercise of human compassion or mercy, Matt. vi. 2, 3, 4 (cf. ver. 1, προσέχετε τὴν δικαιοσύνην ὑμῶν μὴ ποιεῖν κ.τ.λ., Rec. ἐλεημ.). In Luke and Acts = act of kindness, alms, διδόναι ἐλεημοσύνην, Luke xi. 41,

reading ἀντελπίζοντες. Nothing remains for us here than to take ἀπελπ. in a sense not elsewhere found, *to hope to take anything away or for oneself*, as, e.g., ἀπολέγειν signifies *to choose*, and *to refuse or renounce*.

Προελπίζω, *to hope for before*, only late and seldom in profane Greek (Posidipp. in *Athen.* ix. 377 C; Dexipp.), also rare in patristic Greek; in biblical Greek only in Eph. i. 12, εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἡμᾶς εἰς ἔπαινον δόξης αὐτοῦ τοὺς προηλπικότας ἐν τῷ Χφ. We certainly have not as yet, in vv. 3–9, any note of a distinction between Jewish and Gentile Christians, nor does ἐκληρώθημεν προορισθέντες κ.τ.λ. in ver. 11 (cf. ver. 5) point to this; but since as the Epistle proceeds (ii. 1, 3, 11 sqq.) this distinction becomes plain, we may suppose it to enter with this τοὺς προηλπ. in ver. 12, and with the ἡμεῖς marking off or distinguishing the writer and the readers. For προελπ. signifies *to put one's hope in Christ before* (ἐν Χφ is not *to hope for Christ, to expect Him*); cf. 1 Cor. xv. 19; Phil. ii. 19; Hos. x. 14; Ps. lvi. 2; and thus alone is this peculiar expression justified, which is no more a mere strengthening of ἐλπίζειν than is προεπαγγέλλεσθαι in Rom. i. 2 a mere strengthening of ἐπαγγ.

Ἐνέργημα, τό, *effect*, Plut. *plac. phil.* iv. 8 (899 D), ἡ αἴσθησις, ἥτις ἐστὶν ἡ δύναμις, καὶ τὸ ἐπαίσθημα, ὅπερ ἐστὶ τὸ ἐνέργημα. *Operation*, Polyb. ii. 42. 7, τὰ περὶ τὰς πράξεις ἐνέργηματα; iv. 8. 7, αἱ τῶν ἀνθρώπων φύσεις . . . ἔχουσιν τι πολυειδές . . ὥστε τὸν αὐτὸν ἄνδρα μὴ μόνον ἐν τοῖς διαφέρουσιν τῶν ἐνέργηματων. *Energy*, Diodor. iv. 51, τῶν δὲ ἐνέργηματων ὑπὲρ τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην φύσιν φανέντων. In the N. T. 1 Cor. xii. 6, 10; see *Lexicon*, p. 262.

Συνεργός, ον, *working together with, helping*, 2 Macc. xiv. 5; not in the LXX. In the Apocrypha only once more, 2 Macc. viii. 7; here, as always in the N. T., substantival = *co-worker, helper*. Excepting in 3 John 8, it is used only by Paul, who always combines it with the subject-genitive of the person, whereas in the classics it is usually with the dative, the genitive being the object. (a) With the subject-genitive, θεοῦ συνεργοί, 1 Cor. iii. 9 (and 1 Thess. iii. 2, Lachm. Tisch.), instead of διάκονον τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν τῷ εὐαγγ. For this ἐν, compare Aristoph. *Eq.* 588, ἐν στρατιαῖς ξυνεργὸς Νίκη. Elsewhere μου, ἡμῶν, Rom. xvi. 3, 9, 21; Phil. ii. 25, iv. 3; Philem. 1, 24. (b) With the gen. of the object, 2 Cor. i. 24, τῆς χαρᾶς, *promoter*, compare 2 Cor. vi. 1. In this sense the dative, 3 John 8, ἵνα συνεργοὶ γινώμεθα τῇ ἀληθείᾳ. As in 1 Thess. iii. 2 the sphere of work is given with ἐν, so in Col. iv. 11, εἰς τὴν βασ. τ. θ., the direction in which the activity moves is given with εἰς, but not the goal aimed at; cf. 2 Cor. viii. 23, κοινωνὸς ἐμὸς καὶ εἰς ὑμᾶς συνεργός.

Συνεργέω, *to work together with so as to be helpful, to assist, to help*; not in the LXX. Usually with the dative of the person, as in 1 Ezra vii. 2, συνεργοῦντες τοῖς πρεσβ.; 1 Macc. xii. 1, ὁ καιρὸς αὐτῷ συνεργεῖ; Jas. ii. 22, ἡ πίστις συνήργει τοῖς ἔργοις αὐτοῦ, where the connection would be quite inexplicable, and the argument in proof of

the assertion in ver. 20 destroyed were the works spoken of made the co-workers; cf. ver. 22b. Everywhere help or assistance is meant, Mark xvi. 20, κοῦ κυρίου συνεργούντος καὶ τὸν λόγον βεβαιούντος. 2 Cor. vi. 1, συνεργοῦντες δὲ καὶ παρακαλοῦμεν; cf. ver. 13 and i. 24; 1 Cor. xvi. 16; Rom. viii. 28, τοῖς ἀγαπῶσι τὸν θεὸν πάντα συνεργεῖ εἰς ἀγαθόν = to help, to be serviceable, to be of use; cf. Polyb. xi. 9. 1, πολλὰ δὲ συνεργεῖν τὴν ἁρμογὴν τῶν ὅπλων εἰς τὴν χρεῖαν. Not unfrequent in profane Greek.

Ἔρχομαι, cf. Krüger, § 40; Winer, § 15; Buttmann, § 108, 114; Lobeck, *Phryn.* 37 sq. Instead of ἦλθον, often in biblical Greek, occurs the Alexandrine form, ἦλθα, Rev. x. 9; ἦλθατε, Matt. xxv. 36; ἐλθάτω, Matt. vi. 10, etc.; cf. Sturz, *De dial. mac. et alex.* p. 60 sq. The infin. and part. of this form do not occur. The form in the LXX. ἦλθοσαν, Ex. xv. 27, Josh. ii. 22, xxii. 10, Judg. xx. 26, Ruth i. 2, 2 Esdr. iv. 12, and elsewhere, does not appear in the N. T., as indeed this, like other words,—compare, for example, εἶδον,—is much rarer in the N. T. than in the LXX. It signifies to come, the opposite of ὑπάγειν, Mark vi. 31; John viii. 14. In the LXX. = נִצַּח, rarely = נָחַם, also with ἦκω = ἦλֵךְ (πορεύομαι, βαδίζω), נָחַם (ἐξέρχομαι, ἐκπορεύομαι).

Ῥητός, ῆ, ὄν, verbal adj. (α) in the sense of the perf. part. pass. = expressly named, named; e.g. Herod. i. 177, ἐς χρόνον ῥητόν; v. 57, ἐπὶ ῥητοῖσι, *certis definitis conditionibus* (Schweigh.). The same phrase, Plato, *Conv.* 213 A; *Legg.* viii. 850 A, and often. (β) Facultative, what may or can be uttered or named. Eurip. *Iph. Taur.* 938, τί χρῆμα δράσειν; ῥητόν ἢ συγώμενον. Soph. *Oed. R.* 993, ἡ ῥητόν; ἡ οὐχὶ θεμιτὸν ἄλλον εἰδέναι; Plut. *Conv. disp.* iv. 6. 1, see ῥητῶς. In biblical Greek only in Ex. xxii. 9, κατὰ πᾶν ῥητόν ἀδίκημα, and ix. 4, οὐ τελευτήσει ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ υἱῶν ῥητόν = נִצַּח, in the sense of what may be named.

Ῥητῶς, chiefly in later writers = expressly, clearly; Plut. *Brut.* xxix. 4, μόνον οὐχὶ ῥητῶς ὑπὲρ τυραννίδος ἐπολέμησαν, *in express manner. De repugn. Stoic.* 15 (1041 A), to introduce an exact quotation from Aristotle, λέγει ῥητῶς. In biblical Greek only in 1 Tim. iv. 1, τὸ πνεῦμα ῥητῶς λέγει. As this is not a citation, the meaning must be expressly, unmistakably; cf. 1 Thess. v. 19, 20; Acts xx. 29. Polyb. iii. 23. 5, ὑπὲρ δὲ Σικελίας τάναντία διαστέλλονται ῥητῶς. Diog. L. viii. 71, τούτοις δ' ἐναντιοῦται Τίμαιος ῥητῶς λέγων ὡς ἐξεχώρησεν . . . καὶ τὸ σύνολον οὐκ ἀνῆλθεν κ.τ.λ.

Ἀρρήτος, ον, unexpressed; also facultative, inexpressible, unutterable; in biblical Greek only in 2 Cor. xii. 4, ἤκουσεν ἄρρητα ῥήματα, ἃ οὐκ ἐξὸν ἀνθρώπῳ λαλῆσαι; cf. Rev. xiv. 2, οὐδεὶς ἐδύνατο μαθεῖν τὴν ᾠδὴν. Possibly there may be a reference to the use of ἀρρ., of mysteries; cf. Xen. *Hell.* vi. 3. 6, τὰ Δήμητρος καὶ Κόρης ἄρρητα ἱερὰ πρώτοις ξένοις δεῖξαι. Thus often, several times in Plut. In this case, therefore, it would be equivalent to to keep secret. This, however, is contrary to biblical analogy, and would deprive the addition ἃ οὐκ ἐξὸν of its meaning. It seems better to take ἀρρ. as

in Plut. *De sera num. vind.* 22 (564 F), τοὺς δὲ πᾶμπαν ἀνιάτους . . . Ἑρινὺς . . . ἅπαντας ἠφάνισε καὶ κατέδυσεν εἰς τὸ ἄρρητον καὶ ἀόρατον = *unutterable*; cf. Plato, *Conv.* 189 B; *Sophist.* 238 C, in which case ἃ οὐκ ἐξὸν κ.τ.λ. is = "which man cannot dare to utter."

Ῥῆμα answers, like λόγος, but not so frequently, to the Hebrew רַבִּי, רָצָה, הָרָה; רַב only is oftener rendered by ῥῆμα. Ῥῆμα seldom or never denotes a *word* as a part of speech, but always, like λόγος, as a part of discourse, a word uttered; cf. Heb. xii. 19, φωνὴ ῥημάτων; 2 Cor. xii. 4, ῥήματα ἄρρητα. Like λόγος, also, it always keeps in view the substance of what is said, but differs from λόγος in bringing into prominence the fact that something is uttered, and thus denotes the *word* as the expressed *will*, while λόγος denotes the expressed *thought*. Though the two often coincide, especially in biblical Greek, the distinction never wholly disappears, namely, that λόγος and ῥῆμα are distinguishable as counsel and will, and λόγος ζωῆς, λόγια ζῶντα are never exactly synonymous with ῥήματα ζωῆς. Compare the rendering of רַב by ῥῆμα, Ex. xvii. 1; Num. xiv. 41, xxii. 18, xxiv. 13, xvii. 14, xxxiii. 2; Deut. i. 26, 43, ix. 23, xxxiv. 5; 1 Kings xiii. 21, 26. Compare the union of λόγος and ῥῆμα in 1 Sam. xv. 24 = רַבִּי וְרָצָה הָרָה לֵבְךָ, παρέβη τὸν λόγον κυρίου καὶ τὸ ῥῆμά σου.

Παρρησιάζομαι is rare in the LXX., just as παρρησία is. Παρρησία occurs in Prov. i. 20, σοφία—ἐν πλατεῖαις παρρησίαν ἄγει, לֵב יִתֵּן; Prov. xiii. 5, ἀσεβὴς δὲ αἰσχύνεται καὶ οὐχ ἔξει παρρησίαν = רַבִּי, Hiphil; cf. Philo, *de Jos.* ii. 56. 46, παρρησία σὺν αἰδοῖ χρώμενος διελέγετο; *ibid.* 72. 42, παρρησίαν τὴν ἀνευ ἀναισχυντίας ἐπιτηδευκώς; Lev. xxvi. 13 = חִיָּהּ; 1 Macc. iv. 18. Παρρησιάζομαι in Job xxii. 26, εἴτα παρρησιασθήσῃ (A, ἐνπαρρησιάζῃ) ἐναντίον κυρίου = רַבִּי (cf. xxvii. 10); and Prov. xx. 9, τίς παρρησιάζεται καθαρὸς εἶναι ἀπὸ ἁμαρτιῶν; parallel with καυχῆσεται, both = רַבִּי. Further, in Ps. xciv. 1, θεὸς ἐκδικήσεων ἐπαρρησιάζατο = רַבִּי, Hiphil; compare Lev. xxvi. 13, Aquila = ἐπιφάνηθι; Ps. xii. 6, θήσομαι ἐν σωτηρίῳ, παρρησιάζομαι ἐν αὐτῷ. Ps. xciv. 1; Ecclus. vi. 11. Not rare in profane Greek.

Ἑρωτάω, 3 pl. imperf., both ἡρώτων and ἡρώτουν; Matt. xv. 33, and so Tisch. in Mark iv. 10; compare νικούντι, Rev. ii. 7, 19, Buttm. p. 38; = *to ask*, and in N. T. Greek *to beg*. LXX. = רַבִּי, which is consequently rendered in the sense *to ask* by ἑρωτάω, ἐπερωτάω, in the sense *to beg* by αἰτεῖν. (I.) *To ask*, as in profane Greek with the accus. of the thing asked, Gen. xxxii. 29; Jer. vi. 16, l. 5; with the accus. of the person who is asked, Gen. xxiv. 47, xl. 7; Ex. xiii. 14, and often; John ix. 21, xvi. 30; then the thing in the acc. Job xxi. 29; Mark iv. 10; John xvi. 23; cf. λόγον, Matt. xxi. 24; Luke xx. 3; Jer. xxxviii. 14; compare Plato, *Legg.* x. 895 E; with following περί, Matt. xix. 17; Luke ix. 45; John xviii. 19; Neh. i. 2; Isa. xlv. 11; or with the direct question following, Luke xix. 31; John i. 19, 21, v. 12, xvi. 5; introduced by λέγων or the like, Matt. xvi. 13; John i. 25, ix. 2, 19; with indirect question following,

John ix. 15. Instead of the phrase used in profane Greek in Xen. ἔρωτᾶν τὸν θεόν, *to ask God* (*Cyr.* vii. 2. 17; *An.* iii. 1. 7; *Mem.* i. 3. 1), the LXX. say ἔρωτᾶν διὰ τοῦ θεοῦ, *to learn by asking of God*, 1 Sam. xxii. 10, 13; 2 Sam. xv. 19 (once also ἐν θεῷ, 1 Chron. xiv. 14); and indeed *τινί* for *one*, 1 Sam. xxii. 10, 13; merely ἔρωτᾶν *τινί*, *to ask God for one*. Peculiar also is ἔρωτᾶν *τινὰ τὰ εἰς εἰρήνην*, of greetings = לְשָׁלוֹם לְיָיִךְ , 1 Sam. x. 4, xxx. 21; 2 Sam. viii. 11; 1 Chron. xviii. 10; Ps. cxii. 6; without *τά*, 1 Sam. xvii. 22. Compare the same Hebrew expression in Gen. xliii. 27, ἠρώτησε αὐτοὺς πῶς ἔχετε; cf. Delitzsch on Ps. cxii. 6, to ascertain, by asking, a person's well-being, to be glad to know, glad to see, to be inspired with the hope that it is well with him. Seldom in the Apocrypha, 1 Macc. x. 72; 2 Macc. vii. 2, ἔρωτᾶν καὶ μανθάνειν.—(II.) **To pray**, an application of the word clearly arising from its employment to render the Hebrew שָׁאַל , which has made it the most delicate and tenderest expression for prayer or request; compare its combination with παρακαλεῖν, Acts xviii. 20; 1 Thess. iv. 1. With the accus. of the person and the infin. following, Luke v. 3, viii. 37; John iv. 40; Acts iii. 3, x. 48, xvi. 39, xviii. 20, xxiii. 18; 1 Thess. v. 12. *Εἰς τὸ κ.τ.λ.*, 2 Thess. ii. 1; *ἡα*, Mark vii. 26; Luke vii. 36, xvi. 27; John iv. 47, xvii. 15, xix. 31, 38; 2 John 5; *ὅπως*, Luke vii. 3, xi. 37; Acts xxiii. 20; the prayer itself introduced, Matt. xv. 23; Luke xiv. 18, 19; John iv. 31, xii. 21; Phil. iv. 3. *Περί τινος* for any one, Luke iv. 38; John xvii. 9, 20; 1 John v. 16. Also in John xiv. 16; Luke xiv. 32.

Ἐπερωτάω, *to inquire of* (cf. ἐπαιτεῖν, *to come begging*), *to beg of*; in the classics especially of inquiring of the gods or of an oracle, Herod. i. 53. 1; Xen. *Mem.* iv. 3. 16; Thuc. ii. 54. 3; Aristotle, *Rhet.* ii. 23; also without θεόν, Xen. *Apol.* 14; *Oecon.* v. 19, ἐξαρεσκευομένους τοῖς θεοῖς καὶ ἐπερωτῶντας θυσίαις καὶ οἰωνοῖς ὅ, τι δὲ χρὴ ποιεῖν καὶ ὅ, τι μὴ (so also ἐπέρεσθαι). The use of the word in the LXX. = שָׁאַל , in the signification *to ask*, side by side with ἔρωτάω (which see), sometimes also = שָׁאַל , which is usually rendered by ἐπιζητέω, ζητέω, once = שָׁאַל , Isa. lxxv. 1,—is akin to the use of it in the classics. Excepting in Gen. xxvi. 7, xxxviii. 21, xliii. 7, Deut. iv. 32, xxxii. 7, Judg. viii. 14, 2 Sam. xi. 7, xiv. 18, 2 Kings viii. 6, and a few other places, it stands only for *inquiring of God*, or, e.g., of the dead; and when it answers to שָׁאַל , it takes the accus. τὸν κύριον, 2 Kings xxii. 6, 7, 8; Jer. xxi. 2; Ezek. xx. 1, 3; τοὺς θεούς, Isa. xix. 3; τὸν προφήτην, Ezek. xiv. 7; τοὺς νεκρούς, Deut. xviii. 11; cf. Num. xxiii. 15, πορεύσομαι ἐπερωτῆσαι τὸν θεόν = שָׁאַל , Niphal; whereas it is employed to render שָׁאַל with the acc. only in 1 Sam. xiv. 37, τὸν θεόν; Isa. xxx. 2 and 1 Sam. xxviii. 16, ἐμέ; Hag. ii. 12, τοὺς ἱερεῖς; cf. Num. xxvii. 21, ἐπερωτήσουσιν αὐτὸν τὴν κρίσιν τῶν δόλων ἐναντι κυρίου; Deut. xviii. 11, τοὺς νεκρούς. Elsewhere (under the influence of the Hebrew שָׁאַל לַיהוָה) ἐπερ. ἐν κυρίῳ, ἐν τῷ θεῷ, *to inquire of God*, Judg. i. 1, xviii. 5, xx. 18, 23, 27; 1 Sam. x. 22; 2 Sam. ii. 1; cf. xvi. 23, ἐν λόγῳ τοῦ θεοῦ; 1 Chron. x. 13, ἐν τῷ ἐγγαστριμύθῳ; Ezek. xxi. 21, ἐν τοῖς γλυπτοῖς;

Hos. iv. 12, ἐν συμβόλοις; also διὰ κυρίου, 1 Sam. xxiii. 2, 4, xxviii. 6, xxx. 8; 2 Sam. v. 23; 1 Chron. xiv. 10.—The Vatican MS., in Isa. lxv. 1, translates the words עָרָא and לָקַח by ἐπερωτᾶν and ζητεῖν,—ἐμφανὲς ἐγενήθη τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ἐπερωτῶσιν, εὐρέθη τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ζητοῦσιν. Codex A has the words in the reverse order. Ἐπερωτᾶν and ζητεῖν τὸν θεόν are as synon. as לָקַח and עָרָא or עָרָא; cf. Prov. xvii. 29, ἐπερ. σοφίαν. The meaning to request, to demand, occurs only in Ps. cxxxvii. 3, ἐπερώτησαν ἡμᾶς λόγους ῥῶδων, literally to demand by a (scornful) request, just as ἐπερωτᾶν when used of inquiring of God implies an appeal for a decision; cf. Dem. xxii. 9, τοὺς γε μὴ αἰτοῦντας μηδὲ λαβεῖν ἀξιούντας τὴν ἀρχὴν οὐδ' ἐπερωτᾶν προσήκεν; Aesch. i. 22. Compare ἐπερώτημα, Thuc. iii. 68, a question propounded for a judicial decision; Dio Cass. lvii. 15, πολλὰς μὲν δίκας . . . ἀκούων, πολλὰς δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπερωτῶν, perhaps of the carrying on of lawsuits. In the Apocrypha only in the sense to ask, Ecclus. xxxv. 7; 2 Macc. iii. 37, vii. 7, xiv. 5, xv. 3; Judith vi. 16, x. 12; 1 Esdr. vi. 11.

In the N. T. (a) to interrogate, to inquire of, τινα, Matt. xii. 10, xvii. 10, xxii. 23, 41, 46, xxvii. 11; Mark v. 9, vii. 5, 17, viii. 5, 23, 27, ix. 11, 16, 21, 28, 32, 33, x. 17, xii. 18, 28, 34, xiii. 3, xiv. 60, 61, xv. 2, 44; Luke ii. 46, iii. 10, vi. 9, viii. 9, 30, ix. 18, 45, xviii. 18, 40, xx. 21, 27, xxi. 7, xxii. 64, xxiii. 3, 9; John xviii. 7, 21; Acts i. 6, v. 27; 1 Cor. xiv. 35; τινά τι, Mark xi. 29; Luke xx. 40; περὶ τίνος, Mark vii. 17 (Lachm. Tisch. τί); Luke ix. 45; with following εἰ, Mark viii. 23, xv. 44; Luke vi. 9, xxiii. 6;—τί ἐλάλησα, John xviii. 21; cf. Luke viii. 9, τίς εἶη; Acts xxiii. 34, ἐκ ποίας κ.τ.λ. Otherwise the question is usually introduced by λέγων.—Rom. x. 20, τοῖς ἐμὲ μὴ ἐπερωτῶσιν, from Isa. lxv. 1, following Cod. B. The expression there, as everywhere in the O. T. where ἐπερ. stands for asking God, or inquiring His will and counsel, or the impending event,—synon. with ζητεῖν, ἐκζητεῖν,—is equivalent to to inquire from Him, to be anxious to know His will. (b) In the sense to ask for, to demand, as in Ps. cxxxvii. 3; it is supposed to stand in Matt. xvi. 1, ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν σημεῖον ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐπιδειξαι αὐτοῖς. It might, however, be quite as appropriate to take it like ἐπερωτᾶν προφήτην, and the like, in the LXX.

Ἐπερώτημα, τος, τό, the inquiry made; Thuc. iii. 53. 2, τὸ ἐπερώτημα βραχὺ ὄν, ᾧ τὰ μὲν ἀληθῆ ἀποκρίνασθαι κ.τ.λ., parallel with αὐτοὶ λόγον ἡγησάμεθα. Ibid. 68, οἱ δὲ δικασταὶ νομίζοντες τὸ ἐπερώτημα σφίσιν ὀρθῶς ἔξειν, εἴ τι κ.τ.λ. Herod. vi. 67, ὁ δὲ ἀλγήσας τῷ ἐπερωτήματι. It again appears in very late Greek in a forensic sense, akin to ἐπερωτᾶν, of asking for a judicial decision or statement; so in Cod. Justin. viii. 10. 12. 3, ἴσα ποιεῖσθαι τὰ ἐπερωτήματα, aequales facere stipulationes; cf. ἐπερωτᾶσθαι, to be asked, as a term. techn. in making contracts or concluding agreements, of the question spondesne? which begins the concluding of the contract, Theophil. Tit. institut. de verborum obligationibus, iii. 253, 255, 288, 289, 292. Lastly, in the expression κατὰ τὸ ἐπερώτημα τῆς σεμνοτάτης βουλῆς, in inscriptions about the time of the Antonines, perhaps "conformably to the demand or decree of the senate;" Von Zezschwitz, on the

other hand, explains it, "according to the question put in the senate, *i.e.* with the sanction of the magistracy," which is hardly correct, for it clearly corresponds with the Latin *ex senatus consulto*. With this the contemporary rendering of Dan. vi. 14 by Theodotion obviously corresponds, διὰ συγκρίματος εἶρ (עִיר) ὁ λόγος καὶ ῥῆμα ἀγίων τὸ ἐπερώτημα, which was evidently suggested by the כְּהִלָּה of the original, though not answering to it, but hardly on that account to be designated as "meaningless."—We can hardly explain 1 Pet. iii. 21 from this; ὁ (*sc.* ὕδωρ) καὶ ὑμᾶς ἀντίτυπον νῦν σώζει βάπτισμα, οὐ σαρκὸς ἀπόθεσις ῥύπου, ἀλλὰ συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς ἐπερώτημα εἰς θεὸν δι' ἀναστάσεως Ἰυ. Xv. It cannot mean "the fixing or settlement of a good conscience," because of the εἰς θεόν which belongs to ἐπερ. (against which Acts xxiv. 16 is not decisive), and, moreover, in this connection baptism could hardly be designated as a decision affecting a person. Nor indeed can baptism be called a question addressed to God concerning a contract or covenant, for the point treated of is not what the person baptized does, but what baptism is to him; and, moreover, the good conscience is brought about by baptism, the baptized person has a good conscience, he who is to be baptized not yet. But he desires it, and Köhler (*Das Gewissen*, p. 337) thinks, with Hofmann, that ἐπερώτημα συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς must be explained as express prayer (in the sense of asking) for a good conscience. This, however, corresponds neither with the connection (which has to do with the effect of baptism upon the baptized person, and not with what he thereupon does) nor with the δι' ἀναστ. Ἰυ. Xv., which points back to σώζει, and would thus follow too abruptly. Ἐπερωτᾶν signifies not only *to ask*, but *to make a demand upon one*, as in Ps. cxxxvii. 3; and in like manner ἐπερώτημα—and this is in keeping with the later forensic usage of the word—may be equivalent to *claim or demand*; and thus baptism may be designated "the claim," not "for a good conscience," still less "which establishes a good conscience for the person desiring it," but as "the claim which a good conscience has upon God." As a matter of fact, baptism is this; and nothing short of a declaration, expressing the import of baptism to the baptized person as saving him from God's condemnation, is appropriate in this connection. (As to εἰς θεόν, it is not to be explained by 2 Sam. xi. 7, ἐπηρώτησε Δαβὶδ εἰς εἰρήνην, because Δαβὶδ there is the accusative, and εἰς εἰρήνην is to be explained as in ἐρωτᾶν εἰς εἶρ.; see ἐρωτάω.) Compare De Wette, Brückner, Huther, Von Hofmann *in loc.*; Besser in the *Zeitschrift f. Prot. u. Kirche*, 1856, i. p. 293 sqq.; Von Zezschwitz, *Petri ap. de Christi ad inferos descensu sententia*, pp. 44, 45; Köhler, *Das Gewissen*, i. 331 sqq.

Εὐχομαι, εὐξομαι, ἡνξάμην, ἡνγμαι (Num. xvi. 18, 20). According to Buttmann, lxxiv. 5, it is said always in the N. T. to have the augment ἡν, but Tisch. and Lachm. in Acts xxvii. 29 read εὐχόμεν, but in Rom. ix. 3, ἡνχόμεν. The word is regarded by Passow, Benfey (Curtius, 702), Schenkel as akin to αὐχέω, signifying literally *to call aloud*. In linguistic usage it signifies *to pray, to wish, to vow, to praise*, mainly in the

first meanings, so that the signification **to praise, to glory in**, referring to words of praise in prayers, seems only a derived and weakened meaning. In biblical Greek only in the significations **to pray, to wish, to vow**; in the LXX. it is the usual word for נָדַב, *to vow*, and for the rare נָחַן, *to ask*; but it is rarely used for לָבַח, Hithpael (προσεύχ.), which is the common word for *to pray*. We find this also in the Apocrypha and in the N. T., for there προσεύχεσθαι is the usual and εὐχ. the rarer word for *to pray*; in the N. T. still rarer than in the Apocrypha, *i.e.* only in Jas. v. 16; 2 Cor. xiii. 7; but whereas in the Apocrypha εὐχ. still appears in the sense of *to vow*, 1 Esdr. iv. 43-46, v. 53, viii. 50, 2 Macc. iii. 35, in the N. T. it does not once occur in this sense. It stands (a) in the sense **to wish**, 3 John 2, εὐχομαί σε εὐδοῦσθαι καὶ ὑγιαίνειν. Acts xxvii. 29, εὐχοντο ἡμέραν γενέσθαι. Rom. ix. 3, ἡνυχόμεν γὰρ ἀνάθεμα εἶναι, with the accus. 2 Cor. xiii. 9, τοῦτο καὶ ἐυχίμεθα. That the wish is directed to God is made specially prominent in Acts xxvi. 29, ἐνζάμην ἂν τῷ θεῷ . . . τοὺς ἀκούοντας γενέσθαι τοιοῦτους, a construction which with the meaning *to ask, to beg*, occurs here and there in profane Greek, and in the LXX. only where it is = נָחַן, *e.g.* Deut. iii. 24; but, as a rule, εὐχεσθαι ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ. (b) **To beg, to pray**, 2 Cor. xiii. 7, ἐυχόμεθα πρὸς τὸν θεὸν μὴ ποιῆσαι ὑμᾶς κακὸν οὐδέν. So usually in the LXX. as = לָבַח, Hithpael, and נָחַן, Num. xi. 2, xxi. 8; Job xxii. 27, *et al.* Without such an addition, Jas. v. 16, εὐχεσθε ὑπὲρ ἀλλήλους, ὅπως ἰάθητε, seldom in the LXX. Deut. ix. 20; 1 Sam. ii. 1; Job xlii. 8, 10. The person for whom one prays is in the LXX. joined on by περί, Job xlii. 8, 10; Ex. viii. 8, 9; Deut. ix. 20, a construction also found in profane Greek.

Εὐχὴ ἡ, ἡς, ἡ, **prayer, vow, wish**, in the LXX. still more rare than εὐχεσθαι, for הַפְּחָה, Job xvi. 17, Prov. xv. 9, 32, but the usual word for נָדַב, נָחַן, and for נָדַב, which, however, is differently rendered here and there, *e.g.* by ἀγίασμα, ἀφόρισμα, ἀγνισμός. In the Apocrypha only once = *prayer*, 2 Macc. xv. 26, elsewhere = *vow*. In the N. T. (a) **vow**, Acts xviii. 18, xxi. 23; (b) **prayer**, Jas. v. 15.

Προσεύχομαι, **to pray, to vow**, much rarer in profane Greek than the simple verb, but used only in a religious sense; and this may be the reason why in biblical Greek it became the distinctive and usual word for **to pray**, in the N. T. almost wholly supplanting the simple verb. In profane Greek the signification *to pray* is the prevailing one, and *to vow* the rarer; and in biblical Greek, excepting 1 Sam. xiv. 45, it occurs only in the sense *to pray*, and answers to the Hebrew לָבַח, once = נָחַן, Hiphil, Ex. x. 17 = נָבַח, Hithpael, 2 Esdr. x. 1; = פָּרַח, 1 Sam. xiv. 45; = אָבַח, 2 Esdr. vi. 10; אָבַח, Dan. vi. 10. The combination with the dative, almost constant in profane Greek, occurs in the LXX. only in Isa. xlv. 17, xlv. 14, not at all in the Apocrypha, in the N. T. only in Matt. vi. 6; 1 Cor. xi. 13. But that with πρὸς τινα, while rare in profane Greek, occurs, as a rule, in the LXX., with ἐνώπιον κυρίου, τοῦ θεοῦ, 1 Sam. i. 12, xii. 23; 1 Kings viii. 28; Neh. i. 4, 6.—ἐναντίον, 2 Chron. vi. 19;—κατὰ πρόσωπον κ., 1 Chron. xvii. 25;—ἐν σοι, Isa. xlv. 14;—ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου, 1 Kings viii. 44. But these com-

binations do not occur at all in the N. T.; there as a rule we find the absolute *προσεύχεσθαι* = to pray to God, which is rare in profane Greek; but in the LXX., answering to the Hebrew text, in 1 Sam. i. 27; 1 Kings viii. 28, 30, 33, 35, 42, 44, 55; 2 Kings vi. 17; 2 Chron. vi. 38, vii. 1, 14, xxx. 18, xxxii. 20; 2 Esdr. x. 1; Ps. lxxii. 15; Isa. xvi. 12; Jer. vii. 15, xi. 14, xiv. 12; Dan. ix. 20; 2 Esdr. vi. 10; Dan. vi. 10; Ps. cix. 4, xlii. 1. In the Apocrypha also we find, as a rule, the absolute *προσεύχεσθαι*, *πρὸς τὸν θεόν* being added only in Judith xi. 17; Bar. i. 13; 2 Macc. ii. 10, vi. 1. We certainly cannot err in tracing this N. T. absolute *προσεύχεσθαι*, as related to the O. T. mode of expression, to the post-exilian maturity of the religious consciousness. The person prayed for is in the LXX. introduced by *περί τινος*, Gen. xx. 7; 1 Sam. ii. 27, vii. 5, xii. 23; 2 Chron. xxx. 18; Ps. lxxii. 15; Isa. xxxvii. 21; Jer. vii. 15, xi. 14, xxix. 7, xlii. 20; cf. 1 Esdr. vi. 31; 2 Macc. i. 6, 10, xv. 14. By *ὑπέρ τινος*, 1 Sam. i. 27, xii. 19; Jer. xlii. 4; 2 Macc. xii. 44.—*ἐπὶ τινος*, Jer. xiv. 11. In the N. T. *περί τινος*, Acts viii. 15; Col. i. 3, iv. 3; 1 Thess. v. 25; 2 Thess. i. 11, iii. 1; Heb. xiii. 18;—*ὑπέρ τινος*, Matt. v. 44; Luke vi. 28; Col. i. 9;—*ἐπὶ τινα*, over some one, Jas. v. 14; cf. Matt. xix. 13, ἵνα τὰς χεῖρας ἐπιθῇ αὐτοῖς καὶ προσεύξηται; Acts vi. 6. In Luke xviii. 11, *πρὸς ἑαυτόν*, with reference to himself. The subject-matter of the prayer (its aim) is added with ἵνα, Matt. xxiv. 20, xxvi. 41; Mark xiii. 18, xiv. 35, 38; Luke xxii. 46; 1 Cor. xiv. 13; Phil. i. 9; Col. i. 9; 2 Thess. i. 11. With ὅπως, Jas. v. 16; Acts viii. 15; or with the infinitive, Luke xxii. 40; cf. in Jas. v. 17 the infin. with τοῦ. The accus. only in Luke xviii. 11, ταῦτα. In Rom. viii. 26, τί προσευξόμεθα; cf. μακρά, Matt. xxiii. 14 (not in Tisch.), Mark xii. 40; Luke xx. 47. In the LXX. only we have εἰς τι in Jer. xiv. 11; 2 Esdr. vi. 10. For further qualifications, see 1 Cor. xiv. 14, γλώσση, 15, τῷ πνεύμ. Eph. vi. 18, ἐν πνεύμ.; Jude 20. *Προσεύχεσθαι* embraces all that is included in the idea of prayer, εὐχαριστεῖν, αἰτεῖν, δέεσθαι, but the distinctive word in permanent use for worship is *προσκυβεῖν*. In the Psalms *προσεύχεσθαι* occurs very seldom, only in Ps. v. 3, xxxii. 6, lxxii. 15, because the more concrete expressions of request, complaint, vow, thanksgiving prevail. The substantive is more frequent.—*Προσεύχεσθαι* appears in combination with δέισθαι, 1 Kings viii. 33; with αἰτεῖσθαι, Mark xi. 24; Col. i. 9; cf. Eph. vi. 18; with ὑμνεῖν, Acts xvi. 25. With εὐχαριστεῖν, Col. i. 3, cf. iv. 2; 1 Thess. v. 17. The word further occurs in Matt. vi. 5, 6, 7, xiv. 23, xxvi. 36, 39, 42, 44; Mark i. 35, vi. 46, xi. 25, xiii. 33, xiv. 32, 39; Luke i. 10, iii. 21, v. 16, vi. 12, ix. 18, 29, xi. 1, 2, xviii. 1, 10, xxii. 41, 44; Acts i. 24, ix. 11, 40, x. 9, 30, xi. 5, xii. 12, xiii. 3, xiv. 23, xx. 36, xxi. 5, xxii. 17, xxviii. 8; 1 Cor. xi. 4, 5; 1 Tim. ii. 8; Jas. v. 13, 18.

Προσευχή, ἡς, ἡ, prayer, seemingly does not appear in profane Greek (for in Plut. *Timol.* 25 we must read *πρὸς εὐχάς*), and is a word solely of Hellenistic growth; a characteristic mark of Israel's separation from the Gentile world. In the LXX. it is the standing word for *הַפְּלִי*, which is very seldom rendered by *δέησις*, *εὐχή*, or *εὐχομαι*,

once only by ὕμνος. Once it answers to נָרַן, Num. vi. 5 (elsewhere = εὐχή, which see); once to נָחַן, 1 Kings viii. 45 (elsewhere = δέσεις, ἔλεος).—(a) **Prayer**; with δέσεις, 2 Chron. vi. 19, 29; Dan. ix. 3; Bar. ii. 14; 1 Macc. v. 37; Eph. vi. 18; Phil. iv. 6; 1 Tim. ii. 1, v. 5; cf. Rom. i. 10; see προσεύχομαι and δέσεις. Compare αἰτεῖν ἐν πρ., Matt. xxi. 22, with νηστεία, Matt. xvii. 21; Mark ix. 29; Ποιεῖν πρ., 1 Tim. ii. 1; προσκαρτερεῖν τῇ, ταῖς πρ., Acts i. 14, ii. 42, vi. 4; Rom. xii. 12; cf. Luke vi. 12; Acts xii. 5. In the LXX. προσευχὴν προσεύχεσθαι, 2 Sam. vii. 27; 1 Kings viii. 30. In the N. T. προσευχὴ πρ., Jas. v. 17. With the gen. of the object πρ. θεοῦ, *to God*, Luke vi. 12; πρὸς τὸν θεόν, Acts xii. 5, is not to be taken with πρ., but with γινομένη. In Rom. xv. 30, however, it belongs to πρ., as in Ps. lxix. 14. Further, in Matt. xxi. 13, οἶκος προσευχῆς, as in Mark xi. 17, Luke xix. 46, from Isa. lvi. 7.—Luke xxii. 45; Acts iii. 1, x. 4, 31; 1 Cor. vii. 5; Eph. i. 16; Col. iv. 12; 1 Thess. i. 2; Philem. 4, 22; 1 Pet. iii. 7, iv. 7; Rev. v. 8, viii. 3, 4.—(b) **Place of prayer**, 3 Macc. vii. 10, of the house of prayer; Acts xvi. 13, 16, an open place (οὐ ἐνομιζέτο προσευχὴ εἶναι); cf. Juvenal, *Sat.* i. 3. 295; Joseph. *Ant.* xiv. 10. 23.

**E* χ ω occurs comparatively seldom in the LXX., and isolatedly for words such as נָחַן, נָחַל, נָחַן, נָחַן, and others; ἐχόμενος is often = נָחַן, and sometimes = נָחַן.—*Κατέχω*, *to hold, hold fast*; also *to have in one's power, to have under, to rule, and to hold back*; hence according to the connection either = *to protect*, or in a bad sense *to imprison*.—(a) *To hold fast, to maintain*, τὸν λόγον, Luke viii. 15; τὰς παραδόσεις, 1 Cor. viii. 12; τὸ καλόν, 1 Thess. v. 21; τὴν παρρησίαν, and other things, Heb. iii. 6, 14, x. 23; *to have possession of, to know*, 1 Cor. xv. 2; Luke xiv. 9; 2 Cor. vi. 10; *to possess*, 1 Cor. vii. 15.—(b) *To retain*, Philem. 13, *to limit, to hinder*.—(c) *To hold in towards, to steer for the shore*, Acts xxvii. 40; see Lexicons. In the LXX. κατέχω is often = נָחַן, נָחַן, Piel and Hiphil, also נָחַן, נָחַן, נָחַן.

Ζάω, ζῶ, ζῆν, imperf. ἔζων, ἔζης, and so on, once Cod. B, Rom. vii. 9, the later form ἔζην, imperative ζῆθι, Dan. ii. 4, iii. 9, v. 10, vi. 6, 21, elsewhere ζῆ. Fut. Attic, ζήσω, Rom. vi. 2, Heb. xii. 9, undisputed; also according to Lachm. Tisch. ed. 8, in John v. 25, vi. 52, 57, 58, xiv. 19; 2 Cor. xiii. 4; Jas. ix. 15; in the LXX. Ps. cxxxviii. 7, cxlii. 11; and in Ps. cxxxviii. 7, Cod. A reads the form ζώσω, which does not appear in the classics (answering to the epic ζάω, used as a dramatic form, which appears only in the present and imperfect); cf., however, Herod. i. 120, ἐπέζωσε. The ζώσομαι named by Trommius in Jer. xxxviii. 17, Ezek. xvi. 7, is not ratified by the MSS. Elsewhere always the later form ζήσομαι, aor. ἔζησα, for which, as also for the perfect ἔζηκα, which does not occur in biblical Greek, the Attic writers use the corresponding form of βίωω, cf. Winer, Buttmann, Krüger, Kühner. The distinction described by Trench between ζωή and βίος cannot be fully maintained, for ζῆν, ζωή, as the word to express the *fact* of life, designates (better than βίος) *true and actual life*, Dio Cass. lxix. 19, βιοὺς μὲν ἔτη τόσα, ζήσας δὲ ἔτη ἑπτὰ; Xen. *Mem.* iii. 3. 11, νόμῳ μεμαθήκαμεν κάλλιστα ὄντα, δι' ὧν γε ζῆν ἐπισ-

τάμεθα; Ecclus. xl. 29, ἀνὴρ βλέπων εἰς τράπεζαν ἀλλοτρίαν, οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτοῦ ὁ βίος ἐν λογισμῷ ζωῆς. How this distinction is in keeping with that stated appears from ver. 28, ζῶν ἐπαιτήσεως μὴ βιώσης.—In the LXX. ζάω is = ἡ, ἦ. It is noteworthy that (differing from profane Greek) the LXX. use ζῆν transitively in a few places in the Psalms in the aorist, as answering to the Hiphil of ἡ, ζῆσαι τινα, to make to live, to let live, Ps. xli. 3, cxix. 26, 37, 40, 50, 88, 93, 107, 116, 149, 156, cxxxviii. 7, cxliii. 11, which does not occur in the Apocrypha or the N. T.—In Heb. iv. 12, ζῶν is predicated of the word of God, and the epithets which follow are related to it as the particular to the general. We must not, however, suppose that the word here implies an antithesis to dead letters such as the γράμμα in 2 Cor. iii. is said to mean, 2 Cor. iii. 6 being regarded as equivalent to Heb. iv. 12. We should rather adopt the parallel of Plato, *Phaedr.* 276 A, τὸν τοῦ εἰδότος λόγον λέγεις ζῶντα καὶ ἔμψυχον, οὗ ὁ γεγραμμένος εἰδῶλον ἂν τι λέγοιτο δικαίως.—For ζωή in the sense of future and eternal life (Matt. xix. 16, ἵνα ἔχω ζωὴν αἰ (Tisch. σχῶ)), compare Gen. ii. 9, iii. 22, 24; Deut. xxx. 14 sqq., xxxii. 49; Ps. xvi. 12, xxxvi. 11, and often in Proverbs. In the Apocrypha, Ecclus. xlv. 6; 2 Macc. vii. 14. Ζωὴ αἰών. only in Dan. xii. 2 and 4 Macc. xv. 2; compare ἀένναος ζωή, 2 Macc. vii. 36; αἰώνιος ἀναβίωσις ζωῆς, ver. 9. Ὁδὸς ζωῆς, Prov. v. 6, vi. 23, x. 18; Jer. xxi. 8. Ἐξοδὸς ζωῆς, Prov. iv. 23, viii. 35; πηγὴ ζωῆς, Prov. xiii. 15, xvi. 22; Jer. xvii. 13.

Ἀναζάω, only in N. T. and patristic Greek; the ἀναβιώσαι of profane Greek does not correspond with the soteriologic import of the biblical ζωή. According to the analogy of ἀναβιδῶναι, ἀναζῆν is not = to return to life, to revive, but to live again, implying termination of the state of death and restoration of life. (a) Of the resurrection from the dead, so Rom. xiv. 9, in the reading guaranteed by many MSS. and Versions, Χς ἀπέθανεν καὶ ἀνέζησεν (since Griesbach, ἔζησεν), and in like manner, though not so fully guaranteed, Rev. xx. 5, οἱ λοιποὶ τῶν νεκρῶν οὐκ ἀνέζησαν (since Griesbach likewise ἔζησαν). (b) Figuratively of religious renewal of the lost and ruined sinner, Luke xv. 24, οὗτος ὁ υἱός μου νεκρὸς ἦν καὶ ἀνέζησεν, ἦν ἀπολωλὼς καὶ εὗρέθη. In ver. 32, Tisch. 8 and Tregelles read ἔζησεν. (c) In the same figurative sense as νεκρός, Rom. vii. 9, ἡ ἁμαρτία ἀνέζησεν; cf. ver. 8, ἅμ. νεκρά.

Συνζάω (as to the ν in συν before σ and ζ, see Buttm. p. 8), to live together or in common, of being united one with another, e.g. θηρίον ὕδατι σύζων, Aesch. *Fr.* 21 D; Dem. xix. 69, οἷς συζῆν ἀνάγκη τὸν λοιπὸν βίον, especially of spiritual fellowship of life, Aristotle, *Eth. Eud.* vii. 12 = συναισθάνεσθαι καὶ συγγνωρίζειν = τὸ αὐτὸ αἰσθ. καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ γνωρ. *Eth. Nic.* ix. 9, τοῦτο δὲ (sc. τὸ συναισθάνεσθαι) γίνοιτ' ἂν ἐν τῷ συζῆν καὶ κοινωνεῖν λόγων καὶ διανοίας· οὕτω γὰρ ἂν δόξειε τὸ συζῆν ἐπὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων λέγεσθαι, καὶ οὐχ ὥσπερ ἐπὶ τῶν βοσκημάτων τὸ ἐν αὐτῷ νέμεσθαι. In biblical Greek only in the N. T. by Paul, and as meaning union with one another, (a) with reference to natural life, 2 Cor. vii. 3, ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν ἕστε εἰς τὸ συναποθανεῖν καὶ συζῆν. (b) In the soteriologic sense, Rom. vi. 8, of union with Christ, the condition of redeemed life, εἰ δὲ ἀπεθάνομεν

σὺν Χῷ πιστεύομεν ὅτι καὶ συνζήσομεν αὐτῷ; cf. vv. 9, 11; also 2 Tim. ii. 11 of the *fellowship of life* arising out of this union, εἰ γὰρ συναπεθάνομεν, καὶ συνζήσομεν; cf. ver. 10. Plut. *Pyrrh.* xx. 4, συζῆν μετ' αὐτοῦ πρῶτον ὄντα πάντων τῶν ἐταίρων καὶ τῶν στρατηγῶν. Ζωογονέω in the LXX. = 𐤆𐤒𐤕, Lev. xi. 47, τὰ ζωογονοῦντα; 1 Sam. xxvii. 9, 11. So also ζωοποιέω, Neh. ix. 6; 1 Kings v. 7; Ps. lxxi. 20; Eccles. vii. 13.

Ζύμη, ης, ῆ, *leaven*, according to Curtius, not to be connected with ζέω, but to be traced to an Indo-Germanic root *ju* in the sense *to mix by beating, to mix*. While φύραμα signifies the mixed and kneaded dough, ζύμη is that which is mixed in the dough; cf. Rom. xi. 16; 1 Cor. v. 6, 7; Matt. xiii. 33. The idea everywhere in Scripture connected with leaven, except in Matt. xiii. 33, Luke xiii. 21, is that presented in 1 Cor. v. 7, ἐκκαθάρατε τὴν παλαιὰν ζύμην, ἵνα ᾗτε νέον φύραμα, καθὼς ἐστε ἄζυσοι. The leaven destroys the quality designated νέον, it typifies what does not belong originally and essentially to the life, that by which it is disturbed and penetrated, namely, *sin*. This penetrative power of leaven (compare Hos. vii. 4) alone is the point of the comparison in Matt. xiii. 33, Luke xiii. 21 (compare Gal. v. 9), in the parable of the leaven. In all other places ζύμη is the type of sin penetrating the daily life; thus it first appears in the institution of the passover, Ex. xii. 15, 19, 20, 34, 39, xiii. 3, 7, and in the ritual of sacrifices, Ex. xxiii. 18, xxxiv. 25; Lev. ii. 11, 12, vi. 17, vii. 3; Deut. xvi. 3, 4; Amos iv. 5 (wholly effaced in the LXX.). Following hereupon in the N. T. (a) 1 Cor. v. 6–8, where the παλαιὰ ζύμη, in contrast with the νέον φύραμα, wrought by the appropriation of gospel blessings or by cleansing from sin (cf. Josh. v. 11, ἄζυμοι καὶ νέα), designates the remains of the former conversation still lingering and perverting the Christian life,—not only sin in itself, but sin as it characterized the previous heathen life of the readers. But all that disgraces the Christian and detracts from his holy newness of life works after the manner of leaven, of which it holds true μικρὰ ζύμη ὅλον τὸ φύραμα ζυμοῖ, 1 Cor. v. 6; Gal. v. 9; and so (b) *false doctrine* is designated ζύμη, as opposed to that which has been received (Gal. v. 9), or to the necessary renewal of the life, not as permeating sound doctrine with foreign elements. Thus in Gal. v. 9 concerning the πεισμονή practised upon the Galatians. Matt. xvi. 11, 12, οὐ περὶ ἄρτων εἶπον ὑμῖν προσέχετε ἀπὸ τῆς ζύμης τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ Σαδ. ἀλλὰ ἀπὸ τῆς διδαχῆς. Mark viii. 15 (where Herodians are named). In Luke xii. 1, ὑπόκρισις is named in the same connection with this leaven, which finds its embodiment in the doctrine covering their conduct. In the LXX. = 𐤆𐤒𐤕, 𐤆𐤒𐤕.

Ζυμόω, to leaven, to mix with leaven; rare in profane Greek, e.g. in Plut., Hippocr. (a) active, *to permeate with leaven*, 1 Cor. v. 6; Gal. v. 9. (b) The passive = the intrans. *to be leavened or mixed with leaven*, and thus to ferment. In the LXX. = 𐤆𐤒𐤕, both verb and adj. Ex. xii. 34, 39; Lev. vi. 17, xxiii. 17; Hos. vii. 4. In the N. T. Matt. xiii. 33; Luke xiii. 21.

ἄζυμος, *ον*, unleavened, in profane Greek only certified in Athen. iii. 74, and Plato, *Tim.* 74 D, in this latter place in the inexact sense = *unfermented*, therefore *unfinished, unprepared*, τὴν δὲ τῶν νεύρων φύσιν ἐξ ὁστοῦ καὶ σαρκὸς ἀζύμου κράσεως. Often, on the contrary, in biblical Greek answering to the significance of ζύμη and ἄζυμα in the ritual life of Israel. (a) Literally, **unleavened**, of bread, Gen. xix. 3; usually the neuter plural ἄζυμα φαγεῖν, ἑορτὴ τῶν ἀζύμων = פֶּסַח, of the Passover, Ex. xii. 8 sqq., xiii. 6, 7, xxiii. 15, xxix. 2, 23, xxxiv. 17, 18; also Lev. ii. 4, 5, vi. 16, vii. 2, viii. 2, 25, x. 12, xxiii. 6; Num. vi. 15 sqq., ix. 11, xxviii. 17; Deut. xvi. 3, 8, 16; Josh. v. 11; Judg. vi. 19–21; 1 Sam. xxviii. 24; 2 Kings xxiii. 9; 1 Chron. xxiii. 29; 2 Chron. viii. 13, xxx. 13, 21; 2 Esdr. vi. 22; Ezek. xlv. 21. For the meanings, see ζύμη; Josh. v. 11, ἐφάγοσαν ἀπὸ τοῦ σίτου τῆς γῆς ἄζυμα καὶ νέα. In the Apocrypha only 1 Esdr. i. 17, vii. 14, and i. 10, where τὰ ἄζυμα denotes not the bread, but the paschal offering. In the N. T. (b) of the feast of the Passover, ἑορτὴ τῶν ἀ., Luke xxii. 1; αἱ ἡμέραι τ. ἀζ., Acts xii. 3, xx. 6; ἡ πρώτη ἡμ. τ. α., Mark xiv. 12; or ἡ πρ. τ. α.; Matt. xxvi. 17; ἡ ἡμέρα τῶν ἀζ., Luke xxii. 7.—Mark xiv. 1, ἦν δὲ τὸ πάσχα καὶ τὰ ἀζ., shows how much importance was attached in particular to the ἀζ.; compare the similar combination, 1 Esdr. i. 17, which perhaps explains the φαγεῖν τὸ πάσχα, John xviii. 28. (c) **Figuratively**, in the sense named under ζύμη, ἄζυμα εἰλικριθείας, 1 Cor. v. 8; and of men, 1 Cor. v. 7, ἵνα ᾗτε νέον φύραμα, καθὼς ἐστε ἄζυμοι, with reference to the newness of life brought about by purification from sin.

ἦχος, *ον*, ὁ, according to Moeris, ed. Pierson, 175, the Hellenistic form for the Attic ἡχή; also τὸ ἦχος, according to Lachm., Tisch., Treg., Luke xxi. 25, ἐν ἀπορίᾳ ἦχους θαλάσσης, following the analogy of τὸ πλοῦτος and other words, see Winer, § 9. 2. 2; this form, however, is quite unknown in the O. T. and biblical Greek, and hence perhaps it is more correct to accent ἦχοῦς from ἦχω which occurs in biblical Greek, Job iv. 13; Wisd. xvii. 18. (a) **Sound, tone, noise**, LXX. = פֶּשַׁע, פֶּשַׁע, פֶּשַׁע, of no importance, however, for any special word; κυμάτων ἦχ., Ps. lxxv. 8; Jer. li. 42; σάλπιγγος, Ps. cl. 3; Heb. xii. 19; Acts ii. 2, ὥσπερ φερομένης πνοῆς βιαίας. (b) **Talk, report, rumour**, like ἡχή, e.g. in Plut., ἡχώ in Herod. and Pindar. Thus in Luke iv. 37. In the O. T. and in the classics ἦχος is used only of *tone, sound*, etc.

ἦχέω, (a) intrans. *to sound, ring, peal, clang, roar, bluster*, according to the kind of noise; in the LXX. e.g. 1 Kings i. 41, Ps. xlv. 4, lxxxiii. 3 = פֶּשַׁע; 1 Sam. i. 11, Jer. xix. 3 = הָלַח. In the N. T. only in 1 Cor. xiii. 1, χαλκὸς ἡχῶν. (b) Transitive, *to cause to sound*, e.g. ὕμνους, etc., in the Tragedians, Dem. So sometimes in the O. T., Isa. li. 15, ὁ θεὸς—ἡχῶν τὰ κύματα θαλάσσης; Ecclus. xlv. 9, φωνήν. Without object, Ecclus. l. 16, ἐν σάλπιγγιν ἡχησαν, ἀκουστὴν ἐποίησαν φωνὴν μεγάλην; cf. Plut. *Coriol.* xxxviii. 2, ἡχεῖν καὶ διαλέγεσθαι.

Κατηχέω, rare, and only in later Greek, not in the LXX. or Apocrypha = *to sound*

hither and thither, to echo, to resound, and hence transitively,—as intrans. verbs often become trans. by the addition of *κατά*, e.g. *κατάδω*, *καταβακχέω*, *καταγελάω*, *καταθρηνέω*, *καταργέω*, and others; compare the German prefix *be* in *beklagen*, *belachen*, *beweinen*, *beregnen*, etc., where it expresses “the full influence of the verb upon its object, and thus forms pure transitives with the accus. of the person or thing,” Grimm. *Wb.* i. 1203. Thus *κατηχεῖν*, (a) **to make a sound**, both with the acc. and with the gen., which occurs but seldom. Philostr. *Imag.* i. 19, p. 791, *βακχέει ἐν αὐτῇ Διόνυσος καὶ ἐπιρροθοῦσιν αἱ βάκχαι*, *ἁρμονία δέ, ὅποση ὀργιάζει, κατηχεῖ τῆς θαλάσσης*, and in some applications cited by Suidas, *τῶν πόρων, οἰκίας*, though the genitive does not point to an intransitive meaning, and though the connection in Philostr. indicates a *sounding down to* (von Zezschwitz, *Katechetik*, i. 19), but, as in many verbs with *κατά*, denotes the direction against something, an idea very much implied in *ἡχεῖν*; compare also *κατακλαίειν τινός*, *to weep for some one*, *to weep before him for something*. But usually it is combined with the accus., and always with the accus. of the person, *to sound to some one*, *to make to echo round one* (cf. *to sing to*); Lucian, *Jurr. tr.* 39, *οὐ γὰρ ἀληθείας μέλει τοῖς ποιηταῖς, ἀλλὰ τοῦ κηλεῖν τοὺς ἀκούοντας καὶ διὰ τοῦτο μέτροις τε κατὰδουσι καὶ μύθοις κατηχοῦσι καὶ ὅλως ἅπαντα ὑπὲρ τοῦ τερπνοῦ μηχανῶνται*. This leads on (b) to the use of the word for **oral instruction**, especially in N. T. and patristic Greek, which is anticipated in its application to rumours, communications to a person, reports, accounts, especially in the passive = **to hear or learn**, active therefore = *to cause to hear, learn, or understand*, as in Philo, *leg. ad Caj.* ii. 575. 9, *κατήχεται δὲ ὅτι κ.τ.λ.*, *he was informed of the report*; cf. Ἦχος (b). So often in Plut. *de fluv.*, in the phrase *κατηχηθεὶς περὶ τῶν συμβεβηκότων*, vii. 2, viii. 1, xvii. 1, for which xi. 1, *περὶ δὲ τῶν συμβεβηκότων ἀκούσας*. So in the N. T. Acts xxi. 21, *κατηχήθησαν δὲ περὶ σοῦ ὅτι ἀποστασίαν διδάσκεις*; ver. 24, *ὧν κατήχεται περὶ σοῦ οὐδὲν ἔστιν*; cf. Vit. Jos. 65, *ὅταν μέντοι συντύχῃς μοι, καὶ αὐτός σε πολλὰ κατηχήσω τῶν ἀγνωστομένων*, “I will hear or be taught of thee something altogether new, unknown.” In the sense *to hear or learn*, *κατηχεῖσθαι* stands contrasted with more exact knowledge, and so *κατηχεῖν* may stand in contrast with more thorough, more exact communication, Luke i. 3, 4, *ἔδοξε ἡμῶι . . . ἀκριβῶς καθεξῆς σοι γράψαι, ἵνα ἐπιγνῶς περὶ ὧν κατηχήθης λόγων τὴν ἀσφάλειαν*. Connected with this is the use of *κατήχησις* in a passage of Chrysippus preserved in Diog. L. vii. 89, the earliest instance from which the later, and especially the ecclesiastical usage, may be explained, *διαστρέφεισθαι δὲ τὸ λογικὸν ζῶον ποτὲ μὲν διὰ τὰς τῶν ἔξωθεν πραγματειῶν πιθανότητας, ποτὲ δὲ διὰ τὴν κατήχησιν τῶν συνόντων*, “*crebris sermonibus eorum quibuscum versatur*,” cf. Galen. *de plac. Hipp. et Plat.* v. 290. 33, *ἐπειδὴν γὰρ λέγῃ (ὁ Χρύσιππος) τὰς περὶ ἀγαθῶν καὶ κακῶν ἐγγίγνεσθαι τοῖς φαύλοις διαστροφὰς διὰ τὴν πιθανότητα τῶν φαντασιῶν καὶ τὴν κατήχησιν*, where in what follows there corresponds *τὴν νίκην κ.τ.λ. ἐπαινούμενί τε καὶ μακαριζόμενα πρὸς τῶν πολλῶν ἀκούοντες ὡς ἀγαθὰ, περὶ δὲ τῆς ἥτις τε καὶ τῆς ἀτιμίας ὡς κακὰ ἐτοιμῶς πειθώμεθα*. Accordingly we find *κατήχησις*, Cic. *ad Att.* xv. 12, *quid aetati credendum sit, quid nomini, quid haereditati,*

quid κατηχήσει, magni consilii est. In these places it may denote the instructive teaching and convincing or winning influence of public opinion; he who κατηχούμενος ἀκούει τοῦ σύνοντος καὶ πείθεται. He learns to know and to appropriate representations as his own by the influence of what he hears. Thus the word has been applied to the instruction of youth; cf. the passage quoted by Wetstein from Porph. *qu. Homer*, ἡμεῖς δὲ ἐκ τῆς παιδικῆς κατηχίσεως περινοοῦμεν μᾶλλον ἐν τοῖς πλείστοις ἢ νοοῦμεν. The κατήχσις "effects a circumscribed roundabout knowledge, but not a thorough understanding." In the same sense, but passive, the substantive occurs several times in Sext. Empir. Thus κατηχεῖν grows into a *term. techn.* as we find it in ecclesiastical Greek for the first fundamental, persuasive instruction in Christianity, without addition as in Acts xviii. 25, οὗτος ἦν κατηχημένος τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ κυρίου; cf. ver. 26, ἀκριβέστερον αὐτῷ ἐξέθεντο τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ θεοῦ; cf. Hippocrates, κατήχσις ἰδιωτῶν, the oral exhortation of the physician to explain to and instruct the sick man concerning the nature and meaning of his sickness. But this usage is not yet fixed in the N. T., for in Rom. ii. 18, 1 Cor. xiv. 19, Gal. vi. 6, it is used for instruction generally, as in Lucian, *Asin.* 48, where it is interchanged with διδάσκειν; whereas in Lucian, *Philopat.* 17, εὐστόμει καὶ μηδὲν εἴπης φλαῦρον θεοῦ δεξιού, ἀλλὰ κατηχούμενος πείθου παρ' ἐμοῦ, clearly in mockery of the manner and design of the Christian κατηχεῖσθαι, of which Clem. Alex. *Strom.* vi. 15 says, κατηχούνται οἱ ἐξ ἐθνῶν ἰδιῶται ἐξ ἐπιβολῆς δεχόμενοι τὸν λόγον. (Still, this treatise is not Lucian's, but dates from the time of Julian.) At any rate we should look for the origin of this usage, as the passage from Chrysippus shows, in the Stoic sphere. See the thorough explanation of the word, though differing in some points from the above, in Von Zezschwitz, *System der chr. Katechetik*, i. 17 sqq.

Θέλω, thus always in biblical Greek, but in Attic prose the strengthened form ἐθέλω prevails, whence is derived the imperfect ἤθελον and the aorist ἠθέλησα; future θελήσω (connected according to Curtius (726) with the Sanscrit *dhar*, to apply oneself to something, to begin; others give different explanations) = to will. As to the distinction between θέλω and βούλομαι, θέλειν is the stronger word to denote the will pressing on to action; cf. e.g. βούλημα, not like θέλημα denoting the substance of the law, but intention underlying the law; βουλή, counsel, conclusion; θέλημα, resolve; θέλημα, moreover, denotes the will of God which must be done, but βουλὴ θεοῦ refers only to God's self-affirmation in His own acting. θέλειν corresponds, like βούλεσθαι in the LXX., to the Hebrew בָּרַח and יָצַח (once θέλω = בָּרַח , 1 Chron. xxviii. 4), but it is more frequently used for these than is βούλομαι; see also under εὐδοκέω. While βούλεσθαι and βουλεύεσθαι, especially the latter, answer to the Hebrew יָצַח , and βουλή in particular is the usual word for בָּרַח , we never find this Hebrew word rendered by θέλημα and θέλησις, two Hellenistic forms foreign to profane Greek, which almost always are = יָצַח and בָּרַח , for which in turn we never find βουλή. This shows that βούλεσθαι and θέλειν differ as decree and resolve, and θέλειν in the LXX. and N. T. denotes elective inclination, love, occurring frequently

in biblical Greek with the acc. of the object, which is rare with *βούλεσθαι*. The strong *ἰνῶ*, *to refuse*, is usually rendered by *οὐ θέλειν*, and rarely by *οὐ βούλ.* *Θέλειν* further is = *to be about to*, *βούλ.* never. Nevertheless *βούλ.* may be exchanged for *θέλειν*, and *θέλειν*, though far more rarely, for *βούλ.* It stands

(I.) = *to will*, equivalent to *to purpose, to be decided, to have the will*, over against or side by side with *ποιεῖν*, Rom. vii. 21; John viii. 44; 2 Cor. viii. 11; with *ἐνεργεῖν*, Phil. ii. 13; Matt. viii. 2, *ἐὰν θέλῃς*; ver. 3, *θέλω*. Cf. *οὐ θέλειν, not to will, to refuse, to oppose*, Matt. xviii. 30, xxi. 29, xxiii. 37, and often. Also *to be inclined to*, Acts xxvi. 5, *ἐὰν θέλωσι μαρτυρεῖν*. Weakened = *to have a mind to, to list*, John iii. 8; *οὐ θέλειν, not to be inclined, to intend not*, Matt. i. 19, and often. With infinitive of the subject-matter following, Matt. xiv. 5, xxvi. 15; Mark vi. 19, xi. 14; Luke xiii. 31; Acts xiv. 13, xix. 33, xxiv. 27; Rom. vii. 21; 2 Thess. iii. 10. Rarely in this sense with the accusative of the object, as in Rom. vii. 15, *οὐ γὰρ ὁ θέλω τοῦτο πράσσω*; vv. 16, 19, 20; 1 Cor. vii. 36; Gal. v. 17; John xv. 7; 2 Pet. iii. 5; also followed by the accus. with the infinitive, as in John xxi. 22, 23, *ἐὰν αὐτὸν θέλω μένειν*; 1 Thess. ii. 4, and in the Pauline *θέλω ὑμᾶς εἰδέναι*, Col. ii. 1; *οὐ θέλω ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν*, Rom. i. 13, xi. 25; 1 Cor. x. 1, 20, xii. 1; 2 Cor. i. 8; 1 Thess. iv. 13.—

(II.) *To will*, in the sense of *to endeavour, to desire*, rarely by itself, as in Matt. xv. 28, *γενηθήτω σοι ὡς θέλεις*; xxii. 17, *ὁ θέλων λαβέτω*, usually with a statement of the thing desired; thus with the infin. of the subject-matter following, Matt. v. 42, xii. 38, xx. 26, 28; Mark viii. 34, 35, ix. 35, x. 43, 44; Luke viii. 20, ix. 23, 24, x. 24, 29, xvi. 26; John vi. 21, ix. 27; Gal. iii. 2, iv. 20, vi. 12, etc. With the accus. of the object, Matt. xvii. 12; Mark ix. 13, xiv. 36; Luke v. 39; 1 Cor. iv. 21; with accusative *c. infin.* following, Acts xvi. 3; 1 Cor. vii. 7, 32, xiv. 5; Gal. vi. 13, likewise rare; followed by *ἵνα*, Matt. vii. 12; Mark vi. 25, x. 35; Luke vi. 31; John xvii. 24; oftener with the simple conjunction in an indirect question, Matt. xiii. 28, xx. 32, xxvi. 17, xxvii. 17, 21; Mark x. 36, xiv. 12, xv. 9, 12; Luke ix. 54, xviii. 41, xxii. 9; 1 Cor. iv. 21.

—Luke xii. 49, *τί θέλω εἰ ἤδη ἀνήφθη*.—(III.) Answering to the Hebrew *יִצְחָק*, it stands for *what one chooses, likes, is inclined to*, Matt. ix. 13, *ἔλεον θέλω καὶ οὐ θυσίαν*, from Hos. vi. 6; so Matt. xii. 7. Matt. xxvii. 43, *εἰ θέλει αὐτόν*, from Ps. xxii. 9; Heb. x. 5, 8, from Ps. xl. 7. But it is in O. T. quotations that it occurs thus; the construction with *ἐν*, often appearing in the LXX. (see *εὐδοκεῖν*), occurs only in Col. ii. 18, *θέλων ἐν ταπεινοφροσύνῃ καὶ θρησκείᾳ τῶν ἀγγέλων*. Passages such as 1 Tim. ii. 4, Jas. iv. 15, 1 Pet. iii. 17, have been influenced by this use, and connected herewith are the Hellenistic forms, foreign to profane Greek, *θέλημα, θέλησις, θελητής, θελητός*, the two last not in the N. T. How foreign this use of *θέλειν* essentially is to N. T. Greek, is clear from 1 Pet. iii. 10, where instead of the simple *ὁ θέλων ζωὴν* of the LXX. in Ps. xxxiv. 13, we have *ὁ θέλων ζωὴν ἀγαπᾶν*. We cannot thus, moreover, explain John v. 21, *οὗς θέλει ζωοποιεῖ*; Rom. ix. 18, *ἀρα οὖν ὃν θέλει ἐλεεῖ, ὃν δὲ θέλει σκληρύνει*. The expression is employed to give emphasis to the divine sovereignty. In like manner the negative *μή, οὐ, θέλειν*,

is by no means always equivalent to the O. T. לִּשְׁׁלֹא of positive negation; cf. for example, Matt. i. 19 with xxiii. 37, xxvii. 34; Luke xv. 28 with xix. 14, 27; John v. 40, xxi. 18; Acts vii. 39; Rom. vii. 16, 19, and other places.

Θέλημα, τός, τό, an Hellenistic word foreign to profane Greek, even still in the Christian era, LXX. = לִּשְׁׁלֹא and לִּשְׁׁלֹא , and therefore not denoting *will as demand*, but *as an expression of inclination, or pleasure*, towards that which is liked, that which pleases and creates joy; cf. Isa. lviii. 3, 13 and Ps. cxlv. 19, where with *δέησις* it denotes a psychological characteristic. Isa. xxiii. 26, τὰ θελήματα τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν. Compare *θελητὴς νόμου*, 1 Macc. ii. 42. Hence also often like θέλω in combination with ἐν, e.g. Ps. i. 2, xvi. 3; Eccles. v. 3; Mal. i. 10. When it denotes God's will, it signifies His *gracious disposition towards* something, Mal. i. 10, Jer. ix. 23, Isa. lxii. 4, Ps. xxx. 6, and is also used to designate what God Himself does of His own *good pleasure*, Ps. ciii. 7, ἐγνώρισε τὰς ὁδοὺς αὐτοῦ τῷ Μωυσῇ, τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσρ. τὰ θελήματα αὐτοῦ; compare vv. 6, 8 sqq., what He desires or directs as well-pleasing to Him, Isa. xlv. 28, Ps. ciii. 21, so that it does not signify a command, but the expression of His good pleasure, Ps. cxliii. 10, διδάξόν με τοῦ ποιεῖν τὸ θέλημά σου; xl. 9, τοῦ ποιῆται τὸ θέλημά σου ὁ θεός μου ἡβουλήθην, καὶ τὸν νόμον σου ἐν μέσῳ τῆς καρδίας μου. It is not upon the whole frequent in the LXX.; but it is the usual rendering for לִּשְׁׁלֹא , while לִּשְׁׁלֹא is more frequently = *δεκτός*. In the Apocrypha, too, it occurs comparatively seldom, and has the same meaning, Ecclus. xxxv. 17, xliii. 16; of God's will, 1 Esdr. viii. 16, ix. 9; 2 Macc. i. 3; cf. 1 Macc. iii. 60, ὡς δ' ἂν ἡ θέλημα ἐν οὐρανῷ, οὕτω ποιήσει, cf. Isa. xlv. 28.

In the N. T. it is much more frequent, but it does not occur in Phil., 2 Thess., 1 Tim., Titus, Philem., James, 2 and 3 John. The N. T. usage differs from the LXX. in this, that as a rule it stands for *the will of God*; otherwise only in Luke xxiii. 25; John i. 13; 1 Cor. vii. 37; Eph. ii. 3; 2 Tim. ii. 26; 2 Pet. i. 21 (in 1 Pet. iv. 3, Lachm., Tisch., Treg. read *βούλημα*). Its import is the same as in the LXX.; nowhere is it a name for *the commands of God* as such, whether in any particular case or in general, but it designates what occurs, or what should be done by others, as the object of *God's good pleasure*, be it in the carrying out of the divine purpose or the accomplishment of *what He would have*. Thus it stands (I.) for *that which God purposes*, or has purposed, what He regards, or does, as good, Matt. xxvi. 42, γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου; cf. Luke xxii. 42; Acts xxi. 42, τὸ θέλημα τοῦ κυρίου γινέσθω; Matt. xviii. 14; 1 Pet. iii. 17, εἰ θέλοι τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ; iv. 19, οἱ πάσχοντες κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ, and especially as used by Paul, both with reference to God's *saving purpose*, Eph. i. 5, προορίσας ἡμᾶς εἰς *νίθεσίαν* . . . κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ; ver. 9, γνωρίσας ἡμῖν τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ, κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν αὐτοῦ; ver. 11, κατὰ τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ, and in particular to the tracing back his apostleship to the will of God, 1 Cor. i. 1; 2 Cor. i. 1; Gal. i. 4; Col. i. 1; 2 Tim. i. 1, as bestowed upon not only by the *sovereign*, but by the *gracious will* of God; cf. Eph. iii. 7, 8; Tit. i. 3; Gal. i. 15, *et al.*

Θέλημα still in this sense occurs in Rom. i. 10, xv. 32; 2 Cor. viii. 5; Rev. iv. 11; Acts xxii. 14. Once it stands absolutely, 1 Cor. xvi. 12, καὶ πάντως οὐκ ἦν θέλημα ἵνα νῦν ἔλθῃ, where Theodoret, Oecum., Bengel, *et al.*, refer it to *God's will* (cf. 1 Macc iii. 60), and not to the *willingness* of Apollos.

(II.) Of the carrying out of God's will by others, and this (a) with reference to what God has ordained, Acts xiii. 22, ἄνδρα κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν μου ὃς ποιήσει πάντα τὰ θελήματά μου (from Isa. xlv. 28 with 1 Sam. xvi. 1; Ps. lxxxix. 21). So of the Father's will in redemption, as carried out by Christ, John iv. 34, v. 30, vi. 38, 39, 40, ix. 31, compare Heb. x. 7, 9, 10. (b) With reference to God's will or good pleasure to be carried out by us, Rom. xii. 2, εἰς τὸ δοκιμάζειν ὑμᾶς τί τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ τὸ ἀγαθὸν καὶ εὐάρεστον καὶ τέλειον, with an implied reference to God's judgment. Thus Rom. ii. 18; Eph. v. 17, vi. 6; Col. i. 9, iv. 12; 1 Thess. iv. 3, v. 18; Heb. x. 36, xiii. 21; 1 Pet. ii. 15; 1 John ii. 17, v. 14; John vii. 17; Matt. vii. 21, xii. 50, xxi. 31; Mark iii. 35; Luke xii. 47. By taking note of this, the prayer in Matt. vi. 9, γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου κ.τ.λ., receives its full weight and import, and its distinctive colouring side by side with the first petition. The plural only in Acts xiii. 22; Eph. ii. 3; and according to B, in Mark iii. 35.

Θέλησις, εως, ἡ, like θέλημα, an Hellenistic word = will, pleasure. LXX. = רָצוֹן, Ezek. xviii. 23, μὴ θελήσει θελήσω τὸν θάνατον τοῦ ἀνόμου = "willingly," "with pleasure I do not," etc. רָצוֹן, 2 Chron. xv. 15; Prov. viii. 35, ἐτοιμάζεται θέλησις παρὰ κυρίου. In some MSS. also, Ps. xxi. 3 = רָצוֹן, instead of δέησις, parallel with ἐπιθυμία. In the Apocrypha, Wisd. xvi. 25, πρὸς τὴν τῶν δεομένων θελ.; Tob. xii. 18; 2 Macc. xii. 16, τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ θελήσει; 3 Macc. ii. 26, τῇ ἐκείνου θελ. In the N. T. Heb. ii. 4, συνεπιμαρτυροῦντος τοῦ θεοῦ κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ θέλησιν, after His good pleasure; cf. Matt. xi. 26, οὕτως εὐδοκία ἐγένετο ἔμπροσθέν σου.

Θεός. As to Paul's predicative designation of Christ as θεός, we cannot appeal to the Johannine advance from υἱὸς θεοῦ to θεός, John x. 33, nor can we say with Beck (on Rom. ix. 5), that Χς θεός sprang from υἱὸς θεοῦ just as fairly as ἄνθρωπος Χς Ἰς (1 Tim. ii. 5; Rom. v. 15; 1 Cor. xv. 21) from υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου; because the manhood of Christ is never in question in Paul's writings, and ἄνθρ. Χς Ἰς hardly can be said to have arisen from the apostle's use (which is rare) of υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου. This only may with certainty be affirmed, that υἱὸς θεοῦ is true of Christ in a special manner and with a sense of its own. But there is no need of these considerations in the case of Rom. ix. 5. The expression there, ἐξ ᾧ ὁ Χριστὸς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, ὁ ᾧ ἐπὶ πάντων Θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, corresponds so completely with the O. T. contrast between יְהוָה and יֵשׁוּעַ, that it is impossible not to be reminded of this. We must of necessity be thus reminded even were we to separate ὁ ᾧ ἐπὶ παντῶν θεός from what precedes as a doxology of God. Maintaining this contrast, which the so-called doxology itself fully suggests, the subject cannot be changed; and the τὸ κατὰ σάρκα—which in

this form and not the simple *κατὰ σάρκα* leads us to expect a contrast—receives its due weight by the following still further designation of the subject as *ὁ ὢν κ.τ.λ.* Otherwise we should have expected the apostle would have written *ὁ δὲ ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸς κ.τ.λ.*, so as to close his summary of the privileges of Israel with a doxology of God. In keeping with Tit. ii. 13 is 2 Pet. i. 1, *τοῖς ἰσότημον ἡμῖν λαχοῦσι πίστιν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, where the union of *τ. θεοῦ ἢ καὶ σωτῆρος* as predicates of Jesus Christ are confirmed by the distinguishing of God and Christ in ver. 2, *ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν*. Compare also iii. 18, *αὐξάνετε ἐν χάριτι καὶ γνώσει τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*. And the same is true of 2 Thess. i. 12, *κατὰ τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ κυρίου Ἰη. Χν.*

While the question whether Christ is called God, or more accurately, whether the predicate God is attributed to Him,—for only as a predicate does it occur,—must thus be answered in the affirmative, the reading adopted by Tregelles, and fully examined and vindicated by Hort (*Two Dissertations; I. on μονογενὴς θεός in Scripture and Tradition*, etc., London 1876), in John i. 18, *μονογενὴς θεὸς ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο*, instead of *ὁ μονογενὴς υἱός*, still remains unique, and a solecism which would be unbearable if we had to read *ὁ μονογ. θ.* But, omitting the article, this designation of Christ does not go far beyond the use of *θεός* as predicated of Christ in John i. 1; it is rather in keeping with it, pointing back thereto and involving it. But it must neither be rendered, “no one hath ever seen a God, an only-begotten God who is in the Father’s bosom, He hath declared Him” (Harnack in Schürer’s *Theol. Zeit.* 1876, p. 545); nor with Weiss, “the Divine Essence hath no one seen, an only-begotten of the Divine Essence hath declared Him.” The first rendering mistakes the *θεόν* without the article in the preceding *θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἑώρακεν πώποτε*, and the real value of the article in *ὁ ὢν κ.τ.λ.*; the second degrades *θεός* to the position of an adjective, and gives *μονογενὴς* the rank of a substantive. The text should be translated thus, “Who God is no one has ever seen; the only-begotten God is,” etc. But weighty as are the grounds for this reading, the fact has not yet been sufficiently estimated that not a single Western authority witnesses for it, though the formula *μ. θ.* as applied to Christ (without reference to John i. 18) was familiar to them as well as to the Greek Fathers. That the reading wavers in i. 18 only, and not in iii. 16, 18, 1 John iv. 9, does not tell specially for *μ. θ.*, because in these latter places there was no temptation to introduce, instead of *μ. υἱός*, a formula already current in ecclesiastical language before the Christological controversies arose, and unopposed even by the Arians. Rhetorical rather than dogmatic considerations must have led to its adoption in i. 18.

Θεόπνευστος, *ον*, gifted with God’s Spirit, breathing the Divine Spirit (but not = inspired by God). The term belongs only to Hellenistic and ecclesiastical Greek, and as peculiar thereto is connected with expressions belonging to the sphere of heathen prophecy and mysteries, *θεοφόρος*, *θεοφόρητος*, *θεοφορούμενος*, *θεήλατος*, *θεοκίνητος*,

θεοδέγμων, θεοδέκτωρ, θεοπρόπος, θεόμαντις, θεόφρων, θεοφράδμων, θεοφραδής, ἔνθεος, ἐνθουσιαστής, *et al.*, to which Hellenistic Greek adds two new words, θεόπνευστος and θεοδίδακτος, without, however, denoting what the others do—an ecstatic state. The statement of Huther, repeated from his time downwards, on 2 Tim. iii. 16, *πᾶσα γραφή θεόπνευστος*, that θεόπν. is used in the classics of poets and seers to denote what Cicero says, *Pro Arch.* 8, “*nemo vir magnus sine aliquo afflatu divino unquam fuit*,” is clearly incorrect, for θεόπν. occurs neither in the classics nor in later Greek. In Plut. *De plac. phil.* v. 2 (904 F), τοὺς ὀνείρους τοὺς θεοπνεύστους κατ’ ἀνάγκην γίνεσθαι, τοὺς δὲ φυσικοὺς ἀνειδωλοποιουμένης ψυχῆς τὸ συμφέρον αὐτῇ κ.τ.λ., it is in all probability due to the transcriber, who had in his mind θεόπν. in the sense of the Vulgate rendering, *divinitus inspirata*, and it stands, as Wyttenbach supposes, for θεοπέμπτους. It occurs also in Ps.-Phocyl. 121, τῆς δὲ θεοπνεύστου σοφίης λόγος ἐστὶν ἄριστος (if the whole passage is not to be cancelled, as Bernays thinks, because disturbing the connection), and in the 5th book of the *Sibylline Verses*, 308, Κύμη δ’ ἡ μωρὰ σὺν νάμασιν τοῖς θεοπνεύστοις, and ver. 406, ἀλλὰ μέγαν γενετῆρα θεὸν πάντων θεοπνεύστων Ἐν θυσίαις ἐγέραιρον κ.τ.λ. The Pseudo-Phocylides, however, was an Hellenist, and the author of the 5th book of the *Sibyllines* was most probably an Egyptian Jew living in the time of Hadrian. We find the word in Christian soil in 2 Tim. iii. 16, perhaps the first traceable employment of it in writing. Wetstein quotes from the *vita Sabae* (in Cotelierii *monum.*) the passage, ἔφθασε τῇ τοῦ Χϋ χάριτι ἡ πάντων θεοπνεύστων, πάντων χριστοφόρων αὐτοῦ συνοδία μέχρι ὁ ὀνομάτων, and the designation of Marcus Eremita, θεόπνευστος ἀνῆρ. In these last two passages, and in *Sibyll.* v. 406, it is clear that we have the passive meaning = *gifted or filled with God’s Spirit, divinely spirited* (not *inspired*, a distinction which Ewald rightly notes, *Jahrb. f. bibl. Wissenschaft*, vii. 68 sqq., ix. 91 sqq.). Thus γραφή θεόπν. cannot mean *inspired by God* in the sense of the Vulgate; when joined with such words as γραφή here, νᾶμα, *spring* (*Sibyll.* v. 308), it is equivalent to *breathing a divine spirit, the spirit of God*, in keeping with the ordinary transference of the passive into the active meaning, as we find it in ἄπνευστος, εὐπνευστος, *badly or well imbued, breathing forth good or ill*; cf. Nonn. *paraphr. ev. Joh.* i. 102 sqq., οὐ ποδὸς ἄκρου ἀνδρομένην παλάμην οὐκ ἄξιός εἰμι πελάσσας, λύσαι μόνον ἱμάντα θεοπνεύστοιο πεδίλου; 129, βαπτίζειν ἀπύροισι καὶ ἀπνεύστοις λοέτροις. In keeping with this, Phocyl. 121 may be interpreted; certainly the rendering, “wisdom gifted with a divine spirit or breathing a divine spirit,” must have the preference, for θεόπν. thus has the same meaning as in the other passages. A transference of meaning to *inspired by God, given by God*, can hardly be explained or vindicated; this meaning might, without straining the context, suit Ps.-Phocyl. 121, but certainly is inadmissible as an epithet of γραφή, 2 Tim. iii. 16. The signification, *spirit-filled, breathing the Spirit of God*, is in keeping with the connection, especially with the ὠφέλιμος κ.τ.λ. and τὰ δυνάμενά σε σοφίσαι, ver. 15, and likewise with the language employed in other places, *e.g.* in the Hebrews, where what Scripture says is distinctly designated the saying or word of

the Holy Ghost; cf. also Acts xxviii. 25. Origen, *Hom.* 21 in *Jer.*, *sacra volumina spiritus plenitudinem spirant*. Cf. my article, "Inspiration," in Herzog and Plitt, *Real-Enc.* vi. 746 sqq.

Θεοσέβεια, ας, ἡ, the fear of God, Xen., Plato. LXX. = יִרְאָה לַיהוָה, Gen. xx. 11; יִרְאָה לַיהוָה, Job xxviii. 28. In the Apocrypha, Ecclus. i. 25; Bar. v. 4; 4 Macc. i. 9, vii. 6, xvii. 15. The strictly biblical word is φόβος θεοῦ, φοβεῖσθαι, φοβούμενος τὸν θεόν.—In the N. T. 1 Tim. ii. 10, ἐπαγγέλλεσθαι θεοσέβειαν, "professing the fear of God, reverence for God;" see ἐπαγγέλλω.—θεοσεβής occurs in the LXX. in Ex. xviii. 21, Job i. 1, 8, ii. 3 = יִרְאָה לַיהוָה. Ex. xviii. 21, θεοσεβεῖς, ἄνδρας δικαίους, μισούντας ὑπερφηανίαν. In the Apocrypha, Judith xi. 16; 4 Macc. xv. 23.

Θνήσκω, fut. θανοῦμαι, in Prov. xiii. 15; aor. ἔθανον, 2 Macc. xiii. 7; perf. τέθνηκα, infin. τεθνηκέναι, Acts xiv. 19, τεθνάναι, 1 Macc. iv. 35 = מָוָה (but far oftener rendered by ἀποθνήσκω), usually in the perfect, whose participle is = מָוָה. Θνητός is rare in the LXX.; Prov. xx. 24 = מָוָה; Isa. li. 12 = מָוָה; Job xxx. 23 = מָוָה. Θάνατος is in the LXX. = מָוָה, מָוָה, also מָוָה, מָוָה; once according to the sense = מָוָה, 1 Sam. i. 11.—'Αθανασία does not occur in the LXX. but often in the Apocrypha, Wisd. iv. 1, viii. 13, 17, xv. 3; 4 Macc. xiv. 5; compare ἀθάνατος, Wisd. i. 15; Ecclus. xvii. 30; often in 4 Macc., e.g. vii. 3, xiv. 6, xviii. 23. 'Αποθνήσκω in the LXX. = מָוָה; twice = מָוָה, Gen. vii. 21; Num. xvii. 13. שָׁמַר, 2 Chron. xii. 16, xiv. 1.

Συναποθνήσκω, to die together with, Herod., Xen., Plato. Not in the LXX. In the Apocrypha only in Ecclus. xix. 10. In the N. T. Mark xiv. 31; 2 Cor. vii. 3. On 2 Tim. ii. 11, see συνζῆν, συνεγείρειν.

Θρησκός, οὔ, ὁ, accented in some codices, and, as Hesychius thinks, more correctly θρήσκος = Godfearing. Occurs only in the N. T. Jas. i. 26, εἴ τις δοκεῖ θρησκὸς εἶναι μὴ χαλιναγωγῶν γλῶσσαν . . . τούτου μάταιος ἡ θρησκεία; cf. ver. 27, θρησκεία καθαρὰ κ.τ.λ. Hesychius explains it περιττός, δεισιδαίμων. The verb θρησκεύω occurs in Herod. ii. 64. 2, 65. 1; θρησκεία or θρησκητή, ii. 18. 1, 37. 2, the one = to practise religious usages, the latter = religious usage or ceremonial, of the cultus and religious usages of foreign nations. Θρησκεύω occurs again in Plut. *Alex.* ii. 5; θρησκεία in *praec. conj.* 19 (140 D), sometimes in Dion. Hal., Herdn., Diog. L. vi. 101. The primary meaning is uncertain; cf. Passow, Curtius 257, but the idea associated with it is clear from Herod. and Plut.; cf. ii. 37. 1, θεοσεβέες δὲ περισσῶς ἔοντες μάλιστα πάντων ἀνθρώπων. Plut. *Alex.* ii. 5 = κατάκοροι καὶ περιέργοι ἱερουργίαι. *Praec. conj.* l.c., περιέργοις δὲ θρησκειαῖς καὶ ξέναις δεισιδαιμονίαις. In Herod. it describes religious conduct and cultus in general only, or as specially zealous; in Plutarch, of cultus depreciatively and as excessive, and therefore rightly put by Hesychius side by side with δεισιδαίμων. Neither word has in itself a bad meaning, and hence Josephus uses the

substantive of the Jews; cf. Grimm on 2 Macc. v. 6; *e.g.* *Ant.* xiii. 8. 2, of the respect of Antiochus VII. towards the Jews' religion. Hence thus in Jas. i. 26, 27 and Acts xxvi. 5, *κατὰ τὴν ἀκριβεστάτην τῆς ἡμετέρας θρησκείας ἔζησα Φαρισαῖος*. But in a bad sense, as in Plutarch, regarding conduct which is described as blameworthy, *θρησκεύω* and *θρησκεία* occur in the Book of Wisd. xi. 16, xiv. 16, xviii. 27, and to this the *θρησκεία τῶν ἀγγέλων* in Col. ii. 18 corresponds. It was perhaps the only word by which the general idea of religion, objectively viewed, could be expressed (for the expression of which Israel and the Christian Church had no occasion), together with the idea of perverted religion; hence Acts xxvi. 5, in Paul's speech before Agrippa.

Θρησκευω, to practise religious rites, to maintain a religious rule, Herod. ii. 64. 2; Dion. Hal. *Ant. R.* i. 76, ii. 22. 67, in a good sense; Plut. *Alex.* ii. 5, in a bad; see above. So Wisd. xi. 16, xiv. 16.

Θρησκεία, ἡ, (a) **religious worship, religious exercise, cultus**, Herod. ii. 18. 1; xxxvii. 2. So = *the worship of God, religion*, Acts xxvi. 5; Jas. i. 26, 27. (b) In a bad sense = *κατάκορος καὶ περιέργος ἰεθουργία* in Plutarch; see above. So Wisd. xi. 16, xiv. 16; Col. ii. 18.

Ἐθελοθρησκεία, ἡ, **voluntarily adopted, unbidden or forbidden worship**; cf. Suidas, *ἐθελοθρησκεῖ ἰδίῳ θελήματι σέβει τὸ δοκοῦν*, therefore = **will-worship**, not worship or cultus which one allows to be put upon him (Hofmann), but *which one affects*; cf. *ἐθελοδικαιοσύνη*, *affectata justitia*, in Epiphanius; *ἐθελοευλάβεια*, *affectata pietas*, in Basil the Great. The word occurs first in Col. ii. 23 (cf. ver. 18), and afterwards in patristic Greek, where *ἐθελοθρησκεία* is designated *τὸ δόγμα τῶν ἐθνῶν* (Chrys.). Compare also Epiphanius. *Resp. ad ep. Acacii* (Steph. *Thes. s.v.*), of the scribes, *τῇ περιττοτέρᾳ ἐθελοθρησκείᾳ ἔθνη φυλάσσοντες, ἃ οὐ διὰ τοῦ νόμου μεμαθήκασι*.

Θυμός (cf. *θυμιάω*, *θυμίαμα*, *θυμιατήριον*) is in the LXX. = *הַמָּה, הַמָּה, הַמָּה, בָּעַם, עַבְרָה, הָצָר*, cf. Ps. vi. 8; Ecclus. xxvi. 28; = *מָה* in Job xv. 13; Prov. xviii. 14, where it denotes excited feeling.—*Ἐπιθυμέω* in the LXX. represents *חָמַם*, Piel and Hithpael, also *חָמַח*, sometimes likewise *לָחַם, חָמַח, רָחַח, גָּחַח*. *Ἐπιθυμία* in the LXX. = *חָמָה*, and other derivatives from *חָמַח*, and with *ἐπιθύμημα*, *ἐπιθυμητός*, answers to the derivatives of *חָמַח*.

Ἐπιθυμητής, οὗ, ὁ, *one who desires something, e.g. σοφίας*, etc. Herod., Plato, Dem., Xen. in a good sense. But in 1 Cor. x. 6, *ἐ. κακῶν*, like the developed meaning of *ἐπιθυμία*.

Ἱερωσύνη, ἡ, *the office or dignity of a priest*; in Plato and Dem. but seldom; oftener in Plutarch. Once in the LXX. 1 Chron. xxix. 22, *ἔχρισαν αὐτὸν τῷ κυρίῳ εἰς βασιλεία καὶ Σαδὼκ εἰς ἱερωσύνην*, where in the Hebrew we have the concrete *הַכֹּהֵן*. In the N. T. only in Heb. vii. 11, 12 (14, Lachm., Tisch., *περὶ ἱερέων*), 24. Sometimes in the Apocrypha, Ecclus. xlv. 24; 1 Macc. iii. 49, vii. 9; 1 Esdr. v. 38. Also in Josephus.

As distinct from *ἱερατεία*, which is elsewhere employed in the LXX., the word denotes the office as to its *dignity*, *ἱερατεία* as *service*; cf. Ecclus. xlv. 24. Hence it appears that the choice of the word in the Hebrews (instead of *ἱερατεία*, which the author knew, vii. 5) was not merely occasioned by a consideration of better linguistic usage.

Ἱερατεύω, to perform priestly service, to discharge the office of priest; unused in profane Greek; only here and there in later writers, e.g. Herodianus, Heliodorus, Pausanias (and yet *ἱερατεία* in Aristotle), in the same sense as *ἱεραῖσθαι* (*ἱερατός*; cf. *ἱερατικός* in Plato, Arist., and later writers), used in the classics and in Philo. The LXX. employ the word constantly as = כֹּהֵן (once only rendered by *λειτουργεῖν*), Ex. xxviii. 1-4, etc., also = כֹּהֵן, כֹּהֵנִי, 1 Sam. ii. 30; 2 Chron. xxxi. 19; Num. xvi. 10; so also in the Apocrypha and Josephus instead of *ἱεραῖσθαι*. In the N. T. only in Luke i. 8.

Ἱερατεία, as, ἡ, priestly service, priesthood, Arist. Pol. vii. 8, τὴν περὶ τὸ θεῖον ἐπιμέλειαν ἣν καλοῦσιν ἱερατείαν, the fifth and highest among the *ἔργοις* which every commonwealth requires; excepting here the word is rare, and only in late writers, such as Dion. Hal., a current word for the office and position is wanting in profane Greek. Plato once uses ἡ ἱερατική for this, and occasionally we have *ἱερωσύνη* in this sense. LXX. regularly = כֹּהֵן, Ex. xxix. 9; Num. iii. 10, xviii. 1, 7; Josh. xviii. 7, *et al.* Also for the infin. Piel of כָּהַן, Ex. xxxv. 18, xxxix. 43; in the Apocrypha only in Ecclus. xlv. 7. In the N. T. Heb. vii. 5; Luke i. 9.

Ἱεράτευμα, τὸς, τό, only in biblical Greek, and there only in Ex. xix. 6, and the references to this in 1 Pet. ii. 5, 9; 2 Macc. ii. 17. (a) In 2 Macc. ii. 17, ὁ θεὸς ὁ σώσας τὸν πάντα λαὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀποδοὺς τὴν κληρονομίαν πᾶσι καὶ τὸ βασίλειον, καὶ τὸ ἱεράτευμα, καὶ τὸν ἀγιασμόν; like *ἀγιασμός* and *βασίλειον*, it denotes a **rank** or **dignity** belonging to the entire people, not the priesthood established in Israel; cf. Grimm *in loc.* (b) Ex. xix. 6, ἔσεσθέ μοι βασίλειον ἱεράτευμα, מִיִּיִּהֶם כֹּהֲנֵי, it designates **the people collectively as of this rank**, = **priesthood**, and the same in the citation of 1 Pet. ii. 5, 9. See *βασίλειος*.

Ἱερόθυτος, ον, according to Phryn. (*Ecl.*, ed. Lobeck, 169) in lieu of the older *θεόθυτος*, but, as Lobeck observes, not identical, for in Aristoph. *Aves*, 1268, *θεόθυτον* in lieu of *ἱερόθυτον δάπεδον* would be inappropriate. According to usage, it is applied to *the flesh of the sacrifice*, Arist. *De mirabil.* 123, οἱ (ἰκτῖνοι) παρὰ μὲν τῶν διὰ τῆς ἀγορᾶς τὰ κρέα φερόντων ἀρπάξουσιν, τῶν δὲ ἱεροθύτων οὐχ ἄπτονται. Arist. *Oec.* ii. 20; Plut. *Conv.* viii. 8. 3 (729 C), ἐγείντο τῶν ἱεροθύτων. Thus in 1 Cor. x. 28, Lachm., Tisch., Treg., instead of *εἰδωλόθυτον* (characterizing the *ἱερόθυτον* occurring only in biblical and ecclesiastical Greek), 4 Macc. v. 1; Acts xv. 29; 1 Cor. viii. 1, 4, 7, 10, x. 19; Rev. ii. 14, 20; in ecclesiastical Greek also *δαιμονόθυτον*; cf. 1 Cor. x. 20.

Ἱερόσυλος, ου, ὁ, robber of temples, Xen. *Hell.* i. 7. 10; *Mem.* i. 2. 62, with
T

κλέπτων, τοιχωρυχῶν, ἀνδραποδιζόμενος, as in *Apol. Soc.* 25; Plato, *Legg.* viii. 831. 7-9, 856 C. Plut. *Sol.* xvii. 1. Aristotle, *Pol.* v. 4. So in 2 Macc. iv. 42; Acts xix. 37. Cf. *ἱεροσυλία*, 2 Macc. xiii. 6.—As to *ἱεροσυλεῖν* in Rom. ii. 22, the word always denotes robbery of temples, and the reference cannot be to the mere curtailing of the temple offerings (Mal. i. 8, 12, 13, iii. 10; von Hofmann). Standing in antithesis with *βδελυσ. τὰ εἶδωλα*, the reference cannot be to the Jewish sanctuary, and therefore not to Jer. vii. 9-11; Matt. xxi. 13. The word can only signify an offence with regard to idols, and this alone answers to the preceding antitheses. Cf. Josephus, *Ant.* iv. 8. 10, where the command in Ex. xxii. 28 is applied as a command for tolerance; *βλασφημεῖτο μηδεὶς θεοῦς οὗς πόλεις ἄλλαι νομίζουσι μὴ συλᾶν ἱερὰ ξενικά, μηδ' ἂν ἐπωνομασμένον ἢ τινὲ θεῷ κειμήλιον λαμβάνειν*. This passage has, of course, no force as explaining the special act named in Rom. ii. 22; but the passage does not need it. Deut. vii. 25, 26 puts the meaning beyond doubt. Cf. also Delitzsch, *Römerbr. in das Hebr. übers.* p. 77.

Ἱλεως. In the LXX. *Ἱλεως εἶναι* is = *הָלַם*, 2 Chron. vi. 21, 25, 27, 39, vii. 14; Jer. v. 1, 7, xxxi. 34, xxxvi. 3, l. 20; *Ἱλεως γίνεσθαι*, Amos vii. 2; *הָלַם*, Deut. xxi. 11; *הָלַם*, Ex. xxxii. 11.

Ἱλάσκομαι, deponent middle. The word is employed of men in Plut. *Anton.* lxvii. 7, *ἱλάσασθαι Καίσαρα*, to propitiate Caesar; *Cat. min.* lxi. 4, *ἱλασόμενοι τὴν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὀργὴν τοῦ Καίσαρος*. *Ἱλάσκεσθαι* does not occur in the Apocrypha, and but seldom in the LXX., e.g. 2 Kings xxiv. 4; Lam. iii. 41 = *הָלַם*. But *ἐξιλάσκεσθαι* is frequent, Prov. xvi. 14, *ἐξιλ. θυμόν*. Cf. Polyb. iii. 112. 9, *θεοὺς καὶ ἀνθρώπους*; xxxii. 25. 7; i. 68. 4, *τὴν ὀργὴν τινος*. The passive, 1 Sam. iii. 14; *τινά* or *τί τινι*, Ezek. xvi. 62; cf. *ἐναντι κυρίου περὶ τινος*, Lev. x. 17; Num. xxxi. 50. *τὰς ἁμαρτίας*, Eccles. iii. 3, 30, xx. 28, xxviii. 5. Often by itself, Lev. vi. 30, 37, viii. 15, xvi. 10; 2 Sam. xxi. 3. —That the Hebrew *כָּסַף* means to cover is clear from Gen. xxxii. 11, 1 Sam. xii. 3, 2 Sam. xxi. 3, 4 (cf. Gen. xx. 26; Job ix. 24), and its object primarily is not the guilt, but the offended person. Religiously used, God or the priest is the covering subject, the guilt or the sinner is the object; cf. Wellhausen, *Gesch. Israels*, i. 66; Riehm, *Der Begriff der Sühne im A. T.* (Gotha 1877).

Ἱλαστήριον. Philo, *De vita Mos.* 3, ii. 650. 1, speaks thus regarding the Capporeth, *τῆς κιβωτοῦ ἐπίθεμα ὡσανεὶ πῶμα τὸ λεγόμενον ἐν ἱεροῖς βίβλοις ἱλαστήριον*. *Ibid.* 12, *τὸ δ' ἐπίθεμα τὸ προσαγορευόμενον ἱλαστήριον*. *De Cherub.* i. 143. 25, *καὶ γὰρ ἀντιπρόσωπά φασιν εἶναι νέοντα πρὸς τὸ ἱλαστήριον ἐτέροις*. Therefore in Heb. ix. 5 also the Capporeth is meant, and Rom. iii. 25, *ὃν προέθετο ὁ θεὸς ἱλαστήριον διὰ πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι*, must be taken in the same sense. As we are moving in the range of biblical representations, and have not to do with the "propitiatory gifts" of profane usage, or with the analogy of *καθατήριον*, *χαριστήριον*, *εὐχαριστήριον*, *σωτήριον*, it is clear that the subject of the verb *προέθετο* is God. This

exactly corresponds with the range of the Scripture conception expressed by ἰλάσκεσθαι, and as we have still further reference to the *cultus* of sacrifice in the words ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι (see αἷμα), the choice can only be between the two significations *sin-offering* and *Capporeth*. But no word is more inappropriate to *sin-offering* as προέθετο, unless it be regarded as a bad rendering or useless extension of the thought expressed in Lev. xix. 11, or an inadmissible change of it with the insertion of ἐαυτῷ. Nothing therefore remains but to take ἰλαστήριον as = *Capporeth*, whereby all the words retain their natural force, and any seeming tautology or incongruity is obviated. Ἰλαστ. and αἷμα are thus adequately distinguished, the expression ἰλ. ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι is explained, προέθετο becomes perfectly appropriate, and διὰ πίστεως assumes its rightful place. The *Capporeth*, according to Ex. xxv. 22, Lev. xvi. 2, was the central seat and focus of the divine presence, and so Christ, in His attribute as the sacrifice offered for us, is this ἰλαστήριον, and in HIM we (by means of faith) have this saving and gracious presence. With the rendering *sin-offering* διὰ πίστεως would follow altogether too abruptly. The whole thought answers perfectly to the facts that blood of the victim on the great day of atonement became what it is said to have been when sprinkled on the *Capporeth*, and that Christ is what He is ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ αἵματι, whereas the O. T. high priest had to make atonement for himself by the sprinkling of another's blood upon the *Capporeth* (cf. Heb. ix. 25). How fully the *Capporeth* was centre of the O. T. *cultus* appears also from 1 Chron. xxviii. 11, where the temple is called חֶבֶל הַבַּיִת, LXX. οἶκος τοῦ ἐξίλασμού; compare 1 Kings vi. 5, חֶבֶל הַבַּיִת; Targ. חֶבֶל הַבַּיִת. Philo calls it, *De vita Mos. l.c.*, σύμβολον τῆς ἰλεω τοῦ θεοῦ δυνάμεως. The last question is whether the readers of the Epistle could have thought of the *Capporeth*, and whether, in order to remind them of it, the article or τὸ ἰλαστήριον ἡμῶν should have been written. Remembering the intimate acquaintance with the O. T., which especially in the Epistle to the Romans the apostle takes for granted in his readers, there can be no question on the first point. As to the absence of the article, this would indeed be decisive if the expression were in the Epistle to the Hebrews, where the theme is the interpretation of O. T. types, or if it were like 1 Cor. v. 7, where in distinguishing from the O. T. Passover the article is requisite; but here we have the simple and clear conception. Delitzsch accordingly rightly translates חֶבֶל הַבַּיִת אֲשֶׁר מִצַּחֲוֵי הָאֱלֹהִים וְנִגְנָהּ. See his work, *Brief an d. Römer*, p. 79.

Ἰστημι, also as already in Herod. and in later Attic Greek ἰστάω, but only in the present; in biblical Greek mainly the participle ἰστῶν, Ecclus. xxvii. 26; 1 Macc. ii. 27; Job vi. 2; Isa. xlv. 26; indicative, 1 Macc. viii. 1, ἰστῶσιν; cf. Theodot. Dan. ii. 20, καθιστᾶ; LXX. μεθιστῶν. In the N. T. only in Rom. iii. 31, νόμον ἰστῶμεν, Rec.; but Lachm., Tisch., Treg. read ἰστάνομεν from the other form ἰστάνω, which is rarer in profane Greek, is not in the O. T., but often appears in the N. T., especially in its compound forms. The other tenses as in profane Greek, στήσω, ἔστησα, ἔστην, ἔστηκα, whose plural always has the full form ἑστήκαμεν, Rom. v. 2; ἑστήκατε, Deut. xxix. 10;

Acts i. 11; 2 Cor. i. 24; but the infin. always ἐστάναι, the participle usually ἐστώς, ἐστῶσα, ἐστός (in MSS. also the neuter ἐστός, see Winer, § 14. 1), but also frequently ἐστηκώς, 1 Sam. xxviii. 20; Jer. xviii. 20, lii. 12; Zech. iii. 4, 7, xiv. 12; Dan. xii. 1; Matt. xxvii. 47; Mark ix. 1, xi. 5, xiii. 14; John iii. 29, vi. 22; Rev. xviii. 10. Pluperfect εἰστήκειν in the 3rd plural instead of εἰστήκεισαν, also ἐστήκεισαν, Rev. vii. 11, Tisch. ed. 7 (whereas the ἐστήκεισαν of the Rec. text is quite unsupported). Fut. middle στήσομαι; aor. passive ἐστάθην, future σταθήσομαι.

(I.) In the present, imperf. fut. 1 aor. and pass. (also in the middle in the sense for or of oneself to set up), transitively = to set up, to make to stand; but the pass. and mid. do not appear in this sense in the N. T., the 1 aor. pass. has there an intrans. meaning; but, on the other hand, cf. Ecclus. xlv. 23, ἐστάθη αὐτῷ διαθήκη εἰρήνης. In the LXX. = the Hiphil of עָנַן, עָנַן, and עָנַן, also sometimes = עָנַן, עָנַן, et al., and when it stands for the setting up of a price = עָנַן. (a) Generally to set up or place, τί or τινά with statement of the place; ἐν μέσῳ, Matt. xviii. 2; Acts iv. 7, and often; ἐπί τι, Matt. iv. 5; Luke iv. 9; ἐκ δεξιῶν, Matt. xxv. 13; παρ' ἑαυτῷ, Luke ix. 47, to set apart or set up for some object, in order to do something, or that something may be done to one, e.g. μάρτυρας, Acts vi. 13; cf. xxii. 30, τὸν Παῦλον ἔστησαν εἰς αὐτούς; iv. 7, v. 27, vi. 6, i. 23, ἔστησαν δύο . . . καὶ ἔδωκαν κλήρους αὐτοῖς καὶ ἔπεσεν ὁ κλήρος κ.τ.λ. (b) To raise, to lift up, to erect, e.g. τεῖχην, στήλην, etc., to set up something that it may stand upright. Then figuratively like the German aufrichten, e.g. καρδίαν, Pind. Pyth. iii. 170, τινὰ ἐς ὀρθόν, to give strength to, Eur. Suppl. 1290. Similarly Rom. xiv. 1, δυνατεῖ ὁ κύριος στήσαι αὐτόν (see II. b); Jude 24, ὑμᾶς στήσαι κατενώπιον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ ἀμώμους ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει. To this belongs also Rom. iii. 31, νόμον ἱστάνομεν, we establish the law; x. 3, τὴν ἰδίαν δικαιοσύνην; Heb. x. 9, ἀναιρεῖ τὸ πρῶτον, ἵνα τὸ δεύτερον στήσῃ. Hence also (c) to appoint, to determine, e.g. ἑορτήν. Thus Acts xvii. 31, ἡμέραν ἐν ᾗ μέλλει κρίνειν. (d) Of a purchase price, Matt. xxvi. 15, ἔστησαν αὐτῷ τριάκοντα ἀργύρια, literally, to put in the balance, to weigh, Herod., Xen., Plato, et al.; cf. 2 Sam. xiv. 26, ἔστησε τὴν τρίχα τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ; 2 Esdr. viii. 25, and often; Job vi. 2, xxviii. 15; Isa. xl. 12; Zech. xi. 12, et al., therefore ἱστάναι τινί τι, to weigh something for one, Jer. xxxii. 9. With this it is best and simplest to connect Acts vii. 60, μὴ στήσης αὐτοῖς τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ταύτην; cf. Job xxxi. 6; Dan. v. 27. This is at least a figure borrowed from a well-known phrase and not far-fetched, whereas the rendering = do not fasten this sin upon them, as if in antithesis with ἀφιέναι τὰς ἁμ., is a form of expression linguistically unusual, and ignores the origin of the biblical ἀφιέναι τι from the ἀφιέναι τινα of profane Greek. (Delitzsch translates it, changing the figure, by עָנַן, according to the analogy of Job x. 14.)

(II.) Intransitive, 2nd aor. perf. pluperf., likewise the middle with the meaning to place oneself, to tread (but does not appear in the N. T. save in Rev. xviii. 15), 2nd aor. passive, = to stand; LXX. = עָמַד, עָמַד Niphal, קָיָם. (a) Literally with an adverb or preposition, such as ἐκεῖ, ὧδε, ἔξω, μακρόθεν, παρά, πρὸς, et al.; without these, Matt. vi. 5,

xx. 6, *et al.*; 1 aor. pass. Mark xiii. 9; Luke xix. 8, *et al.*; by itself, in contrast with any movement=*to stand still*, Matt. xx. 32; Mark x. 49; Luke viii. 44; Acts viii. 38; 1 aor. pass. Luke xviii. 40. (b) Figuratively, ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, John viii. 44; ἐν τῷ εὐαγγ., 1 Cor. xv. 1; ἐν χάριτι, Rom. v. 2; cf. 1 Pet. v. 12, εἰς ἣν ἐστήκατε; Tisch. ed. 8, στήτε, equivalent to *to find oneself therein*, or more concretely perhaps=*to have one's standing place therein*. As to the absolute *to stand*, *to stand fast or firm*, as it is used, *e.g.*, in contrast with φεύγειν, Hom. Od. vi. 199, *et al.*, Nahum ii. 8, and the transitive ἰστάναι, *to set up on high*, *to place upright*, this usage is found for the most part in the N. T. and in Paul's writings. Thus where it is joined with an adj. ἐδραῖος, 1 Cor. vii. 37; τέλειος, Col. iv. 12, cf. Eph. vi. 14, which is not akin to the adverbial qualifications ἀδίκως, ὀρθῶς ἵστασθαι in Polyb. Then (c) absolutely, always according to the connection,=*to stand fast*, *to remain firm*, *to keep one's ground*, *to continue*, Eph. vi. 13, ἵνα δυνηθῆτε ἀντιστῆναι καὶ ἅπαντα κατεργασάμενοι στήναι; 1 Macc. iv. 18; Rev. vi. 17, ἦλθεν ἡ ἡμέρα τῆς ὀργῆς αὐτῶν καὶ τίς δύναται στήναι; Acts xxvi. 22, ἄχρι τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης ἔστηκα μαρτυρόμενος. So=*to stand fast*, not=*to be found in a right position morally*, but as opposed to πίπτειν in its corresponding import, 1 Cor. x. 12, ὁ δοκῶν ἐστάναι βλεπέτο μὴ πῆσθαι, not of a state of grace as such, but of *abiding* therein as contrasted with corruption and ruin; cf. ver. 8; 2 Cor. i. 24, τῇ γὰρ πίστει ἐστήκατε (not to be likened to Polyb. xxi. 9. 3, ἔστη τῇ διανοίᾳ, *confirmatus est animo*). Cf. Rom. xiv. 4, τῷ ἰδίῳ κυρίῳ στήκει ἢ πίπτει σταθήσεται δέ, δύναται γὰρ ὁ κύριος στῆσαι αὐτόν. In like manner Rom. xi. 20, τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ ἐξεκλάσθησαν, σὺ δὲ τῇ πίστει ἔστηκας, is not to be likened to ἐν χάριτι στήναι, but expresses a contrast to the ruin experienced by others. This Pauline use of the verb both answers to the connection and harmonizes with the examples met with in profane Greek, Plut. *conv. disp.* v. 7. 5 (682 E), τὰ σώματα προσελθόντα μέχρι τῆς ἄκρας ἀκμῆς οὐχ ἔστηκεν ἀλλὰ ῥέπει καὶ ταλαντεύεται πρὸς τὸ ἐναντίον; *Aporrh. Scip.* (201 F), οὐ γὰρ οἷόν τε τὴν Ῥώμην πεσεῖν Σκιπιῶνος ἐστῶτος, οὐδὲ ζῆν Σκιπιῶνα τῆς Ῥώμης πεσούσης. Compare also, *e.g.*, Dan. xi. 4, 6. Σταθῆναι also is thus used in the N. T. Matt. xii. 25, 26, and parallels, Rom. xiv. 4; Rev. vi. 17; Matt. xviii. 16; 2 Cor. xiii. 1.

Ἀστατέω, *to be unsettled*, very rare in profane Greek; not in the LXX. In the N. T. only in 1 Cor. iv. 11, πεινῶμεν καὶ διψῶμεν καὶ γυμνιτεύομεν καὶ κολαφίζόμεθα καὶ ἀστατούμεθα, therefore denoting a suffering life, whereas in profane Greek, like ἄστατος, it denotes *instability*, *unsteadiness*; cf. Plut. *Crass.* xvii. 1, ἔτι δ' ἀστατούσης χιμῶσι τῆς θαλάσσης; *Consol. ad Apoll.* 5, τὸ τῆς τύχης ἄστατον καὶ ἀβέβαιον.

Ἀναστατόω, an Hellenistic word, according to its construction=*ἀνάστατον ποιεῖν*, but different in meaning in the N. T., and harmonizing therewith only in Aquila and Symmachus. (a)=*To drive out or away*, answering to ἀνάστατος, which follows the use of ἀνίστημι as=*to drive away*, *to scare*, and ἀνάστασις, as=*expulsion*, a sense, however, in which the word does not appear in biblical Greek; accordingly ἀνάστατον

ποιεῖν, *e.g.* the pulling down of a house or the laying waste of a country. Thus the word occurs Symm. Ps. lix. 12, ἀναστάτωσον αὐτούς; LXX. διασκόρπισον αὐτούς; Hebrew שִׁחַד; Isa. xxii. 3, ἀνεστατώθησαν; LXX. πεφεύγασιν; Theodotion, μετεκινήθησαν = נָחַ; Isa. xxxvii. 13, ἀνεστάτωσε καὶ ἐταπείνωσε; Hebrew נָחַ ונָחַ; cf. Delitzsch *in loc.* The middle, Aquila Ps. xi. 1, ἀναστατοῦ εἰς τὸ ὄρος ὡς πέτεινον (LXX., μεταναστεύου = נָח). So also in Harpocrates, ἀνεσκεύαστο, τὸ λεγόμενον ἐν τῷ βίῳ ἀναστατωθῆναι. But (b) in the N. T. it is connected with ἀνίστημι in the sense *to stir up*, Il. i. 191, intransitively *to oppose*, *to mutiny*, Herod. v. 29; Mark iii. 26; it occurs only as = *to stir up*, *to set in an uproar*; Acts xvii. 6, οἱ τὴν οἰκουμένην ἀναστατώσαντες οὗτοι καὶ ἐνθάδε πάρεσιν; xxi. 38, ὁ Αἰγύπτιος ὁ . . . ἀναστατώσας καὶ ἐξαγαγὼν εἰς τὴν ἔρημον κ.τ.λ. In Gal. v. 12, οἱ ἀναστατοῦντες ὑμᾶς, are those described in ver. 7 as οἱ ἐνέκοψαν ὑμᾶς ἀληθείᾳ μὴ πείθεσθαι; compare ver. 10, ὁ ταραύσων ὑμᾶς.

Ἐξανίστημι, (I.) transitive, *to make one rise from*, in various combinations, of the setting out of an enemy, the rising of a people, etc. Soph. *El.* 940, ἡ τοὺς θανόντας ἐξαναστήσω ποτέ = *to cause the dead to rise up*. In biblical Greek, *e.g.* σπέρμα, *i.e.* *to raise up* successors to one, Gen. xix. 32, 34, ἐξαναστήσωμεν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν σπέρμα = נָחַ, Piel; Job iv. 4, ἐξανέστησας ἀσθενούντας = נָחַ. With the same object, Mark xii. 19; Luke xx. 28; in Matt. ἀνίστ. (II.) Intransitive, *to rise from*, so as to emphasize the place whence, *e.g.* ἐκ τοῦ θρόνου, Judg. iii. 20; cf. ἀπὸ τοῦ θρόνου, Jonah iii. 6; ἐκ τῆς ἐνέδρας, Josh. viii. 7; ἐκ μέσου τῆς συναγωγῆς, Num. xxv. 7. Hence also = *to go away*, Gen. xviii. 16, ἐξαναστάντες ἐκεῖθεν. 1 Kings i. 49, ἐξέστησαν καὶ ἐξανέστησαν, according to A. Also, generally, *to arise*, *to raise oneself*, Judg. v. 7, ἐξανέστη Δεββώρα (Alex.). So in the N. T. Acts xv. 5. Cf. Jer. li. 29; Hos. x. 15.

Ἀκατάστατος, ον, *unstable*; in a moral sense often in Plutarch, once in Polyb. In the N. T. Jas. i. 8, ἀκατάστατος ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτοῦ. Tisch., Treg., Westcott, also in Jas. iii. 8, ἀκατάστατον for ἀκατάσχετον. Here it must be equivalent to *what cannot be kept at rest*; cf. Plut. *Amator.* 21 (767 C), ἐπιθυμία ἀκαταστάτῳ. Passively in Isa. liv. 11, ταπεινὴ καὶ ἀκατάστατος, *tossed to and fro*, Hebrew נָחַ; cf. Isa. xlii. 3. Symm. Lam. iv. 14, ἀκατάστατοι ἐγένοντο, LXX. ἐσαλεύθησαν, נָח.

Ἀκατασταςία, ας, ἡ, *disorder*, *tumult*; often in Polyb. with *ταραχή*, Polyb. i. 70. 1, xiv. 9. 6, etc. So in Luke xxi. 9; 2 Cor. vi. 5. Of *disorder within the Christian community*, 2 Cor. xii. 20; 1 Cor. xiv. 33. For the plural, 2 Cor. vi. 5 and xii. 20; compare Polyb. xxxii. 21. 5.—Jas. iii. 16, ὅπου γὰρ ζῆλος καὶ ἐριθεία ἐκεῖ ἀκατασταςία καὶ πᾶν φαῦλον πρᾶγμα. Not in the LXX.

Διχοσταςία, ας, ἡ, *disunion*, Herod., Dem., Dion. Hal. *et al.*, but only occasionally. In biblical Greek not in the LXX., in the Apocrypha 1 Macc. iii. 29 = *distraction*, χάριν τῆς διχοσταςίας ἧς κατεσκεύασεν ἐν τῇ γῇ τοῦ ἄραιο τὰ νόμιμα ἃ ἦσαν ἀφ' ἡμερῶν τῶν πρώτων. The word is used also occasionally by Paul in a sense akin to αἵρεσις, of

divisions, arising from disunion as to doctrine, which distracted the Church, Gal. v. 20, ἐριθείαι, διχοστασίαι, αἵρέσεις. Rom. xvi. 17, τὰς διχοστασίας καὶ τὰ σκάνδαλα παρὰ τὴν διδαχὴν. Also in some MSS. 1 Cor. iii. 3. Διχοστασία is the springing up of party divisions, a step towards sects and heresies; it disturbs the union of the Church, while these latter separate from the union.

Καῖνός is in the LXX. the usual word for נָעֻם, which only seldom is rendered by νέος, Lev. xxiii. 17, xxvi. 10, Num. xxviii. 16, Song vii. 13, where καῖνός would be as suitable. Νέος, νεώτερος answers elsewhere to נָעֻם, also to נָעֻץ, נָעֻץ, and therefore equivalent to *young, not yet old*; whereas καῖνός means *in place of what has been hitherto, in lieu of the old*, synon. πρόσφατος, recens.—Ἀνακαινίζω answers in ecclesiastical Greek to ἀνακαινώω, probably a Pauline word = to make a person a καῖνός; cf. Barn. 6, under ἀνακαινώω. But it cannot have this sense in Heb. vi. 6, on account of the εἰς μετάνοιαν. We must take it, as in Lam. v. 21, as synon. with ἐπιστρέφειν, only stronger than this. In so far as a new condition of mind is begun in repentance (Jer. iv. 3), πάλιν ἀνακαινίζειν τινὰ εἰς μετάνοιαν is = *to help a person afresh to a new beginning in repentance*, not by the action of the teacher or pastor, but by the grace of God; compare the preceding participles and vv. 7, 8.

Ἀκαίρως (ἄκαιρος, ον), ill-timed, unseasonable; in biblical Greek only in Ecclus. xxxv. 4, ἀκαίρως μὴ σοφίζον (cf. xx. 7); 2 Tim. iv. 2, κηρύξον τὸν λόγον, ἐπίστηθι εὐκαιρῶς ἀκαίρως, where, according to ver. 3 (ἔσται γὰρ καιρὸς ὅτε τῆς ὑγιαίνουσας διδασκαλίας οὐκ ἀνέχονται), the reference is to a time seasonable or unseasonable, not to the subject but to the *hearer*, as in Ecclus. xxxv. 4. We may further observe that what is treated of is not a time seasonable or unseasonable to the individual, but the course of time as a whole, and its relation to the word of God. The adj. Ecclus. xxii. 6.

Εὐκαιρος, ον, at a convenient, seasonable time, suitable to the time, well-timed; more frequent in later than in classical Greek. Once in the LXX. Ps. civ. 27, τροφή εὐκαιρος. In the N. T. Mark vi. 21, ἡμέρα εὐκ. Cf. Herodianus, i. 9. 6, καιρὸς εὐκ.; Heb. iv. 16, εἰς εὐκ. βοήθειαν; cf. Ps. ix. 10, βοηθὸς ἐν εὐκαιρίας ἐν θλίψει; x. 1. Plut. *de puer. educ.* 14 (10 E), σοφὸν γὰρ εὐκαιρος σιγὴ καὶ παντὸς λόγου κρείττων. 2 Macc. xiv. 29. Of place, appropriate, suitable, 2 Macc. xv. 20; 3 Macc. v. 44, iv. 11.

Εὐκαίρως, more frequent in the classics than the adj. = *at a convenient time*. In biblical Greek only in Ecclus. xviii. 22, μὴ ἐμποδισθῆς τοῦ ἀποδοῦναι εὐχὴν εὐκαίρως. Mark xiv. 11; 2 Tim. iv. 2.

Εὐκαιρία, ἡ, the right and suitable time. Plato, Polyb., Dion. Hal. In biblical Greek only in Ps. ix. 10, x. 1, cv. 15 = נָעֻץ. Ecclus. xxxviii. 24; 1 Macc. xi. 42; Matt. xxvi. 16; Luke xxii. 6.

Κακός is by no means so frequent in biblical as in profane Greek. In the LXX. it answers to נָרָה, נֶפֶשׁ, for which, however, **πονηρός** stands far oftener (also, occasionally, ἄδικος, ἁμαρτωλός, παράνομος, ἀσεβής). There is this distinction, however, while **κακός** stands more frequently in antithesis with ἀγαθός (Deut. i. 39, xxx. 14; 1 Kings xxxi. 9; 2 Chron. xviii. 17, *et al.*), and less so with καλός (Gen. xxiv. 50; 1 Kings xxii. 8, 18; cf. 2 Cor. xiii. 7; Heb. v. 14), **πονηρός**, on the other hand, stands very rarely in antithesis with ἀγαθός (1 Sam. xxv. 3; 2 Sam. xiii. 22, xiv. 17; Isa. vii. 15), but often over against καλός (Gen. ii. 9, 17, iii. 5, 22; Lev. xxvii. 10, and often; Num. xiii. 20, xxiv. 13; Amos v. 14; Micah iii. 2; Isa. v. 20; Ps. xxxv. 12, where A reads **πονηρὰ** ἀντὶ κακῶν, instead of ἀντὶ καλῶν of B; cf. 2 Sam. xix. 35). Further, we find κακά, τὰ κακά frequently = *badness* and also *sin* as specially evil, and rarely κακόν, but never τὸ κακόν; whereas τὸ **πονηρόν** occurs very often, and in a moral and religious sense as the designation of what is bad or evil, ἐνώπιον, ἐναντί, παρὰ κυρίου; but the plural, with or without the article, only very occasionally, as in Hos. vii. 15; Amos v. 15. Finally, both words appear but rarely as epithets of persons; **κακός**, however, more rarely than **πονηρός**. Upon the whole, it may be affirmed that in the LXX. **πονηρός**, in the ethico-religious sense, prevails; but **κακός** occurs more frequently than **πονηρός** in the physical sense. It is noteworthy that **κακός** never answers to the Hebrew נָפֶשׁ, which is the distinctively religious term for evil, especially when predicated of persons; **πονηρός** only stands for this word in 2 Sam. iv. 11; Isa. liii. 9; it is usually rendered by ἀσεβής, also by ἁμαρτωλός and ἄνομος. Κακά once is employed to render the substantive נָפֶשׁ in Prov. xvi. 13. From all this it is clear, not only that **κακός** has failed to receive any distinctive colouring from biblical usage, but that it was regarded as altogether inappropriate for the biblical conception of evil, and this manifestly because it had become too definitely stamped in profane usage to admit of the addition of the religious import prevailing in Scripture. We find the same thing in the N. T. **Κακός** there is much more rarely used of persons than in the LXX., only in Matt. xxiv. 48; Phil. iii. 2; the substantive **κακός** without the article, Matt. xxi. 41, κακοὺς κακῶς ἀπολέσει; Rev. ii. 2, οὐ δύνη βαστάσαι κακοὺς. Usually τὸ κακόν or κακόν, rarely κακά, τὰ κακά.—**Κακῶς** occurs very seldom in the LXX. in a physical sense, Ezek. xxxiv. 4, κακῶς ἔχειν = הלך. In a moral sense, κακῶς ἐρεῖν, εἰπεῖν = רָא, Ex. xxii. 28. Standing for לָרָה, Lev. xix. 14; Isa. viii. 21; Lev. xx. 9. Rare also in the Apocrypha.—**Κακῶς** is not so rare in the LXX. = נָעַר, Hiphil, Gen. xix. 9; Ex. v. 22, *et al.*; in antithesis with εὐποιεῖν, Isa. xli. 23; with ἀγαθοποιεῖν, Zeph. i. 13. Absolutely = *to do evil*, 1 Kings xvii. 20. Further = נָעַר, Kal and Hiphil, Gen. xv. 13 and often; occasionally used for other words, *e.g.* once = נָעַר, Hiphil, Isa. l. 9.

Κάκωσις, ἡ, oppression, sometimes in the LXX. = נָעַר, נֶפֶשׁ, etc. In the N. T. only in Acts vii. 34.

Καλέω answers to קָרָא (which, more rarely, according to its import, is also rendered

by βοᾶν, ἀναγινώσκειν, κηρύσσειν). The distinctive N. T. use of the word (Luke v. 32; Matt. ix. 13; Mark ii. 17, καλέσαι ἁμαρτωλούς) answers to the use of קרי in Isa. l. 2, *ἐκάλεσα καὶ οὐχ ἦν ὑπακούων*, lxv. 2; also Isa. xli. 9, xlii. 6, xlvi. 11, xlviii. 12, 13, 15, li. 2; compare קרי, Isa. xliii. 1, xlv. 3, 4; Ex. xxxi. 2 = *to call a person for a definite purpose* (hence synonymous with *to select or choose*), *to call that he may hear, come, and do that which is incumbent upon him, or be what is designed for him*. The theme depends upon the calling subject. The subject, *i.e.* he who calls, and the purpose for which he is called, together impart to the word its special meaning, so that in linguistic usage it becomes a *term. techn.* for special relationships, as, *e.g.*, καλεῖν is employed in profane Greek for a summons or prosecution in law. In Isaiah the subject of קרי is God, and thus also it is with the N. T. καλεῖν. It denotes a **call from God** or in God's name, a **call to participate in the revelation of grace** (cf. also Rom. iv. 17, καλοῦντος τὰ μὴ ὄντα ὡς ὄντα, and especially the expression κλητὴ ἀγία = קרי קרי, Ex. xii. 16; Lev. xxiii. 2 sqq.).

Ἐγκαλέω, **to accuse, to bring a charge against**, a signification springing from the use of καλεῖν to denote legal proceedings, because the prosecution may be said to take hold of the person = *to serve a summons upon him*; cf. ἐνυβρίζειν τινί, ἐγγεῶν τινί, sometimes τινί τινος, τινί ἐπὶ τινι. It is used both of legal and non-legal accusation in Xen., Dem., Isocr., Plut. *et al.*, usually with τί τινι. Rare in the LXX., Zech. i. 4 = קרי; Prov. xix. 5, ὁ ἐγκαλῶν ἀδικῶς = קרי. The passive, Ex. xxii. 8, πάσης ἀπωλείας τῆς ἐγκαλουμένης, as in profane Greek, τὰ ἐγκαλούμενα, *the accusations* = קרי. In the Apocrypha, Ecclus. xlvi. 19; Wisd. xii. 12; in both cases without the object of the thing. In the N. T. only in the active, and once by Paul, Acts xix. 38, xxiii. 28, δι' ἣν ἐνεκάλουν αὐτῷ. Rom. viii. 33, τίς ἐγκαλέσει κατὰ ἐκλεκτῶν; = *to bring an accusation or charge against*. The passive, of the accused person, and indeed ἐγκαλεῖσθαι περὶ τινος, *to be accused of a thing*, Acts xix. 40, xxiii. 29, xxvi. 2, 7.

Ἐγκαλημα, **τος, τό, (a) accusation, complaint, (b) reproach**. Thuc., Dem., Aristotle, and later writers. Not in the LXX. or Apocrypha. In the N. T. Acts xxiii. 29, xxv. 16 = *reproach*.

Ἀνεγκλητος, **ον, irreproachable**, one against whom a reproach cannot be raised (also when it is said to be raised), Xen. *Hell.* vi. 1, 4, οὐκ ἀνεγκλητος ἂν δικαίως εἴης ἐν τῇ πατρίδι. 3 Macc. v. 31. In the N. T. only in Paul's writings, and (a) with reference to God's judgment, 1 Cor. i. 8, ἕως τέλους ἀνεγκλήτους, and Col. i. 22, παραστήσαι ὑμᾶς ἁγίους καὶ ἀμώμους καὶ ἀνεγκλήτους κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ. (b) In a social sense with reference to the judgment of the Christian community, 1 Tim. iii. 10; Tit. i. 6, 7, among the directions for the choice of πρεσβ. or ἐπίσκ.

Ἐπικαλέω. Absolutely = *to call upon God for oneself*, Rom. x. 14, πῶς οὖν ἐπικαλέσονται εἰς ὃν οὐκ ἐπίστευσαν. Acts vii. 59, ἐλιθοβόλουν τὸν Στέφανον

ἐπικαλούμενον καὶ λέγοντα κύριε κ.τ.λ. In the LXX. answering to the Hebrew we usually have ἐπικαλεῖσθαι τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου, and occasionally τὸν κύριον, τὸν θεόν, very rarely the absolute ἐπικαλεῖσθαι (Ps. iv. 1). In the Apocrypha ἐπικ. τὸν θεόν, τὸν κύριον usually; τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου only in Judith xvi. 2, ἐπὶ τῷ ὄν. and the absolute ἐπικ. nowhere.

Συνπαρακαλέω, (a) *to call upon, summon, order together*, Xen., Plato, Plut. (b) *At once, together to animate or rouse*, Polyb. v. 83. 3. Connected with this in the N. T. is Rom. i. 12, συναπαρκήθηται ἐν ὑμῖν, parallel with ver. 11, εἰς τὸ στηριχθῆναι ὑμᾶς. See παρακαλέω.—Παράκλησις in the LXX. signifies *comfort* = מְנַחֵם, Ps. xciv. 19; Isa. lxvi. 11; Jer. xvi. 6; compare Job xxi. 2; Jer. xxxi. 9; Isa. lvii. 18; Hos. xiii. 14; Nahum iii. 7; Isa. xxx. 7. Also 1 Macc. xii. 9, παράκλησιν ἔχοντες τὰ βιβλία τὰ ἅγια; 2 Macc. xv. 11.

Προκαλέω, *to call forth*; in the middle *to challenge, to call out to fight*, Homer, Xen., generally *to challenge, to provoke, to rouse*; Polyb. i. 1. 4, 4. 2, with παρορμήσαι in a good or bad sense. In the latter, as the context shows in Gal. v. 26, ἀλλήλους προκαλούμενοι, ἀλλήλοις φθονοῦντες. The preceding μὴ γενώμεθα κενόδοξοι shows that the reference is to an incitement in order to outbid, as προκ. is used, e.g., of toasts or pledges at feasts.

Καλός. Our review of the biblical use of this word leads to the same observation as in the case of κακός. This word, which in profane Greek is so prominent, of such rich and wide import, not only falls into the background in the Bible,—in the O. T. still more than in the N. T.,—but even when it is used it is influenced in a very small degree by biblical thought. The biblical ideal is different from the profane. In place of the contrast of καλός and κακός there appears in biblical Greek that of ἀγαθός and πονηρός in a sense most religiously defined, and with the limitation that καλός, ἀγαθός, κακός hardly ever characterize persons, the antithesis is neuter between καλόν and κακόν, ἀγαθόν and πονηρόν. In lieu of the classical καλός, or καλὸς καὶ ἀγαθός for persons, we have δίκαιος in a distinctively biblical sense. The significance of this for the ethics of both is obvious.

Καλύπτω, with its derivatives, answers to the Hebrew כָּסַב, Kal and Piel, for the most part besides the simple form for κατακαλύπτω, also for περιβάλλω, rarely for κρύπτω, which is = כָּסַב, Hiphil, כָּסַב, Hiphil, and כָּסַב, from which also καλύπτω is distinguished as *to cover from, to hide, to do away with*, not, as a rule, an important distinction. But κρύπτειν never, like καλύπτειν, appears with ἁμαρτία as its object. Ἀποκαλύπτω again = *to reveal the concealed*, e.g. ἀσχημοσύνη, Ex. xx. 6, Lev. xviii. 7, is synon. with γνωρίζειν in Dan. ii. 29, Ps. xcviii. 3, Eph. iii. 3, and answers mainly to כָּסַב, 1 Sam. ii. 29, iii. 7, 21; Prov. xi. 13; Ps. xcviii. 3; Isa. liii. 1, lvi. 1; Dan. x. 1; Chaldee, כָּסַב, Dan. ii. 19, 22, 28–30, 47. See Jer. xi. 20. In the O. T. its object is

also the organs of perception, *ἀ. ὀφθαλμούς*, Num. xxii. 31, xxiv. 4; Ps. cxix. 19; cf. 2 Sam. vi. 20; τὸ ὥτίον, 1 Sam. ix. 15, xx. 2, 13, xxii. 8, 17; 2 Sam. vii. 27; cf. Ruth iv. 3. Ἀποκάλυψις also in Ecclus. xi. 27, xxii. 22, xli. 23.

Κανών, ὄνος, ὁ, a straight staff, *e.g.* Judith xiii. 6, προσελθούσα τῷ κανόνι τῆς κλίνης ὃς ἦν πρὸς κεφαλῆς; cf. κανόνες αὐλαιῶν, Ath. xii. 538 D, *garden stakes*, usually *standard measure*, and (I.) technologically, *measuring rod, standard*, Aeschinus in *Ctesiph.* pp. 82, 25, ὥσπερ ἐν τῇ τεκτονικῇ ὅταν εἰδέναι βουλόμεθα τὸ ὀρθὸν καὶ τὸ μὴ τὴν κανόνα προσφέρωμεν. So in the LXX. once, Micah vii. 4, ὡς βαδίζων ἐπὶ κανόνος ἐν ἡμέρᾳ σκοπιᾶς, meaningless translation of the Heb. כַּנְוָן, for which, as Schleusner thinks, we should read כַּנְוָן, which indeed explains the translation, but gives no sense in the connection, unless ἐπὶ κανόνος be = "employed about the measure or standard." Further, Aquila in Job xxxviii. 5, κανόνα for σπαρτίον of the LXX., Symm. σχοινίον μέτρον, and in Ps. xix. 4, Symm. reads ὁ κανὼν αὐτῶν, where the LXX. εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν ἐξῆλθεν ὁ φθόγγος αὐτῶν. Figuratively, 2 Cor. x. 13, ἡμεῖς οὐκ εἰς τὰ ἄμετρα κανχησόμεθα, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸ μέτρον τοῦ κανόνος κ.τ.λ., where μέτρον and κανὼν are distinguished as measure or degree, and direction or scope, compare what follows; κανὼν refers to the direction assigned to the apostle; cf. vv. 15, 16, according to which his conduct would be judged whether or not it went beyond the measure; κανὼν is not here *measuring staff*, but *standard for judging*; cf. II. (a). See Aristotle, *Eth. Nic.* iii. 6, διαφέρει — ὁ σπουδαῖος τῷ τάληθές ἐν ἐκάστοις ὁρᾶν, ὥσπερ κανὼν καὶ μέτρον αὐτῶν ὦν. (II.) Figuratively, *standard, rule*, (a) not because it prescribes or orders something, but because the thing is measured or judged by it, hence synon. with κριτήριον, Sext. Emp. *dogm.* i. 27, τὰ μὲν ἐκτὸς κριτήρια οἶον κανόνας καὶ διαβήτας σταθμία τε καὶ τρυτάνας. Thus he describes τὸ τῆς ἀληθείας κριτήριον as κανὼν δοκιμαστικός, *Log.* ii. 3. Plut. often combines καν. καὶ κριτήριον; *de aud. poet.* viii. (25 E) describes the just and wise of whom poets sing as κανόνες ἀρετῆς ἀπάσης καὶ ὀρθότητος. Cf. Lucn. *Conv.* vii., κανόνα οἱ πολλοὶ ὀνομάζουσιν αὐτὸν ἐς τὴν ὀρθότητα τῆς γνώμης ἀποβλέποντες. Aristot. *l.c.* In this sense the word occurs, Dem. *pro cor.* xviii. 296, τὴν δ' ἐλευθερίαν καὶ τὸ μηδένα ἔχειν δεσπότην αὐτῶν, ἃ τοῖς προτέροις Ἕλλησιν ὄροι τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἦσαν καὶ κανόνες. So Lucn. *de hist. conscr.* 5, *Harmonid.* 3, *Zeux.* 2. It differs from νόμος in that it designates the νόμος itself as the standard for judging. Lycurg. *adv. Leocr.* cxlix. 2, ὅσα γὰρ τῶν ἀδικημάτων νόμος τις διώρικε, ῥάδιον τούτῳ τῷ κανόνι χρωμένους κολάζειν τοὺς παρανομοῦντας. Chrysippus says in a fragment printed by Spengel, *artium scriptores*, p. 177, ὁ νόμος πάντων ἐστὶ βασιλεὺς θεῶν τε καὶ ἀνθρωπίνων πραγμάτων· δεῖ δὲ αὐτὸν προστάτην εἶναι τῶν καλῶν καὶ αἰσχυρῶν . . . καὶ κατὰ τοῦτο κανόνα τε εἶναι δικαίων καὶ ἀδίκων. Aeschin. in *Ctesiph. l.c.*, οὐ γὰρ ἀόριστον ἐστὶ τὸ δίκαιον ἀλλ' ὠρισμένον τοῖς νόμοις οὕτω καὶ ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς ταῖς παρανόμων παρακείται κανὼν τοῦ δικαίου. Answering to this κανὼν is used by the Alexandrian grammarians to denote sum-total of the oldest noteworthy writers, etc. Hence it easily

passes (b) to signify a rule by which one has to judge himself, or by which anything is judged, *e.g.* Plut. *Consol. ad Ap.* p. 103 B, τῆς φρονήσεως καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀρετῶν κανόνες οἷς πρὸς ἀμφοτέρα χρηστέον, a sense in which Philo often uses the word, without further distinguishing νόμος and κανών, save that νόμος refers to Israel's divine law; cf. Credner, *Gesch. des Kanons*, p. 11 sq.—In the N. T. only in Paul's writings, and besides the passage above cited only in Gal. vi. 16, ὅσοι τῷ κανόνι τοῦτοφ στοιχήσουσι, with reference to ver. 15, and therefore in the sense of *standard*, or *judging*, or *criterion*. In the same sense Phil. iii. 16, τῷ αὐτῷ στοιχεῖν κανόνι, but here the word must be cancelled.—In ecclesiastical Greek it signifies the *standard-giving rule*, *ordination*, *prescription*, Clem. Rom. *ad Cor.* i. 1. 3, ἐν τῷ κανόνι τῆς ὑποταγῆς ὑπαρχούσας; *ibid.* vii. 2, ἔλθωμεν ἐπὶ τὸν εὐκλεῆ καὶ σεμνὸν τῆς παραδόσεως ἡμῶν κανόνα καὶ ἴδωμεν τί καλὸν . . . ἐνώπιον τοῦ ποιήσαντος ἡμᾶς; xli. 1, ἐν ἀγαθῇ συνειδήσει ὑπάρχων, μὴ παρεκβαίνων τὸν ὠρισμένον τῆς λειτουργίας αὐτοῦ κανόνα. Here it stands similarly to 2 Cor. x. 13. Afterwards it comes to denote the *standard-giving norm*, and thus it comes to be applied to Holy Scripture; cf. Credner, *l.c.*; Strack in Herzog u. Plitt, *Realenc.* vi. 412 sq.

Κεῖμαι, to lie, seldom in the LXX., Josh. iv. 6; 2 Sam. xiii. 22; 2 Esdr. vi. 1; Isa. ix. 4; Jer. xxiv. 1, for various Hebrew words. Oftener in the Apocrypha; far oftener in the N. T. (a) to lie, to lie there, of men, Luke ii. 12, 16, βρέφος ἐν φάτῃ; Matt. xxviii. 6; Luke xxiii. 53; cf. John xx. 12, ὅπου ἔκειτο τὸ σῶμα. Of things which are there, John ii. 6, ὑδρίαι; cf. Xen. *Oec.* viii. 19, εὐκρινῶς κείμεναι χύτραι; Jer. xxiv. 1 = 𐤒𐤓𐤕; John xix. 20, σκεῦος, *et al.*; Matt. iii. 10 and Luke iii. 9, ἡ ἀξίνη πρὸς τὴν ρίζαν τῶν δένδρων κεῖται, not *is laid*, but *lies there*, and needs only to be taken up; 1 Cor. iii. 11, θεμέλιον ἄλλον οὐδεὶς δύναται θεῖναι παρὰ τὸν κείμενον; 2 Cor. iii. 15, κάλυμμα ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν κεῖται; ver. 16, περιαιρεῖται; Rev. iv. 2, θρόνος ἔκειτο ἐν τῷ οὐρ.; cf. Dan. vii. 9, οἱ θρόνοι ἐτέθησαν. Generally = *to find oneself at a place* or *in a state*, 2 Macc. iii. 11, ἀνὴρ ἐν ὑπεροχῇ κείμενος; 2 Macc. iv. 31, οἱ ἐν ἀξιώματι κείμ.; ver. 34, ἐν ὑποψίᾳ. Thus 1 John v. 19, ὁ κόσμος ἐν τῷ πονηρῷ κεῖται, where the masculine rendering of πον. according to vv. 18, 19a is to be preferred, and κεῖται is to be explained as in Polyb. vi. 14. 6, ἐν τῇ συγκλήτῃ κεῖται, *lies in the senate*, is dependent thereupon; Soph. *Oed. C.* 247, ἐν ὑμῖν ὡς θεῷ κείμεθα, *we rely upon you*; cf. ver. 18, ὁ πονηρὸς οὐχ ἄπτεται αὐτοῦ. Of places = *to lie*, *to be placed* or *laid*, Matt. v. 14; Rev. xx. 16. Of accumulated money or goods, Luke xii. 19; Aristoph. *Ran.* 624 (not = “to be laid out,” which would require an addition such as ἐπὶ τῇ τούτου τραπέζῃ, Isoc. 367 D). (b) Figuratively, of laws, given, existing, and therefore *in force*; Thuc. v. 105. 2, οὔτε θέντες τὸν νόμον οὔτε κειμένῳ πρῶτοι χρησάμενοι; ii. 37. 3, ὅσοι ἐπ’ ὠφελίᾳ τῶν ἀδικουμένων κείνται καὶ ὅσοι ἀγραφοὶ ὄντες αἰσχύνῃ ὁμολογουμένην φέρουσιν. So 2 Macc. iv. 11; 1 Tim. i. 9, δικαίῳ νόμος οὐ κεῖται. Then with a statement of the purpose, to be there, or find oneself there for a definite object;

Luke ii. 34, *κείται εἰς πτώσιν καὶ ἀνάστασιν πολλῶν καὶ εἰς σημεῖον*; cf. Josh. iv. 6, *ἵνα ὑπάρχωσιν ὑμῖν οὗτοι εἰς σημεῖον κείμενον*, a sign present, not to be overlooked, and significant. Not thus in Phil. i. 16, *εἰς ἀπολογίαν τοῦ εὐ. κείμαι*, where *κείμαι* expresses the position of the imprisoned apostle; but perhaps thus in 1 Thess. iii. 3, *εἰς τοῦτο κείμεθα*.

Ἀντίκειμαι, to lie over against, e.g. Europe to Asia, Herod. vi. 2. 4; to be opposite to, often in Aristotle, in a physical, logical, or moral sense; so too in Plutarch. In biblical Greek in a moral sense = *in a hostile way to stand over against, to be an opponent*, rare in the LXX. = *יָצַב*, Zech. iii. 1; = *רָצַב*, Ex. xxiii. 22 (strengthening of *רָצַב*, *ἐχθρεύειν*); Job xiii. 25 = *הָרַב*; 2 Macc. x. 26. In the N. T. = *to be contrary to, to be opposed to*, not of the act of opposing, but of the state of opposition; 1 Tim. i. 10, *εἴ τι ἕτερον τῇ ὑγιαίνουσῃ διδασκαλίᾳ ἀντίκειται*; Gal. v. 17, *ταῦτα ἀλλήλοις ἀντίκειται*, are contrary to one another. Especially the substantival participle *ὁ ἀντικείμενος*, standing opposite to as an enemy, the opponent, peculiar it seems to biblical Greek, LXX. = *מִתְקַבֵּץ*; Esth. ix. 2; Isa. lxvi. 6; *מִתְקַבֵּץ עִמָּם*, 2 Sam. viii. 11; *רָצַב*, Ex. xxiii. 22; *הָרַב*, part. Niphal, Isa. xli. 11; Theodotion = *יָצַב*, Job i. 6. 1 Macc. xiv. 7; 3 Macc. vii. 9; 2 Macc. x. 26. In the N. T. of those who set themselves in opposition to Christ or His disciples (not only oppose or disbelieve), Luke xiii. 17, *πάντες οἱ ἀντικείμενοι αὐτῷ*; xxii. 15, *ἡ οὐ δυνήσονται ἀντιστῆναι ἢ ἀντειπεῖν πάντες οἱ ἀντικείμενοι ὑμῖν*; 1 Cor. xvi. 9; Phil. i. 28. That in 1 Tim. v. 14, *μηδεμίαν ἀφορμὴν διδόναι τῷ ἀντικειμένῳ λοιδορίας χάριν*, the devil is not meant, is evident from Tit. ii. 8; cf. ver. 5. The substantival is used generically; see Krüger, § 50. 3. 4. In 2 Thess. i. 4 it is used to describe the Antichrist as the opposer, the enemy of God, and of all godliness, *ὁ ἀντικείμενος καὶ ὑπεραιρόμενος ἐπὶ πάντα λεγόμενον θεὸν ἢ σέβασμα*.

Κενός in the LXX. is = *עָרֵב*, *רָץ*, or *רָץ*, and with *μάταιος*, *ματαιότης* = *מְטֵר*, occasionally also = *עָרֵב*, *רָץ*, and other words; Isa. xxix. 8, *εἰς κενὸν ἤλπισεν*. *Κενός* denotes the contents, *μάταιος* refers to the design also, *ψευδής* to the form; cf. Job xx. 18; Isa. lix. 4. *Κενώω* in LXX. Jer. xiv. 2, *αἱ πύλαι ἐκενώθησαν*, xv. 9 = *לָקְחָהּ*. As to Phil. ii. 7, Beyschlag's assertion (*Christol. des N. T.* p. 235), that *κενοῦν* throughout the N. T. means "to rob one of his respect, honour, and esteem," is quite unwarranted; the opposite indeed is true, for *κενοῦν* nowhere means this in the N. T., nor has it this signification in profane Greek. The withdrawal of which it speaks may indeed be honour and esteem, but only when these are indicated by the context. In Phil. ii. 7 it is *μορφὴ θεοῦ*, which Christ gave up in order to take *μορφὴ δούλου*. That it cannot mean "a surrender of the *Ego*, of the divine consciousness," *μορφή* itself shows. Christ by the surrender of the *μορφὴ θεοῦ* made Himself *κενός* (cf. Luke i. 53), as it is said of a mother deprived of her children, *ἐκενώθη*, Jer. xv. 9.

Κενόδοξος, Polyb. xxxix. 1. 1, *κενόδοξος ἦν καὶ ἀλαζὼν καὶ πολὺν κεχωρισμένος τῆς πραγματικῆς καὶ στρατηγικῆς δυνάμεως*, and so also xxvi. 6, 12, with *ἀλαζονικός*,

therefore = full of vain conceit, worthless desire of fame, see κενοδοξία; Gal. v. 26, μὴ γενώμεθα κενόδοξοι, ἀλλήλους προκαλούμενοι.

Κενόδοξία, ἡ, Plut. *De adulat.* 14 (57 D), a depreciative name for φιλοτιμία, — φιλοτιμίαν κενοδοξίαν ἄκαρπον ὀνομάζοντες, therefore = striving after worthless honour, worthless desire of fame. Lucian, *Dial. Mort.* xx. 4, like Pol. iii. 81. 9, with τῦφος, inflation; *ibid.* x. 8, with ἀλαζονεία, ἀμαθία, ἔρις; *Ver. Hist.* i. 4, in connection with ψεῦδος. In biblical Greek, Wisd. xiv. 14, ἐπίνοια εἰδώλων . . . κενοδοξία ἀνθρώπων εἰσῆλθεν εἰς κόσμον; cf. ver. 15; 2 Macc. ii. 15; φιλαρχίας καὶ κενοδοξίας καὶ ἀλαζονείας καὶ μεγαλαυχίας. In viii. 18 with ἀλαζονεία; cf. κενοδοξέω; 4 Macc. v. 9. In the N. T. Phil. ii. 3, μηδὲν κατ' ἐριθείαν μηδὲ κατὰ κενοδοξίαν; Suid. ματαία τις περὶ ἑαυτοῦ οἰήσις.

Κεφαλῖς, ἰδος, ἡ, diminutive, little head, (a) in the classics, e.g. of the capitals of pillars; so in the LXX. = כּוֹרֶת, Ex. xxxvi. 36, xxxviii. 29 (2 Chron. iii. 15, iv. 12, κεφαλῇ); כּוֹרֶת, 1 Kings i. 19, 30, elsewhere ἐπίθεμα; כּוֹרֶת, 2 Chron. iii. 15. Also = כּוֹרֶת, pedestal of a column, Ex. xxxviii. 27, 28; cf. Joseph. *Ant.* xii. 2. 8, of the feet of a golden table, τῶν ποδῶν αἱ κεφαλίδες, over against ἡ βάσις, also of the nobs and hooks of the curtains, כּוֹרֶת, Ex. xxvi. 32 and often. (b) The rendering of כּוֹרֶת-כּוֹרֶת in Ps. xl. 8, Ezek. ii. 9, by κεφαλὶς βιβλίου is peculiar, — כּוֹרֶת = κεφαλῖς, Ezek. iii. 1, 2; 2 Esdr. vi. 2; once = χάρτης, Jer. xxxvi. 23, elsewhere in Jeremiah = χαρτίον, xxxvi. 2 sqq.; Aquila in Jer. xxxvi. 2 = κεφαλῖς, who in Ps. xl. 8 has εἶλημα, and Symm. τεύχος. It is improbable that the top of the roll is meant; the LXX. thought it as appropriate to render כּוֹרֶת by κεφαλῖς as כּוֹרֶת by κεφαλῇ (for which we twice have κρανίον). Isa. viii. 1 points to this, where Aquila renders כּוֹרֶת כּוֹרֶת by κεφαλίδα μεγάλην (LXX. τόμον χάρτου καινού μεγάλου; Symm. τεύχος μέγα), as if it were not from כּוֹרֶת, *polire*, but from כּוֹרֶת, *volvere*; Delitzsch on Heb. x. 7. Then κεφαλῖς would be = roll. Answering to this Theodoret says, κεφαλίδα καλεῖ τὰ εἰλητὰ βιβλία.

Κεφάλαιον, τό, (a) main thing, what stands first; Plato, *Legg.* i. 643 C, κεφάλαιον δὴ παιδείας λέγομεν τὴν ὀρθὴν τροφήν. Thuc. iv. 50, ἐν αἷς (ἐπιστολαῖς) πολλῶν ἄλλων γεγραμμένων κεφάλαιον ἦν. Also of the main idea of the whole, of a speech or writing, which collects the main points or the result, e.g. Isocr. iii. 62, iv. 149. We cannot take the word in either of these ways in Heb. viii. 1, κεφάλαιον δὲ ἐπὶ τοῖς λεγομένοις, for what follows is neither the result, "the sum," nor the main point of what precedes, nor is it the chief thing to which others are subordinate. Something new is really introduced which forms the crowning point to the preceding; cf. Dem. xxi. 18, δύο ταῦτα ὥσπερ κεφάλαια ἐφ' ἅσας τοῖς ἑαυτῷ νεοεανιευμένοις ἐπέθηκεν. Thus the difficult words ἐπὶ τοῖς λεγ. receive their right force. (b) Sum, = capital, strictly, main sum in relation to rent and profit; Plato, *Legg.* v. 742 C, ἀποδιδόναι μῆτε τόκον μῆτε κεφάλαιον; so in Acts xxii. 28. In the LXX. = כּוֹרֶת, Lev. v. 24; Num. v. 7; cf. iv. 2, xxi. 26, 49.

Ἀνακεφαλαίω, not often in the classics; κεφαλαίω, act. and middle = *to bring together under heads*, Thuc., Plato, and later writers; Thuc. viii. 53, λόγους ἐποιοῦντο ἐν τῷ δήμῳ κεφαλαιοῦντες ἐκ πολλῶν; Aristotle, *Mor. magn.* ii. 9, καθόλου συνθέντας τὰ καθ' ἕκαστα κεφαλαιωσαμένους εἰπεῖν. Hence ἀνακεφ. = *to summarize again*, and indeed (a) *to repeat*; Aristotle, *Fragm.* 123 (Opp. ed. Berol. v. 1499, 33a), ἔργα δὲ ῥητορικῆς . . . προοιμιάσασθαι πρὸς εὐνοίαν, διηγῆσασθαι πρὸς πίστιν, ἀγωνίσασθαι πρὸς ἀπόδειξιν, ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι πρὸς ἀνάμνησιν; Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* i. 90, τὴν ἀνακεφαλαίωσιν τῶν ἐν ταύτῃ δεδηλωμένων τῇ βίβλῳ; Quinctil. vi. 1, rerum repetitio et congregatio quae graece ἀνακεφαλαίωσις dicitur; Protev. Jac. xiii. 1, εἰς ἐμὲ ἀνακεφαλαιώθη ἡ ἱστορία τοῦ Ἀδάμ. Accordingly the proposition is = *iterum*, as must be allowed in Rom. xiii. 9, ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ ἀνακεφαλαιοῦται; but it must be remembered that it is not the κεφαλαιοῦν that is repeated, but the thing previously mentioned is repeated by the κεφαλ., and the κεφαλαιοῦν thus becomes an ἀνακεφ.; cf. Plut. *De puer. educ.* 5 C, συνελὼν τοίνυν ἐγὼ φημι, ὅτι ἐν πρώτῳ καὶ μέσῳ καὶ τελευταίῳ ἐν τούτοις κεφάλαιοι. But (b) repetition of the κεφαλαιοῦν is denoted in Eph. i. 10, ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι τὰ πάντα ἐν τῷ Χρ̄, only that κεφαλαιοῦν here is defined according to its object. Aristotle, *De muni.* 2, τὸ δὲ τῶν πλανήτων πλῆθος εἰς ἑπτὰ μέρη κεφαλαιοῦμενον, is not a similar case, for κεφ. here stands as is usual for reflection upon the things. The expression in Eph. i. 10 finds its analogy in the usage neither of κεφαλαιοῦν nor of συγκεφαλαιοῦν (Xen., Plat., Aesch., Polyb.). Elsewhere it may denote a comprehensive act of reflection, but here it means a gathering together of the objects—τὰ πάντα, and the thought is none other than that in Col. i. 16, 20. That we are not to regard Christ as κεφαλὴ here is shown by the prep. ἐν. But the middle is to be emphasized; it is the mystery of God's will to gather all together for Himself in Christ, to bring all into a unity, to put an end to the world's discord wrought by sin (see κόσμος οὐρανός), and to re-establish the original state of mutual dependence in fellowship with God; cf. Rom. xi. 35. Accordingly Chrysostom does not stop short with μίαν κεφαλὴν ἅπασιν ἐπέθηκεν, but adds συνάψαι.

Κήρυξ. The preacher is thus designated with reference to his work, to announce his message with the authority which is expressed by the name ἀποστόλος.—Κηρύσσω always implies a solemn, important, public announcement made by the authority of a higher power, the proclamation of a message which therefore claims attention. In the LXX. it is used of the announcement of royal messages, Gen. xli. 43 (ⲕⲓⲣ). 2 Chron. xxxvi. 22, παρήγγειλε κηρύξαι ἐν πάσῃ τῇ βασιλείᾳ αὐτοῦ ἐν γραπτῷ λέγων, Τάδε λέγει Κύριος βασιλεὺς κ.τ.λ. Dan. v. 31; Esth. vi. 9, 11, public announcements, Ex. xxxvi. 6, e.g. νηστείαν, ἐορτήν. Ex. xxxii. 5; 2 Chron. xx. 3, xxiv. 9; 2 Kings x. 20; Jonah i. 14, ii. 15, iii. 5, 7. Then in the prophets of the announcement of the day of Jehovah, the judgment day, Joel ii. 1, iii. 9; Jonah i. 2, iii. 2; cf. Micah iii. 5, of false prophets, κηρύσσοντας εἰρήνην. Isa. lxi. 1, κηρύξαι αἰχμαλώτοις ἄφεσιν; cf. Plut. *Apophth.* 197 B, νικήσας . . . ἐκήρυξεν ἐν Ἰσθμίοις ὅτι τοὺς Ἕλληνας

ἐλευθέρους καὶ αὐτονόμους ἀφήσιν. Poetically, Zeph. iii. 15; Zech. ix. 9; Prov. i. 21, viii. 1. In most of these places = כָּרַן (see *καλεῖν*), sometimes כָּרַן כָּרַן, כָּרַן, *et al.* But it does not become a fixed word for any special announcement; for this the compounds of ἀγγέλλειν, especially ἀναγγέλλειν, ἀπαγγέλλειν = נִגַּן are used, words which in the N. T. give place to ἐπαγγέλλειν, ἐπαγγέλλεσθαι, for *God's message of salvation*, words which in the LXX. are rare; and to εὐαγγελίζεσθαι and κηρύσσειν for the promise and the specific announcement of its fulfilment.—In 1 Pet. iii. 19, ἐν ᾧ (πνεύματι) καὶ τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασιν πορευθεὶς ἐκήρυξεν, the word seems to have been chosen instead of εὐαγγελίζεσθαι (iv. 6) with reference to the ἀπειθής (and perhaps to the ἐν φυλακῇ; cf. Isa. lxi. 1), with which εὐαγ. would not have been in keeping. Compare von Zezschwitz, *Petri ap. de Christi ad inferos descensu sent.* p. 31.

Προσκηρύσσω, used in the classics of the herald sent forth = **to make publicly known in advance, to command or proclaim in advance**, Xen. *Resp. Lac.* xi. 2, πρῶτον μὲν οἱ ἔφοροι προκηρύττουσι τὰ ἔτη εἰς ἃ δεῖ στρατεύεσθαι. In biblical Greek, Acts xiii. 24, προκηρύξαντος Ἰωάννου πρὸ προσώπου τῆς εἰσόδου αὐτοῦ βάπτισμα μεταν. Cf. κηρύσσω. The expression is clearly qualified by the N. T. use of κηρύσσω, and therefore is not to be regarded as like Joseph. *Ant.* x. 5. 1, Ἱερεμίας τὰ μέλλοντα τῇ πόλει δεινὰ προεκήρυξε. Just. Mart. *Apol.* i. 31 (72 B), θεοῦ προφήται δι' ὧν τὸ προφητικὸν πνεῦμα προεκήρυξε τὰ γενήσεσθαι μέλλοντα πρὶν ἢ γενέσθαι.

Προσκληρώω, to allot to one, to assign by lot, only in later Greek; e.g. Lucr. *Amor.* 3, τούτῳ τῷ βίῳ ἢ τύχῃ προσεκλήρωσέ σε. Plut. *Conv.* ix. 3. 1 (738 D). Often in Philo; see Loesner, *observ.* *Philon.* p. 209, with whom προσκληροῦσθαι, synonym. προστίθεσθαι, e.g. τῷ θεῷ λαῶ, *de sacrif. Cain et Abel*, i. 164. 25 sqq. Not in the LXX. In N. T. Acts xvii. 4, τινὲς ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐπίσθησαν καὶ προσεκλήρωθησαν τῷ Παύλῳ καὶ τῷ Σίλα, medial passive; see Krüger, § 52. 6. Cf. Philo, *de exsecrat.* ii. 435. 26, τῷ θεῷ μόνῳ προσεκλήρωσθαι τοὺς ἄπλαστον ἀλήθειαν ἀντὶ πεπλασμένων μύθων μεταδιώκοντας. Leg. ad Caj. ii. 546. 9, τὸ ἱκετικὸν γένος ἀνθρώπων τῷ πατρὶ καὶ βασιλεῖ τῶν ὄλων καὶ πάντων αἰτίῳ προσεκλήρωται, of trust in God's providence; *ibid.* 555. 36, τῶν μὲν τούτῳ τῶν δ' ἐκείνῳ προσκληρωμένων, ἐξ ὧν ταραχαὶ ἐμφύλιοι τε καὶ ξενικοὶ πόλεμοι συνίστανται.

Κληρονομία is in the LXX. the regular word for כְּלִיָּה, though κληρὸς is also occasionally employed; it is also = כְּלִיָּה, and other derivatives from כְּלִי. As used for כְּלִיָּה it denotes the blessing promised upon the ground of God's relation to Israel; cf. Num. xviii. 20, xxxiv. 2; Deut. iv. 38; 1 Sam. xxvi. 19; 2 Sam. xiv. 16, xx. 1, 19, xxi. 3; 1 Kings viii. 36; 2 Chron. vi. 27; Ps. xxxvii. 18, cv. 11; and the N. T. usage is in keeping with this, denoting the blessing of God's saving health, both *as promised and as given*, inasmuch as man being κληρονόμος is to possess it.—Κληρονομέω is also in the LXX. = כָּלַם, Kal and Hiphil, and כָּלַם, Kal and Hiphil, both which are usually

rendered by κληρονομεῖν and κατακληρονομεῖν. This last word is never, like κληρονομεῖν, applied to private relationships, but always refers to the inheritance promised and given by God to His people. Κατά often only strengthens the import of the simple verb; but sometimes, answering to the other force of κατά, κατακλη., signifies *to hand over as an inheritance*, thus taking an intransitive verb transitively. The explanation of this special and new usage in the LXX. probably is that "to inherit the promises," "to inherit the promised land," denotes an inheritance of a peculiar kind,—peculiar in form, because everywhere it is *the entrance*, the *receiving* of it, the taking or possessing of the inheritance that is meant, though κληρονομεῖν in itself does not signify this; it is the entrance upon the inheritance without previous death. Accordingly the appointment to the inheritance, or the gift of it on God's part who has ordained it, is different from the appointment of an inheritance, which is expressed by διατιθέναι. Κληρονομεῖν does not express this, κλ. τινά means only *to appoint some one as heir*, and only once, Prov. xiii. 23 = *to leave behind as heir*. As the clearer and more direct fulfilment of the promise in its literal and temporal reference fades, κατακλ. becomes rarer and disappears; and with the N. T. revelation the idea of διατιθέναι, διαθήκη, in the sense of appointment to an inheritance, becomes prominent, and thus a new force is given to these O. T. words.

Κοινός is connected with ξυν, συν, cum. In Prov. xxi. 9, xxv. 24, it is = כָּבֵד. It is used in the meaning *in common* in the Apocrypha also, except in 1 Macc. i. 47, 62, where it stands in the ethical sense. In relation to βέβηλος, κοινός denotes a theocratic and βέβηλος an ethico-religious judgment. In Josephus it occurs, Ant. xii. 2. 13, ὅτι τοῦτ' αὐτῷ συμβαίη περιεργαζομένῳ τὰ θεῖα καὶ ταῦτ' ἐκφέρειν εἰς κοινούς ἀνθρώπους θελήσαντι; xiii. 1. 1, τῶν Ἰουδαίων τοὺς ἀποστάντας τῆς πατρῴου συνηθείας καὶ τὸν κοινὸν βίον προηρημένους. Philo seems never to have used the word in this sense.—Κοινόω primarily means *to make a thing a common possession*. The LXX. do not employ it in its ethical sense, but rather βεβηλοῦν, μαιίνειν. In the Apocrypha once, in 4 Macc. vii. 6, οὐδὲ τὴν θεοσέβειαν χωρήσασαν γαστέρα ἐκοίνωσας μιαιοφαγία.—Κοινωνός usually takes the gen. of the person, Prov. xxviii. 24; Isa. i. 23. The thing is added by ἐν; cf. Plut. De aud. xiv. (45 E), κοινωνὸς γὰρ ἐστὶ τοῦ λόγου καὶ συνεργὸς τοῦ λέγοντος. Praec. ger. reip. xxvi. (819 C), λάμβανε δὴ καὶ δίκης συνεργὸν καὶ πρεσβείας κοινωνόν. The gen. of the thing, Ecclus. vi. 10, κ. τραπέζων. Plut. Brut. xiii. 5.—Κοινωνικός is = *common*, *in common*, Aristotle, Eth. Nic. ix. 14, κ. φιλία. Polit. iii. 13, κ. ἀρετή. Eth. Eud. viii. 10, κοινωνικὸν ζῶον ὁ ἄνθρωπος.—Κοινωνέω also is = *to have something in common*, with the gen. of the thing, Rom. xv. 13. In Rom. xii. 13 it is = *to communicate*, but this need not be taken as a new meaning, the representation is the same, though the setting on foot of the κοινωνία is of a special kind. The genitive is used of what one has in common or communicates, the dative of the person or thing to which, and hence is the stronger construction, and rarer in profane Greek. 2 Macc. v. 20,

εὐεργετημάτων ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου ἐκοινώνησε.—Κοινωνία occurs in the LXX. only in Lev. vi. 2; in the Apocrypha, Wisd. viii. 18; 3 Macc. iv. 6.

Κόπτω, to strike, to hew, to thrust, etc., e.g. to hew down trees, to lop off branches, to strike down people; with several references used in the LXX. = כָּרַח, Hiphil, with παίω, τύπτω, etc., also = כָּרַח, for which oftener ἐκκόπτω, and as a term. techn. διατίθημι. (a) Actively, to strike; trees, Isa. ix. 10 = כָּרַח; cf. 2 Chron. xxxiv. 7. In 1 Kings v. 6, 2 Kings xix. 23, 2 Chron. ii. 8 = כָּרַח, always of felling timber. In the N. T. Matt. xxi. 8, ἐκοπτον κλάδους ἀπὸ τῶν δένδρων; Mark xi. 8; Xen. Hell. v. 2. 29. To strike down men, 2 Sam. xi. 15, Ezek. ix. 5, etc. = כָּרַח, figuratively τὴν γῆν, Jer. xlvi. 13. Also = to oppress or weary out with blows, Xen. Eq. i. 4, viii. 7; to be wearisome, to trouble, Dem., Plut., hence κόπος and its derivatives. (b) In the middle, to strike oneself, with grief (on the breast, thighs, etc.), plangere = to mourn, to lament; LXX. = כָּרַח, which only occasionally is rendered differently. With the acc. of the part struck, τὰ μέτωπα, Herod. ii. 61; 121. 8; κεφαλὴν, Hom. Il. xxii. 33. So Ezek. xx. 43, vi. 9. Absolutely = to mourn, Lucian, De sacrific. 15; Matt. xi. 17, xxiv. 30. Κοπετὸν κοπτ., 1 Macc. iv. 39; ἐπὶ τινά, for some one, Rev. i. 7, xviii. 9 (Lachm. ἐπ' αὐτῇ; cf. Zech. xii. 10, κόψονται ἐπ' αὐτὸν κοπετὸν ὡς ἐπ' ἀγαπητῶ). Then also τινά, to bewail some one, 2 Sam. xi. 26; Gen. xxii. 2, l. 10; Luke viii. 52, xxiii. 27. So also in profane Greek. 1 Macc. ii. 70, ix. 20, xiii. 26, ἐκόψαντο αὐτὸν κοπετὸν μέγαν. Synon. πενθεῖν (Lucian, De sacrific. 15), θρηνεῖν (Matt. xi. 17; Luke xxiii. 27), κλαίειν (Luke viii. 52), with obvious shades of meaning.

Ἀποκόπτω, (a) to hew off, e.g. the limbs of the body, etc. Used from Homer to Plutarch. Mark ix. 43, 45; John xviii. 10, 26; Deut. xxv. 12, Judg. i. 6. 7 = כָּרַח; 1 Sam. xxxi. 9 = כָּרַח; Num. xvi. 14 = כָּרַח, to pluck out the eyes, to cut away a ship's ropes, Acts xxvii. 32; cf. Od. x. 127; Xen. Hell. i. 6. 25. Figuratively, Polyb. iii. 63. 8, ἀποκεκομμένης καθόλου τῆς ἐλπίδος. Ps. lxxvii. 9, εἰς τέλος ἀποκόψει τὸ ἔλεος. Cf. Job xix. 10, ὥσπερ δένδρον ἐξέκοψε τὴν ἐλπίδα μου.—(b) The middle, Gal. v. 12, ὄφελον καὶ ἀποκόφονται οἱ ἀναστατοῦντες ὑμᾶς, can, as the middle, be explained only by reference to Deut. xxiii. 1, οὐκ εἰσελεύσεται θλαδίας οὐδὲ ἀποκεκομμένος εἰς ἐκκλησίαν κυρίου = to undergo castration; LXX. = כָּרַח; cf. Arr. Epict. ii. 20, οἱ ἀποκοπτόμενοι τὰς γε προθυμίας τὰς τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἀποκόφασθαι οὐ δύνανται. Lucian, Eunuch. 8, τοῦτον ἐξ ἀρχῆς εὐθὺς ἀποκεκόφθαι. Philo, De legg. spec. ii. 306. 38, τὰ γεννητικὰ προσαπέκοψαν. De vict. ii. 261. 21, θλαδίας καὶ ἀποκεκομμένους τὰ γεννητικά. Strab. xiii. 630, ἀπόκοπος = castrated. So Chrys., Theodoret, Theophyl., Oecumen., Jerome, Augustine, et al. Cf. κατατομή and περιτομή, Phil. iii. 2, 3.

Προσκόπτω, to stumble against; i.e. either to give a stumble or to receive one, offendere and offendi. (a) To give offence or stumbling, τινι, physical, Matt. vii. 27; figurative, Polyb. v. 49. 5, προσέκοπτε τοῖς πολλοῖς, ἐλύπει δὲ καὶ τὸν Ἀντίοχον. Ecclus.

xliv. 23, xxxiv. 17. (b) *To take offence, to be scandalized with, e.g.* by a false step to knock the foot against something, Matt. iv. 6; Luke iv. 11, μήποτε προσκόψης πρὸς λίθον τὸν πόδα σου, from Ps. xci. 12 = 72, as in Prov. iii. 23; Jer. xiii. 16. Absolutely = *to stumble*, John xi. 9, 10; cf. Tobit xi. 9; Ecclus. xxxv. 20. Figuratively, in later Greek = *to take offence at*, to feel oneself injured; syn. σκανδαλίζεσθαι, see πρόσκομμα; compare 1 Pet. ii. 7 with Isa. viii. 14; Rom. ix. 32, προσέκοψεν τῷ λίθῳ τοῦ προσκόμματος; 1 Pet. ii. 8, προσκόπτουσιν τῷ λόγῳ ἀπειθοῦντες; Rom. xiv. 21, ἐν ᾧ (cf. Ecclus. xxxv. 30) ὁ ἀδελφός σου προσκόπτει ἢ σκανδαλίζεται ἢ ἀσθενεῖ. In profane Greek, compare Polyb. vi. 6. 6, τῷ τοιούτῳ δυσαρεστεῖσθαι καὶ προσκόπτειν. So often in Polyb. equivalent to *to feel oneself injured and slighted*, so also in Diod. Sic. *et al.* But the N. T. *πρ.* has a special colouring; compare Diod. Sic. xvii. 30, προσκόψαι τοῖς λόγοις, in contrast with the preceding τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ὁ βασιλεὺς συγκατετίθετο τοῖς λεγομένοις. In Rom. ix. 32, 1 Pet. ii. 7, 8, it denotes the antipathy of unbelief to the salvation presented in Christ, since by the latter the person not only feels himself personally insulted, but sustains actual harm or disgrace on account of his antipathy. Both passages refer to this harm, as also does Rom. xiv. 21, to an injury to one's Christian position.

Προσκοπή, ἡς, ἡ, Plut., Polyb. *et al.*, *stumbling-block, offence*. In Polyb. it denotes the offence received, like προσκόπτειν (b); cf. Polyb. xxxi. 18. 4, ἡ τῶν ὄχλων πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀλλοτριότης καὶ προσκοπή; xxvii. 6. 10, διδόναι ἀφορμὰς προσκοπῆς, and often, with φθόνος, μῖσος, ὀργή. On the other hand, in the only place in the N. T. where it occurs, it signifies the offence given, 2 Cor. vi. 3, μηδεμίαν ἐν μηδενὶ διδόντες προσκοπήν, ἵνα μὴ μωμηθῇ ἡ διακονία ἡμῶν, in the sense of Rom. xiv. 13; 1 Cor. viii. 9.

Πρόσκομμα, τος, τό, the stumble or offence, only in later Greek, and not often there. Plut. = *hindrance*, otherwise = *spoil*, Athen. iii. 97 F. In biblical Greek, LXX. = עָרִיצָה, Ex. xxiii. 33, (οἱ θεοὶ αὐτῶν) ἔσονται σοι εἰς πρόσκομμα; xxxiv. 12, μήποτε γένηται πρόσκομμα ἐν ὑμῖν; Isa. xxix. 21, *πρ.* τιθέναι; viii. 14, ἔσται σοι εἰς ἀγίασμα καὶ οὐχ ὡς λίθου προσκόμματι συναντήσεσθε αὐτῷ. It denotes an injury or hurt in a moral and religious sense, specially the reverse of a help to salvation, and thus occurs several times in Ecclus. xvii. 25, xxxiv. 7, 30, xxxix. 24; cf. xxxi. 19, οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ κυρίου φυλακὴ ἀπὸ προσκόμματος καὶ βοήθεια ἀπὸ πτώματος. Also Judith viii. 22. Hence in the N. T. Christ is called λίθος προσκόμματος, for those who would not lay hold upon Him for salvation, but, taking offence at Him, suffer loss or hurt, and, consequently, sin and punishment, Rom. ix. 32, 33; in 1 Pet. ii. 8, parallel to the stronger expression πέτρα σκανδάλου. Everywhere it signifies the offence taken, the injury sustained by a resistance or hindering of saving faith, which, becoming a σκάνδαλον, destroys the state of salvation. Rom. xiv. 20, ὁ διὰ προσκόμματος ἐσθίων. Also 1 Cor. viii. 9, βλέπετε μήπως ἡ ἐξουσία ὑμῶν αὕτη πρόσκομμα γένηται τοῖς

ἀσθενέσιν, is probably best interpreted as = the offence taken, or at which they are scandalized, not = what gives offence to them; compare vv. 10, 11.

Κρίνω is also used to denote the action of the judge, of the prince, and of God Himself in maintaining justice in behalf of His people; κρίνειν τινά, and sometimes in the LXX. τινι = to do justice in behalf of, answering to the use of the three Hebrew words which are constantly rendered by κρίνειν, יָד, יָר, וַפֶּשֶׁת. These three stand not only for judgment, as punishing the guilty, but for judgment doing justice for the innocent, the oppressed, the righteous; synon. with σώζειν, λυτροῦν, ῥύεσθαι, δικαιοῦν; and indeed יָד in particular with the oppressed as its object, Gen. xlix. 16; Deut. xxxii. 36; Ps. liv. 3 (paral. σώζειν), lxxii. 2, cxxxv. 14; Jer. v. 28, xxi. 12, xxii. 16; compare τινί, Gen. xxx. 5; יָר sometimes with the guilty as its object, yet so that the judgment is in behalf of the innocent, Jer. li. 36, l. 34; cf. 1 Sam. xxiv. 16, xxv. 39; Ps. cxix. 154 (paral. λυτροῦν); Isa. xlix. 25 (paral. ῥύεσθαι), li. 22. וַפֶּשֶׁת stands mainly with the innocent as its object, Ps. vii. 9, x. 18, xxvi. 1, xxxv. 24, xxxvi. 33, οὐδὲ μὴ καταδικάσαι αὐτὸν ὅταν κρίνηται αὐτῷ. Ps. xliii. 1, lxxii. 4 (paral. σώζειν), lxxxii. 3, κρίνατε ὀρφανὸν καὶ πτωχόν, τάπεινον καὶ πίνητα δικαιώσατε; cf. Isa. i. 17, 23. Deut. xxv. 1, προσέλθωσιν εἰς κρίσιν καὶ κρίνωσιν καὶ δικαιώσωσιν τὸν δίκαιον καὶ καταγνώσιν τοῦ ἀσεβοῦς. 2 Sam. xviii. 19, 31, ἔκρινέ σοι κύριος σήμερον ἐκ χειρὸς πάντων τῶν ἐπεγειρομένων ἐπὶ σε. Zech. vii. 9, κρίμα δίκαιον κρίνετε καὶ ἔλεος καὶ οἰκτιρμὸν ποιεῖτε. Prov. xix. 14; Isa. xi. 4. Then in the sense to *overrule*, the main point being the triumph of right in behalf of the people, cf. Gen. xviii. 25; Judg. iii. 10, iv. 4, and often; 1 Kings xv. 5; cf. 1 Sam. viii. 20, καὶ δικάσαι ἡμᾶς βασιλεὺς ἡμῶν. Even when it stands for the punitive judgment of God, as in κρίνειν τὴν γῆν, τὴν οἰκουμένην, as in Ps. xciv. 2, ὑψώθητι ὁ κρίνων τὴν γῆν, ἀπόδος ἀνταπόδοσιν τοῖς ὑπερηφάνοις, xcvi. 13, Isa. ii. 4, lxvi. 16, *et al.*, it is always a judging in favour of His people, and only seldom of a judging the sinner apart from this, as it appears only in Ezek. vii. 8, xi. 10, xviii. 30, xx. 36, xxi. 30, xxii. 2, xxiii. 36, xxiv. 14, xxxiii. 20, xxxvi. 19, xxxviii. 22. In the Apocrypha, likewise, the thought of vindication of right is prominent, Eccus. xxxii. 22, xlv. 26; cf. xlvi. 14; Susannah 52. With this compare in the N. T. δικαίως κρίνειν, 1 Pet. ii. 23; Matt. xix. 28, κρίνοντες τὰς δώδεκα φυλὰς τοῦ Ἰσρ.; Luke xxii. 30; Acts vii. 7, τὸ ἔθνος ᾧ ἐὰν δουλεύουσιν κρινῶ ἐγώ; Rev. vi. 10, οὐ κρινεῖς καὶ ἐκδικεῖς. But for the rest, this use of the word falls decidedly into the background in the N. T., save in Rev. vi. 10, xvi. 5, xviii. 8, xx. 19, ii. 11. The purpose or result of the judicial decision is for the most part not specified, as in Matt. vii. 1, μὴ κρίνετε ἵνα μὴ κριθῆτε; Acts xiii. 27, etc.

Κρίσις is used in the LXX. almost invariably for יָד or יָר; also continually with κρίμα for וַפֶּשֶׁת. Answering to the use of κρίνειν in the O. T. to denote justice in behalf of the oppressed, we find κρίσις as almost synon. with ἔλεος, Ps. cxl. 13, ποιήσει κύριος τὴν κρίσιν τοῦ πτωχοῦ. Jer. v. 28, xxii. 16 = יָד. Thus = וַפֶּשֶׁת, Ps. ci. 2, ἔλεος καὶ

κρίσιν ἄσομαί σοι. Ps. xxxiii. 5, ἀγαπᾷ ἐλεημοσύνην καὶ κρίσιν; cxi. 6; Isa. i. 17, ἐκζητήσατε κρίσιν, ῥύσασθε ἀδικούμενον; xxviii. 17, θήσω κρίσιν εἰς ἐλπίδα; xxxiii. 5, xl. 27. Further = כִּי, Ex. xxiii. 6; 1 Sam. xxiv. 16, xxv. 39; Ps. cxix. 154; Isa. xxxiv. 8, ἡμέρα κρίσεως κυρίου καὶ ἐνιαυτὸς ἀποδόσεως κρίσεως Σιών, יוֹם כִּי יִבָּרֵךְ הַיְיָ, *et al.* Jer. ix. 23, ὁ ποιῶν ἔλεος καὶ κρίμα καὶ δικαιοσύνην. So pervading is this thought, that God's judgment of the nations and the final judgment are represented as working righteousness for His people and salvation for His Church, Ps. cxix. 136, cxxii. 5; Ezek. xxviii. 26, xxxix. 21, *et al.*; with which we may compare in the N. T. 2 Thess. i. 5; Rev. xiv. 7, xvi. 7, xix. 2; Jude 9, 15. Under the influence of this view, מִצְדִּיק, which is usually rendered by κρίσις, κρίμα, is also rendered occasionally by δικαίωμα, as equivalent to *right, justice*; both *the right which belongs to one*, and the justice which the judge executes or brings about by assisting the right. Hence Micah vii. 9, מִצְדִּיק נִתֵּן, ποιήσει τὸ κρίμα μου καὶ ἐξάξει με εἰς τὸ φῶς. Compare Job viii. 3, ב' נִתֵּן, to bend or pervert the right, xxxiv. 12; likewise ב' נִתֵּן, Ex. xxxiii. 6. Hence its frequent combination with the genitive ἡ κρίσις μου, αὐτοῦ, etc. = *my right, which*, for the sake of justice, is to be maintained or demanded by justice, to be distinguished from δικαιοσύνη, as righteousness or justice from the righteous cause; see δίκαιος. Isa. x. 2, ἐκκλίνοντες κρίσιν πτωχῶν; Lam. iii. 34, 58. So Acts viii. 33, ἐν τῇ ταπεινώσει ἡ κρίσις αὐτοῦ ἦρθη. Accordingly, Matt. xii. 18, κρίσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἀπαγγελεῖ, ver. 20, ἕως ἂν ἐκβάλῃ εἰς νίκος τὴν κρίσιν, from Isa. xlii. 1, is to be explained both of the right and of the righteous cause of the people. Of justice which is exercised, Jer. xvii. 11, ποιῶν πλοῦτον αὐτοῦ οὐ μετὰ κρίσεως. Isa. xxxii. 1, μετὰ κρίσεως ἄρχειν; Ps. xcix. 3, τιμὴ βασιλέως κρίσιν ἀγαπᾷ· σὺ ἡτοίμασας εὐθύτητα, κρίσιν καὶ δικαιοσύνην ἐν Ἰακώβ σὺ ἐποίησας; Isa. v. 7, xxvi. 8, lvi. 1, *et al.* In this sense = *right effecting justice for the oppressed*, κρίσις stands in Matt. xxiii. 23; Luke xi. 42.

Κρίμα. The LXX. use of this word differs from that of the N. T. in that it stands more frequently even than κρίσις for מִצְדִּיק (for כִּי, נִתֵּן, only in Job xxxvi. 17, Dan. vii. 22; never for כִּי), and seldom for legal or condemnatory judgment as in Deut. xxi. 22, ἐὰν δὲ γένηται ἐν τινὶ ἁμαρτία κρίμα θανάτου; xxxii. 41, ἀνθέξεται κρίματος ἡ χεὶρ μου. Thus 1 Chron. xvi. 12, 14; Job ix. 19; Ps. ix. 17; Isa. xxviii. 26; Jer. xxi. 12, li. 9; 1 Kings xi. 28, ἤκουσαν πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ τὸ κρίμα τοῦτο ὃ ἔκρινεν ὁ βασιλεὺς. Ezek. v. 8, 10, 15, vii. 27, xviii. 8, xxiii. 24, xxviii. 22, xxx. 19 (cf. κρίνειν in Ezek.); Wisd. xii. 12. Elsewhere it denotes the right which one has, or which is granted as one's due, Ex. xxiii. 6, οὐ διαστρέψεις τὸ κρίμα πένητος ἐν τῇ κρίσει αὐτοῦ, הַכִּי מִצְדִּיק יִבָּרֵךְ. Job xiii. 18, ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐγγὺς εἰμι τοῦ κρίματος μου, οἶδα ἐγὼ ὅτι δίκαιος ἀναφανοῦμαι. Job xix. 7, xxxi. 13, xxxii. 9, xxxiv. 5, 6, xxxvi. 6, κρίμα πτωχῶν δώσει; ver. 17, xl. 3; Isa. x. 2. With δικαιοσύνη, Ps. xcvi. 2; Isa. i. 27, v. 16, ix. 7; Jer. xxii. 15, xxxiii. 5; Hos. vi. 5; Amos v. 7, and often. Hence also with ἔλεος, ἐλεημοσύνη; see κρίνειν. Ps. ciii. 6, ποιῶν ἐλεημοσύνας ὁ κύριος καὶ κρίμα πᾶσιν τοῖς

ἀδικουμένοις. Jer. v. 1, ix. 23, *et al.* In the N. T. Rev. xviii. 20, ἔκρινεν ὁ θεὸς τὸ κρίμα ὑμῶν ἐξ αὐτῆς; xx. 4, κρίμα ἐδόθη αὐτοῖς; cf. Dan. vii. 22, τὸ κρίμα ἔδωκεν τοῖς ἁγίοις ὑψίστου. This judgment executed for the oppressed is at the same time judgment upon their enemies, Rev. xvii. 1, δείξω σοι τὸ κρίμα τῆς πόρνῃς, judgment that has come upon her. Κρίμα stands oftenest in the LXX., like כִּרְמָה , in the sense of justice, judgment which holds good, as synon. with רֶחַם , רַחֲמָה (in which case כִּרְמָה is rendered often by δικαίωμα), synon. with πρόσταγμα, δικαίωμα. Lev. xviii. 4, 5, xx. 22, xxvi. 15; Num. xxxv. 24, κρινεῖ ἡ συναγωγή . . . κατὰ τὰ κρίματα ταῦτα; ver. 29, ἔσται ταῦτα ὑμῖν εἰς δικαίωμα κρίματος. Deut. iv. 1, 8, *et al.* In this sense, which is akin to its meaning, decision, conclusion, it does not occur in the N. T., not even in Rom. xi. 33, ὡς ἀνεξεραύνητα τὰ κρίματα αὐτοῦ.

Κριτής, in the LXX., usually answers to שֹׁפֵט , which is rarely rendered by δικαστής, Ex. ii. 14; Josh. viii. 33, xxiii. 2, xxiv. 1; 1 Sam. viii. 1, 2; Isa. iii. 2; where the choice of this word shows the perception of the distinction, because the thought of legislative action predominates. Κριτής, indeed, refers to this in many places, Deut. i. 16, xvi. 18, xix. 17, 18, xxi. 2, xxv. 2; 2 Chron. xix. 5, *et al.*, but as only one part of the duty assigned to κριταῖς, Deut. xvii. 9; the judges of Israel are so called on account of their position at the head of the people, the leaders of Israel, Judg. ii. 16–19; Ruth i. 1; 2 Sam. xxii. 21. The maintenance of justice and right is the main part of the ruler's office; cf. Ps. cxlviii. 11, and in particular God as ruler is judge, Isa. xxxiii. 22, κύριος κριτῆς ἡμῶν, κύριος ἄρχων ὑμῶν, His judging is the outgo of His power, Ps. vii. 12, l. 6, lxxv. 8. Δικαστής would not express this; κριτής in the Scripture sense is the possessor of executive power. We have both combined in 1 Sam. xxiv. 16.—Ἀκατάκριτος, ον, not in profane Greek = uncondemned, without being condemned, Acts xvi. 37, xxii. 25.

Κυνέω, to kiss, Homer, Tragedians, Theocritus; rare in prose, not in biblical Greek. Hence

Προσκυνέω, in Herod. i. 134. 1, to be distinguished from the φιλεῖν τοῖς στόμασι, as a more reverential salutation. It is there said of the Persians, ἀντὶ γὰρ τοῦ προσαγορεύειν ἀλλήλους φιλέουσιν τοῖσι στόμασι, ἣν δὲ ἢ οὔτερος ὑποδεέστερος ὀλίγῳ, τὰς παρειὰς φιλέονται, ἣν δὲ πολλῷ ἢ οὔτερος ἀγενέστερος, προσπίπτων προσκυνεῖ τὸν ἕτερον. Therefore to prostrate oneself and kiss towards, to lay the hand upon the mouth, and to stretch it out with a kiss. The word first appears among the Greeks after their contact with the Persians, and is employed by the poets for profoundly reverential worship of the gods, and supplication of them, more rarely thus in prose, Xen. Anab. iii. 2. 9; Polyb. xviii. 37. 10, especially of the prostrate adoration, regarded as slavish and idolatrous, of the Persian kings, Herod., Xen., Plut., *et al.*; cf. Arr. Anab. iv. 11. 8, τοὺς Ἕλληνας τοὺς ἐλευθερωτάτους προσαναγκάσεις εἰς τὴν προσκύνησιν. Dem. xxi. 106, προσκυνεῖν τοὺς ὑβρίζοντας ὥσπερ ἐν τοῖς βαρβάροις οὐκ ἀμύνεσθαι κράτιστον ἔσται. Xen. Anab.

iii. 2. 13, οὐδένα γὰρ ἄνθρωπον δεσπότην ἀλλὰ τοὺς θεοὺς προσκυνεῖτε, as the sign of freedom. This element of religious or idolatrous submission determines the conception, Plato, *Rep.* iii. 398 A, προσκυνοῖμεν ἂν αὐτὸν ὡς ἱερὸν καὶ θαυμαστὸν καὶ ἡδὺν . . . μῦρον κατὰ τῆς κεφαλῆς καταχέαντες καὶ ἐρίῳ στέφαντες. Plut. *De aud. poet.* 8 (26 B), μηδὲ ὥσπερ ὑπὸ δεισιδαιμονίας ἐν ἱερῷ φρίττειν ἅπαντα καὶ προσκυνεῖν. We may thus understand how it was that this word, which originally was simply a Greek expression for an observance of Oriental life, appears very frequently in biblical Greek, in the LXX. = *proskunein*, Hithpael, = to prostrate oneself in token of reverence and submission, Isa. xlv. 15, both before men and before God, most frequently, however, in a religious sense, of the adoration due and belonging to God, and therefore = to worship, so that προσκυνεῖν is equivalent to offer *divine adoration*, Ex. xx. 5, οὐ προσκυνήσεις αὐτοῖς οὐδὲ λατρεύσεις; xxiii. 24, οὐ προσκυνήσεις τοῖς θεοῖς αὐτῶν, οὐδὲ μὴ λατρεύσης αὐτοῖς; xxxiv. 14; Lev. xxvi. 1; Num. xxv. 2; Deut. iv. 19, v. 9, viii. 19, and often; Isa. ii. 8, 20, xlv. 15, *et al.* Conjoined with λατρεύειν (with δουλεύειν, Ps. lxxii. 11; 1 Kings xvi. 31, xxii. 54; see λατρεύω), it differs from it in that λατ. denotes adoration manifest in act by service, by sacrifice, but προσκ. adoration in word and gesture, prayer and confession; compare Dan. iii. 5, 7, 11, for προσκυνεῖν includes προσπίπτειν and προσαγορεύειν (see Herod. *passim*), Neh. ix. 3, καὶ ἦσαν ἐξαγορεύοντες τῷ κυρίῳ καὶ προσκυνούντες τῷ κυρίῳ θεῷ αὐτῶν. Cf. προσκυνεῖν ἐνώπιον τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου, 2 Kings xviii. 22; πρ. ἐν οἴκῳ τινός, v. 18; cf. 1 Chron. xvi. 29; 2 Chron. xxv. 14, ἤνεγκε πρὸς αὐτὸν τοὺς θεοὺς υἱὼν Σηεὶρ καὶ ἔστησεν αὐτοὺς αὐτῷ εἰς θεούς, καὶ ἐναντίον αὐτῶν προσκύνει καὶ αὐτοὺς εἵθε. It signifies *worship*, be it mainly the acknowledgment and extolling of God in praise, 2 Chron. vii. 3, xxix. 30, Neh. ix. 3, 6, Ps. lxxv. 4, lxxii. 11, or the submission of the worshipper that is prominently meant, as in Job i. 20, Ps. xcix. 5, Isa. xxvii. 13, especially when he is seeking help, Ps. v. 8, xcv. 6. In the Apocrypha the word occurs comparatively seldom, but oftener in the N. T., and indeed (a) primarily in the religious sense = to worship, to submit oneself to God, to acknowledge oneself as in subjection to God, and to exalt Him, to praise, to adore, to celebrate, to recognise and confess Him as Lord, Matt. iv. 10, τὸν θεόν σου προσκυνήσῃ; cf. Luke iv. 8; and the LXX. in the corresponding text, Deut. vi. 13, φοβεῖσθαι = *proskunein*; cf. Rev. xiv. 7, φοβήθητε τὸν θεὸν καὶ δότε αὐτῷ δόξαν . . . καὶ προσκυνήσατε τῷ ποιήσαντι κ.τ.λ.; 1 Cor. xiv. 25, πεσὼν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον προσκυνήσει τῷ θεῷ. John iv. 21 sqq.; Rev. iv. 10; cf. ver. 11, vii. 11, xi. 16, xv. 4, xix. 4, 10, xxii. 9. By itself (absolutely), John iv. 20, 24, xii. 20; Acts viii. 27, xxiv. 11; Heb. xi. 21; Rev. v. 14. Compare πρ. ἐνώπιόν τινος, Rev. xv. 4, iii. 9; ἔμπροσθεν, xxii. 8; xi. 1, τοὺς προσκυνούντας ἐν τῷ ναῷ τοῦ θεοῦ.—Of idolatrous worship, Matt. iv. 9; Luke iv. 7; Acts vii. 43; Rev. ix. 20, xiii. 4, 8, 12, 15, xiv. 9, 11, xvi. 2, xix. 20, xx. 4. How greatly the religious element preponderates in προσκυνεῖν is strikingly shown in Acts x. 25, 26, ὁ Κορνήλιος πεσὼν ἐπὶ τοὺς πόδας προσκύνῃσεν. ὁ δὲ Πέτρος ἡγειρεν αὐτὸν λέγων, ἀνάστηθι καὶ ἐγὼ αὐτὸς ἄνθρωπός εἰμι. This element accordingly cannot be withdrawn when προσκυνεῖν stands (b) with Christ

as its object, in the first instance of those who seek for help in Him, Matt. viii. 2, ix. 18, xv. 25, xx. 20, Mark v. 6, while the Proskunesis of the risen Saviour can hardly otherwise be understood than as worship, Matt. xxviii. 9, 17; Luke xxiv. 52 (not in Tisch.); cf. Heb. i. 6. The religious element, however, retires, and only the devotion of the petitioner or the person offering homage is expressed in the word, Matt. ii. 2, 8, 11, xviii. 26; Mark xv. 19; Rev. iii. 9.

While in profane Greek *προσκ.* takes the accusative, and only seldom, like other verbs compounded with *πρός*, the dative (cf. Lobeck, *Phryn.* 463), in the LXX. it usually takes the dative, and the acc. is very rare, Gen. xxxvii. 7, 9 (ver. 10 the dat.); Judg. vii. 15; 2 Sam. xv. 5; 2 Kings v. 18, and elsewhere occasionally; in the Apocrypha, Baruch vi. 5; Cont. of Esther iii. 5, 7, vi. 10, the acc., but usually here also the dative. We also have instead of this *πρός τινα*, *ἐνώπιόν τινος*. In the N. T. the acc. is more frequent, Matt. iv. 10; Luke iv. 8 (xxiv. 52); John iv. 22-24. In the Rev. the MSS. vary between the dat. and acc., Rev. xiii. 4, 8, 15, xx. 4, but the acc. is certified in Rev. ix. 20, xiii. 12, xiv. 9, 11. Besides the Gospels, Acts, and Rev., the word occurs only in Heb. i. 6, xi. 21, and 1 Cor. xiv. 25. Derived from it is *προσκύνησις*, Ecclus. i. 21 (cf. ver. 17) and 3 Macc. iii. 7 (plural), and in the N. T. *προσκυνητής*.

Προσκυνητής, οὐ, ὁ, adorer, worshipper, not in pre-Christian Greek, and very seldom afterwards, e.g. in inscriptions, in Eustathius and Hesychius. John iv. 23, οἱ ἀληθινοὶ προσκυνῆται, i.e. they who in truth and reality practise *προσκύνησις*.

Κύριος differs from *δεσπότης*, as honourable superiority and authority does from mere force; cf. Philo, *Quis rer. div. haer.* ii. 476, 25 sqq., *κύριος μὲν γὰρ παρὰ τὸ κύρος, δὲ δὴ βέβαιόν ἐστιν εἶρηται καὶ ἐναντιότητα ἀβεβαίου καὶ ἀκύρου. δεσπότης δὲ παρὰ τὸν δεσμόν, ἀφ' οὗ δέος οἶμαι. "Ὡστε τὸν δεσπότην κύριον εἶναι καὶ ἔτι ὡσανεὶ φοβερὸν κύριον, οὐ μόνον τὸ κύρος καὶ τὸ κράτος ἀπάντων ἀνημμένον ἀλλὰ καὶ δέος καὶ φόβον ἱκανὸν ἐμποιῆσαι.* In the LXX. *δεσπότης*, Gen. xv. 2, 8; Josh. v. 14; Prov. vi. 7, xxix. 26, xxx. 11; Isa. i. 24, iii. 1, x. 33; Jer. i. 6, iv. 10; Job v. 8. Compare the observation of the grammarians, that *δεσπότης* designates the relation of the master to his slaves, *κύριος* his relation to wife and children; see Pilon, *Syn. grees.* p. 236; Trench, *s.v.* *κύριος, δεσπότης*. Acts iv. 24; Jude 4; 2 Pet. ii. 1; Rev. vi. 10.

Κυριεύω, to be lord, to have power and dominion over, with the genitive, Xen., Polyb., Plut., Diod. Sic.; in the LXX. with *ἄρχειν* (also *κατάρχειν, δεσπόζειν, et al.*, occasionally) = *לָמַד*, sometimes also = *רָדָה, יָרַשׁ, נָשָׂא*, never = *נָלַךְ, βασιλεύω*, from which it differs, as *to govern, to lord it over*, does from *to reign*. It is noteworthy that in the LXX. it is seldom, in the N. T. never, applied to God (to Christ only in Rom. xiv. 9), notwithstanding the divine title *κύριος*; in the LXX. only in Dan. iv. 22, 29, v. 23 (and in the doubtful reading of Ex. viii. 22), where it designates God's dominion over the powers of earth. *Κυριεύειν* is not the main or essential self-affirmation of God in His

revelation; therefore the rendering of the name $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron$ by $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron$, is in keeping neither with God's testimony concerning Himself, nor with Israel's perceptions concerning God. In the N. T. (a) to be lord, to hold authority over one, Rom. xiv. 9, $\zeta\eta\alpha\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \nu\epsilon\kappa\rho\acute{\alpha}\nu\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \zeta\omega\acute{\nu}\tau\omega\upsilon\omicron\upsilon\ \kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\eta$. More definitely (b) to have or exercise power or force, $\tau\iota\upsilon\omicron\varsigma$, upon or over one, Luke xxii. 25, $\omicron\iota\ \beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \tau\acute{\omega}\nu\ \epsilon\theta\nu\acute{\omega}\nu\ \kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\nu\sigma\iota\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omega}\nu\ .\ .\ .\ \acute{\upsilon}\mu\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \delta\epsilon\ \omicron\upsilon\chi\ \omicron\upsilon\tau\omega\varsigma$; 2 Cor. i. 24, $\omicron\upsilon\chi\ \omicron\tau\iota\ \kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\nu\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\ \acute{\upsilon}\mu\acute{\omega}\nu\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega\varsigma$, $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}\ \sigma\upsilon\nu\epsilon\rho\gamma\omicron\iota\ \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\mu\epsilon\nu\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \chi\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \acute{\upsilon}\mu\acute{\omega}\nu$; Rom. vi. 9, $\theta\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$; ver. 14, $\acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\rho\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha$; vii. 1, $\nu\acute{\omicron}\mu\omicron\varsigma$; 1 Tim. vi. 15, of God, $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\acute{\omega}\nu\ \kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\epsilon\nu\acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\omega\nu$.

Κατακυριεύω , very seldom in profane Greek, often in the LXX. The statement of the Lexicons, that it is = $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\omega$, is not quite correct. It differs therefrom as **to force** differs from **to have power**, and signifies according to the circumstances, (a) primarily **to overpower**, **to become lord**, **to subjugate**, so Diod. Sic. xiv. 64, $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\epsilon\ \nu\alpha\upsilon\sigma\iota\acute{\nu}\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\alpha\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omega}\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\alpha\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\eta}\gamma\omicron\nu\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \tau\eta\nu\ \pi\acute{\omicron}\acute{\omicron}\lambda\iota\nu$. Thus in the LXX. = כבש , Josh. xv. 16; חָפַץ , Ps. x. 6; חָזַק , Ps. x. 10; שָׁרַי , Num. xxi. 24; כָּבַשׁ , Num. xxxii. 22, 29; לָשׁוּב , Ps. xix. 13. Cf. 1 Macc. xv. 30. So in Acts xix. 16 = **to overpower**. Then (b) **to be lord**, **to rule by force**, **to exercise violence**, $\tau\iota\upsilon\omicron\varsigma$, against one, Ps. cxix. 133 = שָׁרַץ ; Gen. i. 28 = כָּבַשׁ ; cf. Eccles. xvii. 4. Ps. xlv. 19 = הָרַר , to which it answers also in Ps. lxxii. 8, ex. 2, where, used absolutely, it is = **to rule**; Ps. cx. 2, $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\epsilon\nu\epsilon\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\phi\ \tau\acute{\omega}\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\chi\theta\rho\acute{\omega}\nu\ \sigma\omicron\upsilon$. So too in the N. T. = **to exercise power**, **to rule by force**, Matt. xx. 25; Mark x. 42; synon. with $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\chi\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\acute{\alpha}\zeta\epsilon\iota\nu$, where Luke xxii. 25 has $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\epsilon\iota\nu$; 1 Pet. v. 3, $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma\ \tau\acute{\omega}\nu\ \kappa\lambda\acute{\eta}\rho\omega\nu$ (cf. Ps. xlix. 15). As in profane Greek with $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\epsilon\iota\nu$, the passive of $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\kappa$. occurs in the LXX. Num. xxxii. 22.

Λαμβάνω . The retaining of the μ by Lachm., followed by Tisch., Treg., West. and Hort, in the future and aorist, is reckoned by Sturz (p. 130) among the peculiarities of the Egyptian dialect. Cf. Winer, § 5. 4.— Ἀντίληψις means also the *claim which one makes, a laying claim to*; further, *apprehension, perception*, and the like. Lastly, the **hold which one has**, Xen. Equ. v. 7, of the horseman's hold in mounting; and akin to this is the Scripture meaning **help**. Cf. in the LXX. ἀντιλήπτωρ , *helper, assistant*, Ps. iii. 4, cxix. 114, with $\beta\omicron\eta\theta\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$; 2 Sam. xxii. 3, with $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\phi\upsilon\gamma\eta$; Ps. i. 3, 4, v. 8, and often in the Psalms.

Ἐπιλαμβάνω , both = *to take besides*, and = *to lay hold of*, **to seize**, the latter usually. In biblical Greek only in the middle, which prevails especially in later Greek, = **to seize for oneself**, **to attach oneself to**, **to appropriate to oneself**, **to lay hands on**, **to take possession of**. In the LXX. = לָקַח (side by side with $\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\iota\nu$, $\kappa\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$, *et al.*) and קָיָה , Hiphil (usually rendered by $\kappa\alpha\tau\iota\sigma\chi\acute{\epsilon}\iota\nu$, $\kappa\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$, $\kappa\rho\alpha\tau\alpha\iota\omicron\upsilon\nu$, also $\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\iota\nu$, $\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\iota\lambda\alpha\mu\beta\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$, *et al.*), and occasionally = שָׁקַח , *et al.* In profane Greek and in the LXX. it is construed with the genitive, rarely, as in Plato, *Legg.* vi. 779 C, with the acc. In the N. T. and in Luke's writings we have the acc. often, Acts ix. 27, $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\lambda\alpha\beta\acute{\omicron}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu$

ἡγαγε; xvi. 19, ἐπιλαβόμενοι τὸν Παῦλον εἴλκυσαν; xviii. 17, ἐπιλαβόμενοι Σωσθένην ἔτυπτον, where the case is determined always by the finite verb, as is often the case where two connected verbs have the same object; cf. Krüger, § 1x. 5. 2, 3, and Luke xiv. 4, ἐπιλαβόμενος ἰάσατο αὐτόν. But it certainly occurs with the acc. in Luke xxiii. 26, ἐπιλαβόμενοι Σίμωνα . . . ἐπέθηκαν αὐτῷ (Lachm., Tisch., Treg., Westcott; but Rec., Griesb. read Σίμωνος, after the Alex.). It occurs in biblical Greek (a) = to seize something for oneself, in order to hold thereto, to attach oneself to, 1 Kings i. 50; Zech. viii. 23; Isa. iv. 1. (b) To seize something, to grasp, so as to hold it, Ex. iv. 4; Deut. xxv. 11; Gen. xxv. 26; Ps. xxxv. 2; Prov. vii. 13. Generally, to seize, Acts xxi. 33; Heb. viii. 9; to take to oneself, Acts ix. 27, xxi. 33; to lay hold upon, to seize so as to appropriate, to possess, 2 Sam. xiii. 11. Figuratively in Prov. iv. 13, ἐπιλαβοῦ ἐμῆς παιδείας . . . φύλαξον αὐτήν; 1 Tim. vi. 12, ἐπιλαβοῦ τῆς αἰωνίου ζωῆς; ver. 19, ἵνα ἐπιλάβωνται τῆς ὀντως ζωῆς = to attain; cf. Polyb. xv. 8. 12, βραχείας ἐλπίδος ἐπελάβοντο; vi. 50. 6, δυναστείας ἐπιλ., to obtain the dominion, to possess oneself of a thing or person, Judg. xix. 25, 29, et al.; Jer. xlix. 23, τρόμος ἐπελάβετο αὐτῆς; xlv. 23, ἐπελάβετο ὑμῶν τὰ κακὰ ταῦτα. Hence (c) to seize in a hostile way, to lay hands on, Acts xvi. 19, xvii. 19, xviii. 17, xxi. 30; Luke xx. 20, ἵνα ἐπιλάβωνται αὐτοῦ λόγου; ver. 26, οὐκ ἴσχυσαν ἐπιλαβέσθαι αὐτοῦ ῥήματος, to catch him in a word; cf. Plut. Regg. Apophth. 207 C, ἐπιλαβόμενος αὐτοῦ τῆς χειρός. Also, however (d) friendlily, to take hold of one (cf. Matt. xiv. 31, viii. 23; Heb. viii. 9, where it is = to lay hold of in order to help). So Ecclus. iv. 11, ἡ σοφία υἱὸς ἑαυτῇ ἀνύψωσε καὶ ἐπιλαμβάνεται τῶν ζητούντων αὐτήν; Heb. ii. 16, οὐ γὰρ δήπου ἀγγέλων ἐπιλαμβάνεται, ἀλλὰ σπέρματος Ἀβραὰμ ἐπιλαμβάνεται, the reference here being (cf. vv. 15, 18) to the entire conduct and work of the Messiah in effecting universal deliverance and succour for man, and not, as Delitzsch would limit it, to that particular saving work whose goal is not angels, but the universal Church of God gathered from mankind. Such a limitation is not sanctioned by Heb. viii. 9, from Jer. xxxi. 32, as in Isa. xli. 8, 9, where the LXX. read ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι as = רִּיחַץ. For what is treated of in the connection is not a fact in history, but an abiding line of conduct or behaviour, and the more general ἐπιλαμβ. is chosen instead of the more definite ἀντιλ., because the conclusion has still to be stated in vv. 17, 18. In profane Greek it is not elsewhere used of taking hold of in order to help. Bleek quotes the Schol. ad Aesch. Pers. 742, ὅταν σπεύδῃ τις ἢ εἰς καλὰ ἢ εἰς κακά, ὁ θεὸς αὐτοῦ ἐπιλαμβάνεται.

Εὐλάβεια. See Plato, Deff. 413 C, εὐλ. φυλακὴ κακοῦ, ἐπιμέλεια φυλακῆς. As a rule it differs from fear as forethought from timidity, caution from cowardice; Aristotle, De virtut. vi. 8, distinguishes it from δειλία, and connects it with αἰδώς; cf. Diog. Laert. vii. 116 in Grimm, s.v. Compare εὐλαβεῖσθαι, 1 Sam. xviii. 29, Job xiii. 25, with Heb. v. 7. In Plutarch it answers to the Latin religio; Plut. Num. 32, Cam. vi. 4, ἡ δὲ εὐλάβεια καὶ τὸ μηδὲν ἀγὰν ἄριστον, in contrast with δεισιδαιμονία and τύφος on the one hand, and with ὀλογορία τῶν θεῶν and περιφρόνησις on the other. Polyb. employs

δεισιδαιμονία for *religio*.—Εὐλαβέομαι, see Plato, *Gorg.* 519 A, σοῦ δὲ ἵσως ἐπιλήφονται τὰ κακά, εἰ μὴ εὐλαβῇ.

Λαός, οὗ, ὁ, Attic λαός, *people*; perhaps akin to the German 'Leute,' old high G. "liut," *populous*. In the *Iliad* it denotes (sing. and plur.) *the war-people*, sometimes the infantry as distinct from the cavalry, the land forces as distinct from the seamen, also generally "the people" as distinct from the generals; in the *Odyssey*, subjects as distinct from their lords; applied by Pindar to the people under different designations, *e.g.* Δωριεύς, Περσικός, Λυδῶν, Ἀργεῖος. In post-Homeric Greek, however, it is seldom used, oftener in the Tragedians and Aristoph., but in Xen. only once in a Homeric quotation, not at all in Thuc. and Dem., Plato very occasionally, Aristotle only in a citation preserved by Plut., in Polyb. and Plut. very rarely. But the LXX. use the word very frequently, employing it to render עַם in distinction from יָהּ, and their adoption of this word (which had become comparatively rare) clearly arose from the need of bringing out the difference between these two Hebrew terms, עַם denoting a *people blended together in a commonwealth*, namely Israel, but יָהּ *a multitude, a host*, being used, specially in the later books, of the non-Israelite nations; see ἔθνος. When עַם, especially in the plural, stands for other peoples, it is as a rule rendered by ἔθνος. Λαός is used for יָהּ only in a few places, Josh. iii. 17, iv. 1; Isa. ix. 3, xxvi. 2, lv. 5, lviii. 2; Jer. xxxiii. 9; Ezek. xx. 41, xxxvi. 15; Zech. xiv. 14; and in these three last-named texts it might easily have been exchanged for ἔθνος. עַם־יִשְׂרָאֵל is as frequently rendered by λαός as by ἔθνος, but stands for Israel in Ps. xlv. 13 only. Thus in the LXX. λαός signifies (I.) the *peoples* as a collection of tribes or smaller nations, synon. with ἔθνος, and usually in the plural, Gen. xxxv. 23, Ps. ii. 1, vii. 8, ix. 9, xlv. 3, cv. 44, cxlviii. 11, cxlix. 7 = עַם־יִשְׂרָאֵל; Isa. lv. 2; Ezek. xx. 41, xxxvi. 15, Zech. xiv. 14 = יָהּ. In 1 Kings viii. 61, 2 Chron. vi. 33 = עַם. The sing. in Gen. xxv. 23 = עַם־יִשְׂרָאֵל; Jer. xxxiii. 9 = יָהּ, and thus especially when it is = עַם, used of non-Israelite peoples, Gen. xxiii. 7, 12, 13, xxvi. 11, and often; cf. xxv. 8, where it is said of Abraham's death, προσετέθη πρὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ. Sometimes also in Exodus and other books, *e.g.* 2 Chron. xiii. 9; 2 Kings iii. 7, *et al.* The idea of united kinship or affinity is prominent in Isa. xxvi. 2, εἰσελθέτω λαὸς φυλάσσω δικαιοσύνην; lviii. 2, λαὸς δικαιοσύνην πεποιηκώς = יָהּ.—(II.) The *people* as distinct from their kings, priests, or prophets, the *people collectively* over against a single person, or in distinction from individuals, 2 Kings iv. 41 sqq., x. 9; Deut. ii. 32, *et al.* = עַם; Prov. xiv. 30 = עַם־יִשְׂרָאֵל.—(III.) The *people of Israel*, in most places, because their national name 'Εβραῖοι occurs only on the lips of foreigners; 'Ιουδαῖοι only in Ezra, Neh., Esther, Jer., Macc., and the N. T.; 'Ισραηλῖται only in 4 Macc. and the N. T. In many cases where the LXX. put λαός, a Greek would use πλῆθος, ὄχλος, or δῆμος to designate the "people;" but such phraseology would fail to satisfy the *national and monarchical element* of Jewish consciousness, and it is just this which the choice of the expression has embodied. The element becomes specially prominent in the very frequent designation of Israel as *the people of*

God, λαὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, τοῦ κυρίου, or in the mouth of God, ὁ λαὸς μου, Ex. iii. 7, 10, 12, v. 1, vi. 7, vii. 4, 14, 16, xviii. 1, xix. 5; Deut. vii. 6, *et al.*

The usage of the N. T. answers to that of the LXX. Here λαός denotes (I.) the people as a collection of tribes or nations, parallel with ἔθνος in Rom. xv. 11, coupled with ἔθνος, φυλή, γλῶσσα, Rev. v. 9, vii. 9, x. 11, xi. 9, xiv. 6, xvii. 15. Compare Luke ii. 31 and Acts iv. 25 from Ps. ii. 1, John xi. 50. How fully the thought of unity and affinity, or compactness under one head, penetrates the word, is manifest from 1 Pet. ii. 10, οἱ ποτε οὐ λαός, νῦν δὲ λαὸς θεοῦ, ver. 9, ἔθνος ἅγιον, λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν, from Ex. xix. 5; 2 Cor. vi. 16 from Lev. xxvi. 12; Acts xv. 14, πρῶτον ὁ θεὸς ἐπεσκέψατο λαβεῖν ἐξ ἐθνῶν λαὸν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ; xviii. 10, λαὸς ἐστὶ μοι πολλὸς ἐν κ.τ.λ.—(II.) The people of Israel as distinct from the ἔθνη, Acts xxvi. 17, ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν, ver. 23; Rom. xv. 10, ἔθνη μετὰ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ, from Deut. xxxii. 43. Compare 2 Pet. ii. 1, ἐγένοντο δὲ καὶ ψευδοπροφῆται ἐν τῷ λαῷ ὡς καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσονται ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι, in distinction from the N. T. community; cf. i. 1. More explicitly, ὁ λαὸς Ἰσραὴλ, Acts iv. 10, xiii. 24; cf. Matt. ii. 6; Luke ii. 32; τῶν Ἰουδαίων, Acts xii. 11; ὁ λαὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, Matt. ii. 6; Luke i. 68, 77, ii. 32; Acts vii. 34, xxiii. 5; Rom. ix. 25, 26, xi. 1, 2, xv. 10; Heb. iv. 9, viii. 10, x. 30, xi. 25.—In 2 Cor. vi. 16, 1 Pet. ii. 10, Rev. xviii. 4, xxi. 3, the designation λ. τ. θ. is figuratively applied to the N. T. fellowship; cf. Heb. iv. 9, viii. 10.—(III.) The (Israelitish) people as a whole, without giving prominence to their idiosyncrasy, but simply in the mass; cf. Luke i. 10; τὸ πλῆθος τοῦ λαοῦ; Acts xxi. 30, 36; πᾶς ὁ λαός, Acts v. 34, x. 41, xiii. 24; Luke iii. 21, *et al.*; but, on the contrary, *e.g.* in Acts xix. 20, δῆμος is used of the people of Ephesus, xiv. 18, ὄχλοι of the people at Lystra.—Thus διδάσκειν, εὐαγγελίζεσθαι τὸν λαόν, Luke iii. 18, xx. 1; Acts iv. 2, *et al.* The people are distinct from the πρεσβύτεροι, ἄρχοντες, in Matt. xxi. 13, xxvi. 3, 47, xxvii. 1; cf. ver. 25; Luke xxii. 66, xxiii. 13; Acts iv. 8, ἄρχοντες τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ πρεσβύτεροι, where the Rec. text and Tisch. 7 add τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ, so that the second part of the address is a strengthening of the first. Λαός occurs seldom in the Epistles, mostly in Hebrews, ii. 17, iv. 9, v. 3, vii. 5, 11, 27, viii. 10, ix. 7, 19, x. 30, xi. 25, xiii. 12. Elsewhere only in the Gospels, Acts, Rom., Cor., Peter, Jude, Rev.; in the Gospel of John only viii. 2, xi. 50, xviii. 14; here, instead of λαός, very often οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι occurs.

Λειτουργίῳ, ἐλειτουργοῦν, in Jer. lii. 15, *et al.*, from the unused Attic λείτον, instead of λήιτον; Doric λάιτον, the affairs of the community or State, or what pertains to State affairs, etc., Herod. vii. 197. 2, λήιτον δὲ καλέουσι τὸ πρυτανήϊον οἱ Ἀχαιοί. Plut. Qu. Rom. 67 (Mor. 280 B), λήιτον ἄχρι νῦν τὸ δημόσιον ἐν πολλοῖς τῶν Ἑλλήνων νόμων γέγραπται. Moer. ed. Pierson, p. 252, λητουργεῖν, διὰ τοῦ ἡ Ἀττικῶς, διὰ δὲ τοῦ διφθόγγου εἰ Ἑλληνικῶς λήιτον γὰρ τὸ δημόσιον. The word signifies to prosecute public or State affairs, and is used of the service of the λειτουργίαι, certain regular services of State (especially in Athens) resting upon every Phyle in turn (ἐγκύκλιοι), to which every

citizen possessing three or more talents was bound, duties which might be undertaken voluntarily by others (Passow), but were always performed at their own cost. Afterwards applied to the rendering of service generally, *e.g.* Aristotle, *Pol.* iii. 5, of the labour of slaves, mechanics, and merchants, in so far as it was for the advantage or benefit of others.

The LXX. have adopted the word to denote the services of priests and Levites in the sanctuary, an application of it unsanctioned in profane Greek, for only very late and very occasionally is a word of the same family, *λειτουργός*, used of priests. But there seems to have been in profane Greek no term more appropriate than this to designate the *cultus* and the ministers thereof in the organism of Israel, seeing that it bore the impress of *service rendered for the common weal*. Thus it stands in the LXX. as a rule = *שָׁרַף*, Piel, more fully *λειτ. ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις*, Ex. xxix. 30, xxxix. 1, 43; *πρὸς τὸ θυσιαστήριον*, Ex. xxviii. 39, xxx. 20; cf. 2 Chron. xxxi. 2; Neh. x. 36; also *τῷ θυσ.*, *τῷ οἴκῳ*, Joel i. 9, 13; Ezek. xlv. 5, xlvi. 25; and elsewhere *τῷ κυρίῳ*, 1 Chron. xxiii. 13, xxvi. 12; 2 Chron. xiii. 10, xxix. 11; Ezek. xl. 48, and often; Jonah ii. 17; usually, however, without any qualifying addition, as = *to discharge sacerdotal or temple service, or to offer sacrifices, to wait in the priest's office*, Ex. xxxix. 25; Deut. x. 8, xvii. 12, *et al.* Also = *עָבַד*, but only where this word stands for priestly service, Num. iv. 24, 37, 41, viii. 22, xvi. 9, xviii. 6, 7, 21, 23; 2 Chron. xxxv. 3 (in 1 Chron. xxiii. 28, 32 = *עָבַד*), *עָבַד* in a general religious sense is = *λατρεύειν* (which see), and elsewhere = *δουλεύειν* or *ἐργάζεσθαι*. The difference between *λειτουργεῖν* and *λατρεύειν* in the usage of the LXX. lies in the fact that the latter denotes *the divine service and worship of the entire people* (see *λειτουργία*), their religious acts collectively, but *λειτουργεῖν* *the official service of the priests only*. *Λειτουργεῖν* appears as equivalent to *λατρεύειν* only in Ps. ci. 6, *πορευόμενος ἐν ὁδῷ ἀμώμῳ οὗτος μοι ἐλειτουργεῖ*; compare ver. 7 and Ecclus. iv. 14, *οἱ λατρεύοντες τῇ σοφίᾳ λειτουργήσουσιν ἁγίῳ καὶ τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας αὐτὴν ἀγαπᾷ ὁ κύριος*. Yet both these passages show that somewhat more than the general *λατρεία* is understood; cf. Isa. lxi. 6, *ὑμεῖς δὲ ἱερεῖς κυρίου κληθήσεσθε, λειτουργοὶ θεοῦ*. 1 Chron. xxviii. 13, *λειτουργήσουσι σκεύη τῆς λατρείας οἴκου κυρίου*. *Λατρεύειν* may be used of priestly service generally, but *λειτουργεῖν* is never used of the divine service of the congregation; see the translation of *עָבַד* under *λειτουργία*. In Ecclus. xlv. 15, *λειτουργεῖν* and *ἱερατεύειν* together express the office handed down from Aaron. Besides *שָׁרַף* and *עָבַד*, we find *עָבַד* *בֹּא* *עָבַד* *עָבַד* rendered by *εἰσπορεύεσθαι λειτουργεῖν*, where it stands of the temple service (Luther wrongly takes it of the service of the host), Num. iv. 3, 23, 30, 35, 39, 43.

For other than priestly performances, and as = *to serve a higher than oneself*, *λειτ.* stands as = *שָׁרַף* only in 1 Kings i. 4, 15, xix. 21, 2 Chron. xvii. 19, xxii. 8 (Num. iii. 6 of the Levites in relation to Aaron), while in these cases the LXX. elsewhere render the word otherwise (*παριστάειν*, *ἐνδρασεῖν*). In the Apocrypha only in Ecclus. viii. 9, x. 25, *οἰκέτῃ σοφῷ ἐλεύθεροι λειτουργήσουσιν*. Besides the following *λειτουργία*,

λειτουργός, λειτουργικός, we find in the LXX. the derivatives (not appearing in the N. T.). λειτούργημα (= לְהַעֲרִיץ, Num. iv. 32, vii. 9) and λειτουργήσιμος, 1 Chron. xxviii. 13.

It is very significant that this group of words has not been adopted in N. T. Greek for the N. T. ministry and its functions. Only once, in Rom. xv. 16, Paul designates himself, with reference to the design of his labour, λειτουργὸς Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ (see under λειτουργός). Judging from its profane use, it would have been quite as appropriate (cf. δαπανᾶν, 2 Cor. xii. 15) as it was for the O. T. cultus. But this adoption of it would have connected it again closely with the profane usage, which in the N. T. age was no longer the primary. Seeing that λειτ. had grown to be a *term. techn.* in the language of the O. T. cultus, it could only have been employed in a passing way in Rom. xv. 16, and was no longer fit directly to designate the duty and work of the N. T. ministry; for this διακονία appears instead, a word which, of all the expressions designating *service*, was nearest to λειτουργεῖν, inasmuch as it signifies *service for the sake of others*. Moreover, in the primary and strictly profane use of the term, there lay an element which made λειτουργεῖν altogether inappropriate to designate the N. T. ministry and its import, for the λειτουργιαί were offices of rank and dignity, whereas the ministerial office in the N. T. lays no claim to any such a position in the Church. In the N. T. λειτουργεῖν, λειτουργία, λειτουργός, λειτουργικός occur only in Luke's and Paul's writings, and in the Hebrews,—in all very seldom,—but even where the reference is not to the O. T. cultus, always in a religious sense (except perhaps Phil. ii. 20, but compare ver. 30).

Λειτουργεῖν stands (a) for the O. T. *priestly service*, Heb. x. 11. With this is connected (b) the singular phraseology of Acts xiii. 2 concerning the προφήται καὶ διδάσκαλοι of the Christian community at Antioch, λειτουργούντων αὐτῶν τῷ κυρίῳ καὶ νηστευόντων εἶπε τὸ πν. τὸ ἅγιον, where, considering its combination with νηστευόντων, the reference can hardly be to the functions of these officers in the Christian assemblies, but is far better understood as referring to the *prayers* of these persons; cf. Luke ii. 37. Lastly it stands (c) of the κοινωνία εἰς τοὺς πτωχοὺς τῶν ἁγίων ἐν Ἱερ., Rom. xv. 27, εἰ γὰρ τοῖς πνευματικοῖς αὐτῶν ἐκοινώνησαν τὰ ἔθνη, ὀφείλουσιν καὶ ἐν τοῖς σαρκικοῖς λειτουργῆσαι αὐτοῖς, where it clearly is equivalent to *to render holy service*, marking thus the import of the σαρκικά as it is here meant; cf. 2 Cor. ix. 12.

Λειτουργία, ας, ἡ, the performance of the duties of a public office, discharged at one's own cost, *State-service*; later (Aristotle, *et al.*) more generally as = **ministration, rendering service**. In the LXX. = עֲבָדָה, where it denotes *priestly service* in the sanctuary (for which no Hebrew noun has been formed from עָבַד), while elsewhere it is rendered by ἔργον, δουλεία, ἐργασία, and also side by side with λειτ., by λατρεία in a few places, with reference to the service of God, viz. in Ex. xii. 25, 26, xiii. 5, of the Passover; Josh. xxii. 27, of the *cultus* of the people collectively; only in 1 Chron. xxviii. 13, of the service of the sanctuary. The usage of the Apocrypha with regard to λειτουργία is the same. In the N. T. it stands (a) of the O. T. *cultus*, Luke i. 23, Heb. ix. 21. With this is connected its

employment in Heb. viii. 6 of the priestly function of the N. T. Mediator, compare vv. 2, 3. (b) In Phil. ii. 17, Paul designates the work and labour of his calling towards the Philippians as λειτουργία,—εἰ καὶ σπένδομαι ἐπὶ τῇ θυσίᾳ καὶ λειτουργίᾳ τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν,—their faith is the sacrifice which he (as a priest) offers up to God; compare εἰς καύχημα ἐμοὶ κ.τ.λ., and Rom. xv. 16, under λειτουργός. On the other hand, (c) in Phil. ii. 30 it characterizes the service rendered to the apostle by the Philippians, ἵνα ἀναπληρώσῃ τὸ ὑμῶν ὑστέρημα τῆς πρὸς με λειτουργίας, for it is only as the apostle regards the alms of the Philippians as a holy offering that he can speak thus of Epaphroditus, and his disregard of life for the sake of the work of Christ. And in like manner in 2 Cor. ix. 12, of the alms of the Pauline churches for the saints at Jerusalem, ἡ διακονία τῆς λειτουργίας ταύτης—the ministration of this sacred service—οὐ μόνον ἐστὶ προσαναπληροῦσα τὰ ὑστερήματα τῶν ἁγίων, ἀλλὰ περισσεύουσα διὰ πολλῶν εὐχαριστῶν τῷ θεῷ; cf. ver. 11, ἥτις κατεργάζεται δι' ἡμῶν εὐχαριστίαν τῷ θεῷ; cf. Heb. xiii. 15, 16.

Λειτουργός, οὗ, ό, occurs to designate one who performs a λειτουργία, therefore one who is entrusted with or takes upon himself a service for the State; only in inscriptions; in writings it appears late, once in Plut. of the lictors, in Polyb. of the labourers in the army, in Plut. and Dion. Hal. occasionally, likewise of priests. It is in keeping with this rareness of the word that in the LXX. it does not answer to the Hebrew כֹּהֵן where this word designates the priests and Levites, except in Isa. lxi. 6, ὑμεῖς δὲ ἱερεῖς κυρίου κληθήσεσθε, λειτουργοὶ θεοῦ; in these cases it is usually rendered by λειτουργῶν, λειτουργοῦντες. On the contrary, in Josh. i. 1 (Alex.), 2 Sam. xiii. 18, 1 Kings x. 5, 2 Kings iv. 43, vi. 15, 2 Chron. ix. 4, where it denotes persons of higher rank, it is rendered by λειτουργός. In Esth. i. 10, ii. 2, vi. 3, by διάκονος. In Ps. ciii. 21, civ. 4, it is applied to angels as God's ministers. In the Apocrypha, Ecclus. x. 2, of the servant of the κριτῆς τοῦ λαοῦ, 3 Macc. v. 5, of subordinate officers; only in Ecclus. vii. 30 is it parallel with ἱερεὺς. The use of the word in the N. T., rare as it is, clearly indicates the influence of the O. T. λειτουργεῖν. It stands (a) in Heb. viii. 2, τῶν ἁγίων λειτουργός καὶ τῆς σκηνῆς τῆς ἀληθινῆς, of Christ, as the High Priest of the N. T. Akin to this is Rom. xv. 16, where Paul designates himself λειτ. Χυ (cf. Phil. ii. 17), εἰς τὸ εἶναι με λειτουργὸν Χοῦ Ἰν εἰς τὰ ἔθνη, ἱεουργοῦντα τὸ εὐαγγ. τοῦ θεοῦ ἵνα γένηται ἡ προσφορὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν εὐπρόσδεκτος. (b) In Rom. xiii. 6, the civil authorities are designed λειτουργοὶ θεοῦ, in order to confirm and strengthen the preceding θεοῦ διάκονος σοὶ εἰς τὸ ἀγαθόν in ver. 4, for λειτ. is weightier than διάκ. In Heb. i. 7 from Ps. civ. 4, of the angels. (c) But in Phil. ii. 13 it is used without any reference to holy ministration, λειτουργὸν τῆς χρείας μου, as in Josh. i. 1.

Λειτουργικός, ή, όν, belonging to ministration, belonging to holy ministration, occurs only in biblical and ecclesiastical Greek, and in the O. T. of the *vasis et vestibus saceris*, Num. iv. 12, 26, vii. 5; 2 Chron. xxiv. 14 = כֹּהֵן, סֹכֵּן, סִכְּוּת, σκεύη, ἔργα λ.; Ex. xxxi. 10, xxxix. 1, 43, στολαὶ λ. = כִּתְּוֵי בְּגָדִים (cf. xxxv. 19), used in the LXX. interchangeably with כֹּהֵן. In the N. T. only in Heb. i. 14, of the angels, compare Dan. vii. 10, Ps. ciii. 21, civ. 4, and in like manner in ecclesiastical Greek. As to the relative

meanings of λατρεύειν and λειτουργεῖν, it may be observed generally, that while δοῦλος and οἰκέτης denote the position, and θεράπων and διάκονος the calling, λάτρης and λατρεύειν denote the relationship of ministration in general, whether voluntary or involuntary, the relationship of subordinate ministration. But in biblical Greek λατρεύειν comes into closer affinity with λειτουργεῖν, because like λειτ. it is confined in its application to ministering service rendered to God, λειτ. denoting *official or priestly* divine service, and λατρ. the divine service rendered *by the entire people*. Λατρεία again emphasizes and embodies the *worship and service* of God, whereas θρησκεία, which is the more general term, emphasizes and embodies generally the *fear* of God.

Λόγος. In Heb. iv. 13, πρὸς ὃν ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος means *with whom we have to do, to whom we have to give account, with whom we have to reckon*; cf. Bleek in loc., who quotes Liban. Declam. ii. 20 B, τοῖς δὲ ἀδίκως ἀποκτενοῦσι καὶ πρὸς θεοῦς καὶ πρὸς ἀνθρώπους γίνεται ὁ λόγος. This rendering is determined by the connection, for λόγος πρὸς τινα may sometimes have another and even opposite meaning, according to the connection; see 1 Kings ii. 14; 2 Kings ix. 5. Λογισμός is in the LXX. = $\mu\lambda\psi\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$, Jer. xi. 19, xviii. 11, xxix. 11, and often. Ps. xxxiii. 10, 11, syn. with βουλή; Prov. xii. 5, λογισμοὶ δικαίων κρίματα, κυβερνῶσι δὲ ἀσεβεῖς δόλους.—Διαλογίζομαι occurs in Luke iii. 15, διαλογιζομένων ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν περὶ τοῦ Ἰωάννου μήποτε αὐτὸς εἴη ὁ Χρ. It is rare in the LXX., and occurs only in the Psalms = $\mu\lambda\psi$, instead of the usual λογίζομαι, Ps. x. 2, xxi. 12, xxxv. 20, cxl. 5.

Βαττολογέω, or as Tisch. 8, Treg., West., following the Vat. and Sin., writo. βατταλογέω, is not only "very rare in the classics" (Achelis), but does not appear there at all, nor in profane Greek, save once, under the influence of ecclesiastical Greek in Simplic, in *Epicteti enchirid.* 37, p. 212 (6th cent. A.D.), ἐπὶ τὰ λοιπὰ κεφάλαια τοῦ Ἐπικτήτου τρεπτέον, μὴ ἐμαυτὸν λάθω προθέμενος μὲν τὰ τοῦ Ἐπικτήτου σαφηνίσαι, περὶ δὲ καθηκόντων βαττολογῶν νῦν, here in contrast with σαφηνίσαι, *to explain*, in its undoubted meaning as = *to chatter*; so also Matt. vi. 7, προσευχόμενοι δὲ μὴ βαττολογήσητε ὥσπερ οἱ ἔθνικοί· δοκοῦσιν γὰρ ὅτι ἐν τῇ πολυλογίᾳ αὐτῶν εἰσακουσθήσονται. It serves to characterize the πολυλογία, and therefore Luther well renders it = "plappern," *to babble*; for the thing meant, compare 1 Kings xviii. 26; Acts xix. 34; Mark xii. 40. Since Vossius, *Inst. orat.* v. p. 313, it is usually traced back to the onomatopoietikon βατταρίζω, *to stutter*, Lucian, *Jup. Trag.* 27; cf. βάτταλος (more correctly βάταλος), the mocking name given to Demosthenes by Aeschines, *Adv. Timarch.* 51, which Schaefer, *appar. ad Demosth.* ii. 251, rightly explains *de vitio pronuntiationis*, as Demosthenes himself (*pro corona*, 180) takes it. But it tells against this derivation that, e.g. Plutarch, *Dem.* iv. 3–5, takes this designation of Demosth. as an opprobrious epithet of immoral import, as if the idea of imperfection of utterance was remote from it; and that βατταρίζω, βατταρισμός are not used in the same sense as βαττολογέω in our text, but denote only impediment of speech. Moreover, in Dio Chrys. xi. p. 158, βατταρίζειν does not signify *to chatter*, but

is synon. with the words joined to it, ἀσαφῶς λέγειν, describing those who could not express themselves, not those who spoke glibly, but without sense. It is therefore more probable that βαπτολογεῖν should be taken as a *vox hybrida*, formed like ἀγαλλιᾶω, ἀκροβυστία, by connecting together a Hebrew and a Greek expression, namely, the Hebrew כַּבַּב, *effutivit, to speak foolishly*, כַּבַּב, e.g. of indiscreet, thoughtless vows, Buxtorf, *Lex. Rabb.*; Levy, *Neuhebr. u. Chald. Wörterb.* (cf. also כַּבַּב, *garrere, blaterare clamose colloqui instar ebriorum*; and for ב=β, cf. the βούβαστος of the LXX. Ezek. xxx. 17 = חֲבִיבִי), and the Greek βατταρίζειν. Thus from the Hebrew there comes the meaning to **chatter or babble**. The repeated attempts of the Greek exegesists to explain the word show that it does not come directly from βατταρίζειν. Chrysostom says, βαπτολογίαν ὀνομάζει τὴν φλυαρίαν, τὴν διὰ πολλῶν μὲν λόγων προφερομένην, ὠφελείας δὲ πάσης ἐσθηρεμένην. Delitzsch translates, חֲבִיבִי כַּבַּב־לָא.

Εὐλογέω, with or without the augment in the preterites even in the same MSS., e.g. ηὐλόγησα, Gen. xxiv. 1, 35, but in ver. 48 εὐλόγησα, as in εὐδοκεῖν, which see. In Heb. vii. 6, Lachm. has adopted the form ηὐλόγηκεν, whereas in the perfect, from which, besides this form (Gen. xvii. 20; Ps. cxxix. 8), only the passive part. εὐλογημένος occurs, the MSS. do not seem to waver. According to Tisch. 8 on Luke xxiv. 30, the augmented form of the imp. and aor. appear in Luke, especially in the Sin., Alex., and Cantabr. MSS. The Vat. seems never to have it. Treg. has retained it only in Matt. xiv. 19, but everywhere else, as Tisch. 8 and West., the non-augmented form is adopted.

The word is not used in classical prose, but often occurs in the Tragedians and Aristoph., also later occasionally in prose; Polyb. has it often, Arist. once, Plut. not at all; in Plato a few times in the spurious writings of later date (Min. and Axioch.), not in Xen., Thuc., Dem. It has nothing to do with εὐλογος as = *conformable with reason, probabilis*, belonging to the classics and later Greek (once in some Codd. of the LXX. in the sense *eloquent*, Ex. iv. 10 = יְהִי עֲלֵי אֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם וְעַל יְהוֹשֻׁעַ בְּנֵי נֹחַ, the usual reading *ικανός*, Symm. εὐλαος). On the other hand, it answers to the use of εὐλογία, *praise*, and is the opposite of κακολογεῖν, *to revile, to speak evil of*, which likewise is rare in better Greek; cf. Lobeck, *Phryn.* p. 200. Elsewhere εὐ, *κακῶς λέγειν*. Aristotle, *Rhet. ad Alex.* 4; Polyb. i. 14. 4, opposed to ψέγειν, ἐλέγχειν; Plato, *Min.* 320 E, οἱ γὰρ ποιηταὶ μέγα δύνανται εἰς δόξαν, ἐφ' ὅπότερ' ἂν ποιᾶσιν εἰς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους εὐλογοῦντες ἢ κατηγοροῦντες. In Dio Cass. xlii. 28, in combination with θαυμάζειν.

In biblical Greek, on the contrary, εὐλογεῖν is all the more frequent, but almost without exception as a **purely religious conception** (cf. 3 Macc. vi. 11, εὐλογεῖν τοῖς ματαίοις); as to Rom. xvi. 18, the only place where εὐλογία seems to stand without any religious reference, see εὐλογία. This difference between biblical and profane Greek influences also the usage of Philo, to whom εὐλογεῖν, εὐλογία are not unknown, but who usually employs other words, such as εὐχή, ἔπαινος, εὐφημία; see Loesner, *Observ. Philon.* on Eph. i. 3. In Josephus also εὐλογεῖν, εὐλογία are not frequent. In biblical Greek

εὐλογεῖν, εὐλογία are the opposite of καταρᾶσθαι, κατάρα (cf. Gen. xii. 3, xxvii. 29; Num. xxii. 12, xxiii. 23, xxiv. 9, 10; Deut. xxx. 1, 19, and very often), and usually answer to the Hebrew בָּרַךְ mostly in Piel = to bless. We must distinguish both as to the object and the subject of the act.

I. With **man** as subject, and this (a) with God as the object, εὐλογεῖν τὸν θεόν, κύριον, τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου = to glorify, of thankfully praising and extolling God, both in the form of worship and of proclamation; compare Josephus, *Ant.* vii. 14. 11, τὸν θεὸν εὐλογεῖν ἤρξατο πατέρα τε καὶ γενέτορα τῶν ὄλων ἀποκαλῶν. Synon. with ἐπαινεῖν, ὑμνοῦν, cf. Neh. ix. 5, εὐλογεῖτε κύριον τὸν θεὸν ἡμῶν . . . εὐλογήσουσιν ὄνομα δόξης σου καὶ ὑψώσουσιν ἐπὶ πάσῃ εὐλογίᾳ καὶ αἰνέσει; Ps. cxlv. 1. Not thus, however, in the Torah or in the Prophet. Priores, but in Chron., Neh., Job, Psalms, Isaiah, Jer., Ezek., Dan.; cf. 1 Chron. xxix. 10, 20; Neh. viii. 8, ix. 5; Job i. 21; Ps. xvi. 7, xxvi. 12, and often; Isa. lxv. 16; Jer. xxxi. 23; Ezek. iii. 12; Dan. ii. 19, 20. In Isa. xii. 1, xxxviii. 19 = בָּרַךְ; lxiv. 11 = הֵבִיחַ; cf. Josephus, *Ant.* xi. 4. 2, οἱ Λευῖται καὶ οἱ Ἀσάφου παῖδες ἀναστάντες ὑμνοῦν τὸν θεόν, ὡς τὴν εἰς αὐτὸν εὐλογίαν Δαυίδης κατέδειξε πρῶτος. Oftener in the Apocrypha, e.g. Ecclus. xliii. 11; Tob. iv. 19, *et al.* Not till very late with the dative, Dan. iv. 31 (Theodot.), τῷ ὑψίστῳ εὐλόγησα καὶ τῷ ζῶντι εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ᾗνεσα καὶ ἐδόξασα; Ecclus. i. 22, li. 12; 1 Esdr. iv. 58, v. 58; 2 Macc. x. 38; cf. 3 Macc. vi. 11, τοῖς ματαίοις = devoutly to praise. In this case it is intrans. = to sing praise; cf. 1 Esdr. v. 57, οἱ Λευῖται . . . ὑμνοῦντες τῷ κυρίῳ καὶ εὐλογοῦντες κατὰ Δαυίδ.—In the N. T. with the acc. Luke i. 64, xxiv. 53, αἰνοῦντες καὶ εὐλογοῦντες τὸν θεόν; Jas. iii. 9. Absolutely = to offer praise and glory to God, Matt. xiv. 19, λαβὼν τοὺς ἄρτους ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εὐλόγησεν; Mark vi. 41, viii. 7, Rec., West.; Luke xxiv. 30; Matt. xxvi. 26; 1 Cor. xiv. 16. Akin to this, (b) εὐλογεῖν τι, to say, God be praised and thanked, to praise Him for something, connecting God's praise with some definite thing; cf. Mark viii. 7, Tisch. εὐλόγησας αὐτὰ (τὰ ἰχθύδια) παρέθηκεν, where, however, the acc. depends on παρέθ. Thus only in 1 Cor. x. 16, τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας ὃ εὐλογοῦμεν, the cup of thanksgiving which we give thanks for. In the O. T. only in 1 Sam. ix. 13, εὐλογεῖ τὴν θυσίαν καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐσθίουσιν. Otherwise the human εὐλογεῖν nowhere appears with a thing as its object; and that we cannot understand this (consecrating) εὐλογεῖν as a prayer for the divine blessing upon the object named is clear from the εὐχαριστήσας of Luke xxii. 17, 19, and from the Jewish formulae of blessing at the Passover as given by Lightfoot, *Horae Hebr.* on Matt. xxvi. 26, which contain simply glory and praise to God with reference to the coming feast.

II. With **God** as the subject, and (a) with man as the object of the favour and grace which God promises, and by which He elevates him, makes him great, gives him prosperity; not, however, of the mere promise, but always of the guaranteed and communicated gift. The connection of this with the primary meaning appears from the synonym *μεγαλύνειν*, Gen. xii. 2, εὐλόγησω σε καὶ μεγαλυνῶ τὸ ὄνομά σου καὶ ἔσῃ εὐλογημένος; cf. Gen. xvii. 20, xxii. 17, with *πληθύνειν*; xxviii. 3 with *αὐξάνειν*. As

to the gift, compare Num. vi. 23 with φυλάσσειν; Ps. xxviii. 9 with σώζειν, ποιμαίνειν, ἐπαίρειν; Ps. lxvii. 1 with οἰκτείνειν; Ps. cxix. 10, κύριος εὐλογήσει τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν εἰρήνῃ; Gen. xxvi. 2, ἔσομαι μετὰ σου καὶ εὐλογήσω σε; Ecclus. xxxvi. 12, ἐξ αὐτῶν εὐλόγησε καὶ ἀνύψωσε. The difference is this—the human εὐλογεῖν of God is an exaltation with words, the divine εὐλογεῖν is an exaltation by act. We cannot make the promise of God's blessing the primary meaning, because of such texts as Gen. i. 22, 28, εὐλόγησαν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς λέγων, where the gift of the blessing is meant, the blessed relationship arising out of the express and promising word. Cf. the so-called Aaronic blessing, Num. vi. 23, 24. We must, however, distinguish between the blessing as the promise of the gift and of grace, and blessing as denoting the communication of these; cf. Gen. xii. 2 and the future, εὐλογήσω σε. With God as its subject εὐλογεῖν seldom stands in the former sense, but usually in the latter. In the Apocrypha εὐλογεῖν with God as its subject seldom occurs; Ecclus. i. 13, Alex. εὐλογηθήσεται, Vat. εὐρήσει χάριν; iv. 13, xxxvi. 12; Tob. iv. 12, xiii. 12; Judith xv. 10. In the N. T. Matt. xxv. 34, οἱ εὐλογημένοι τοῦ πατρὸς; Acts iii. 26; Eph. i. 3, ὁ εὐλογήσας ἡμᾶς ἐν πάσῃ εὐλογίᾳ πνευματικῇ ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις; Gal. iii. 8, 9; Heb. vi. 14, from Gen. xxii. 17. (b) With a thing as object, by which we do not, of course, mean such collective words as σπέρμα, Gen. xxii. 17, *et al.*; οἶκός τινος, 1 Chron. xvii. 27, etc.; but τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ἐβδομήν, Gen. ii. 3; Ex. xx. 11; τὸν ἄρτον, Ex. xxiii. 25; Deut. xxviii. 5, 12; cf. ver. 3 = **to connect His favour and grace with it.** Thus neither in the Apocrypha nor in the N. T. Peculiar, yet within this range of representation, is Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* v. 9. 4, ὑμῖν δὲ τί τῶν εὐλογηθέντων ὑπὸ τοῦ νομοθέτου πέπρακται, where τὰ εὐλ. is not = *quae legis conditor comprobavit*, but, "What have you done of the things commanded on which the Lawgiver has pronounced His blessing?" cf. *Ant.* iv. 8. 44.

Connected with this and not with I. we find, III. εὐλογεῖν with man both as subject and object, and this (a) **to promise a person God's grace and favour, prosperity from God;** rarely in a weakened sense *to wish*, and still more feebly, *to greet*, yet used as rarely declaratively as εὐλ. II.; cf. the future in Gen. xii. 2, *et al.*, but always communicatively; cf. Gen. xii. 3, xxiv. 60, xxvii. 4 sqq., xxviii. 1, xlviii. 15, 16, 20; Ex. xxxix. 44; Lev. ix. 22, 23; Num. vi. 23–25, xxiii. 20–22, xxiv. 1, 9, 10; Deut. xxvi. 15, xxvii. 12. Only once seemingly declarative in Ps. cxxix. 8, εὐλογήκαμεν ὑμᾶς ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου, where, however, we must take into account the perfect, and the preceding εὐλογία κυρίου ἐφ' ὑμᾶς, bearing in mind likewise the weakened use of the word as = *to greet*, 2 Kings iv. 29; 1 Chron. xvi. 43; also compare Ruth iii. 10; 2 Sam. iii. 5, and often, εὐλογημένοι ὑμεῖς τῷ κυρίῳ (the dative answering to the Hebrew ^{יְיָ}); Ps. cxviii. 24, εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου. For the view taken of this blessing, compare Gen. xxvii. 7, εὐλογήσω σε ἐναντίον κυρίου; Deut. xxi. 5, τοὺς Λευῖτας ἐπέλεξε κύριος ὁ θεὸς παρεστηκέναι αὐτῷ καὶ εὐλογεῖν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ, and Deut. xxiii. 5, οὐκ ἠθέλησε κύριος ὁ θεὸς σου εἰσακοῦσαι τοῦ Βαλαὰμ καὶ μετέστρεψε . . . τὰς κακὰρας εἰς εὐλογίαν. Very seldom in this sense in the Apocrypha; in the N. T., on the other

hand, mainly thus, Matt. v. 44, Rec.; Luke ii. 34, vi. 28; Rom. xii. 14; 1 Cor. iv. 12; Heb. vii. 1, 6, 7, xi. 20, 21; 1 Pet. iii. 9. Further, in the greeting from Ps. cxviii. 24, εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος κ.τ.λ., Matt. xxi. 9, xxiii. 39; Mark xi. 9; John xii. 23, evidently neither *greeted* nor *praised*, but (cf. the Hosannah) either *God's favour be upon thee*, or more probably, *God be praised for thee*, and therefore belonging to II. b, for which Mark xi. 10, εὐλογημένη ἡ βασιλεία κ.τ.λ., tells, as does Luke i. 28, 42, εὐλογημένη σὺ ἐν γυναιξίν; ver. 42, εὐλογημένος ὁ καρπὸς κ.τ.λ.; see εὐλογία. But especially compare 2 Chron. xxxi. 8, εὐλόγησαν τὸν κύριον καὶ τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ Ἰσρ.—(b) Catachrestically, coupling the blessing with leave-taking=*to give the dismissal*, Ps. x. 3; Job i. 5, μήποτε ἡμαρτον καὶ εὐλόγησαν θεόν; vv. 11, 21, ii. 5; 1 Kings xxi. 13, εὐλόγησε θεὸν καὶ βασιλέα. Thus neither in the Apocrypha nor the N. T.—In the LXX. we find ἐνευλογεῖν, συνευλ.; in Josephus, προευλ.; Ant. iv. 8. 47, προευλογῆσαι τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ δύναμιν.

Εὐλογητός, ἡ, ὄν (contrary to the rule, Krüger, xxii. 5. 7; compare Judith xiii. 18, εὐλογητή), a verbal adj. in the sense of the perf. part. pass. answering to פִּרְיָ. (a) Usually of God, εὐλ. ὁ θεός, κύριος ὁ θς, κύριος=*blessed, praised*, see εὐλογέω, I. (a). Thus in Gen. ix. 26, xiv. 20, 24, 27; 1 Sam. xxv. 32; 1 Kings i. 48, and often; in the Psalms continually, and so in the Apocrypha except Judith xiii. 18. In like manner in the N. T. only of God or (Rom. ix. 5) of Christ; Luke i. 68, εὐλ. ὁ θεός; 2 Cor. i. 3; Eph. i. 3; 1 Pet. i. 3, εὐλ. ὁ θεός; Rom. i. 25; 2 Cor. xi. 31; Rom. ix. 5, εὐλ. εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. As a name for God, Mark xiv. 61, ὁ Χς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ εὐλογήτου, shortened form of the Rabbinical designation of God יהוה פִּרְיָ, especially יהוה בִּרְיָ שְׁתִּירָ. But בִּרְיָ never appears as God's name; see Wünsche, *Neue Beitr. zur Erläut. der Evv.* p. 407. (b) Of men = *blessed of God*, Gen. xxiv. 31, εὐλ. κυρίου; xxvi. 29, εὐλ. ὑπὸ κυρίου (Alex., but the Vat. εὐλογημένος). With the dative answering to the Hebrew הַ, see εὐλογεῖν, III.; Ruth ii. 20, εὐλογητός ἐστι τῷ κυρίῳ; 1 Sam. xv. 13; Judith xiii. 18. Accordingly in Deut. vii. 14, εὐλογητὸς ἔσθι παρὰ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, we must adopt the signification *blessed* and not *praised*; cf. Gen. xii. 3, xiv. 19, εὐλόγησε τὸν Ἀβραμ καὶ εἶπεν, Εὐλογημένος Ἀβραμ τῷ θεῷ τῷ ὑψίστῳ. Nowhere thus in the N. T.

Εὐλογία, as, ἡ, in poets and prose writers=*praise, fame, good report of one*, active and passive. Also=*fair speech, beauty of expression*; Plat. Rep. iii. 400 D, εὐλογία καὶ εὐαρμοστία καὶ εὐσχημοσύνη καὶ εὐρυθμία (τῆς λέξεως) εὐηθεία (τῆς ψυχῆς) ἀκολουθεῖ; Lucian, *Lexiph.* 1, εὐαρχός ἐστι ὁ λόγος καὶ πολλὴν τὴν εὐλογίαν ἐπιδεικνύμενος καὶ εὐλεξίς (the latter of the elegance of a single expression). Some explain Rom. xvi. 18 thus, διὰ τῆς χρηστολογίας καὶ εὐλογίας ἐξαπατῶσιν τὰς καρδίας τῶν ἀκάκων, for considering ἀκάκ. it cannot well be taken in the sense of *praise*. Still it is improbable that in connection with χρηστολογία it denotes merely beauty of expression. The effect of χρηστολ. καὶ εὐλ. upon the ἄκακοι will be better explained by taking εὐλ. as in keeping with the invariable use of εὐλογεῖν, εὐλογία in biblical Greek, namely, in a religious sense=*pious discourse*. Also in Josephus and Philo εὐλογία stands

only in a religious sense in both the meanings to be named, and answering to the Hebrew עֲרֵבָה.

(I.) The praise of God, answering to εὐλογεῖν τὸν θεόν. In the O. T. thus only in Neh. xix. 5, ὑψώσουσιν ὄνομα δόξης ἐν πάσῃ εὐλογίᾳ καὶ αἰνέσει. In the Apocrypha, Tob. viii. 15, εὐλογητὸς εἰ σὺ ὁ θεὸς ἐν πάσῃ εὐλογίᾳ καθαρᾷ καὶ ἀγίᾳ; Ecclus. i. 20. In like manner, the οὗ τὸ μνημόσυνον ἐν εὐλογίαις of Ecclus. xlv. 1, xlv. 11, cf. 1 Macc. iii. 7, εἰς εὐλ., may be understood of praise to God on account of some one, this answering at least to the actual character of such εὐλογία in Ecclus. xlv. Thus the LXX. have understood עֲרֵבָה in Ps. xxxvii. 26, τὸ σπέρμα αὐτοῦ εἰς εὐλογίαν ἔσται. In the N. T. thus in Rev. vii. 12, ἡ εὐλογία καὶ ἡ δόξα τῷ θεῷ; v. 13, τῷ ἀρνίῳ ἡ εὐλ.; ver. 12, ἄξιός λαβεῖν . . . δόξαν καὶ εὐλ.; and in like manner 1 Cor. x. 16, τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας, according to what has been said under εὐλογεῖν, (I.) b.

(II.) Blessing (from εὐλογ. with God as its subject), which God promises and bestows; cf. the gen. of the subject εὐλ. τοῦ θεοῦ, Wisd. xv. 19; Ecclus. xi. 22, xxx. 25. (a) Actively, of the promises of blessing, the opposite of κατάρρα, Deut. xi. 29, xxiii. 5, μετέστρεψε κύριος ὁ θεὸς σου τὰς κατάρρας εἰς εὐλογίας; Neh. xiii. 2; Deut. xxviii. 2, xxviii. 23; Isa. viii. 34, *et al.*; Josephus, *Ant.* iv. 8. 44. But usually (b) passively, of the contents of these promises, *the good or blessing promised*, that which God's favour secures, Gen. xxviii. 4, xxxix. 5, xlix. 25; Ex. xxxii. 29; Lev. xxv. 29, ἀποστέλλω τὴν εὐλογίαν μου ὑμῖν. In Ps. iii. 8 syn. with σωτηρία; xxi. 4, 7, xxiv. 5, syn. with ἐλεημοσύνη (Heb. עֲרֵבָה, see δικαιοσύνη); Isa. xlv. 3; Zech. viii. 13. Thus in the N. T. and excepting Heb. vi. 7, xii. 17, 2 Cor. ix. 6, always in a soteriologic sense of N. T. blessing, Gal. iii. 14, ἵνα εἰς τὰ ἔθνη ἡ εὐλ. τοῦ Ἀβρ. γένηται. For this genitive of possession, cf. Ecclus. vii. 32. Eph. i. 3, εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεὸς ὁ εὐλόγησας ἡμᾶς ἐν πάσῃ εὐλογίᾳ πνευματικῇ ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις κ.τ.λ.; 1 Pet. iii. 9, εὐλογίαν κληρονομεῖν (cf. Heb. xii. 17); Rom. xv. 29, ἐν πληρώματι εὐλογίας Χρ. ἐλεύσομαι (compare i. 11).

(III.) Blessing, which men promise or pronounce. (a) Actively, of the word of blessing, Gen. xxvii. 12, 35, 36, 38, 41; Ecclus. iii. 8, 9; 2 Chron. v. 1. So also of the Aaronic blessing, Ecclus. xxxvi. 22, κατὰ τὴν εἰλ. Ἀαρὼν περὶ τοῦ λαοῦ σου. In the N. T. Jas. iii. 10, ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ στόματος ἐξέρχεται εὐλογία καὶ κατάρρα. (b) Passively of the blessing or good itself, *e.g.* the designation of gifts presented as blessings, Gen. xxxiii. 11; 1 Sam. xxv. 27, xxx. 26; 2 Kings v. 15; and so in the N. T. 2 Cor. ix. 5, ἵνα προκαταρτίσωσιν τὴν προεπηγγελμένην εὐλογίαν ὑμῶν, ταύτην ἐτοιμὴν εἶναι οὕτως ὡς εὐλογίαν καὶ μὴ ὡς πλεονεξίαν.

Ἐνευλογέω, in the LXX. answering to עֲרֵבָה, Gen. xii. 3, xviii. 8, xxii. 18, xxviii. 14 (xxvi. 4, Alex., but Vat. εὐλ.); Ps. lxxii. 17, and thus Ecclus. xlv. 21; so in the N. T. Gal. iii. 8, ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν σοὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, from Gen. xii. 3; Acts iii. 25, ἐν τῷ σπέρματί σου ἐνευλογηθήσονται (West. εὐλ.) πᾶσαι αἱ πατριαὶ τῆς γῆς, from Gen. xxii. 8; therefore = *to bless a person, so that he may be a blessing to others, so that the*

blessing promised and bestowed may be shared by others (not to be likened to the German "einsegnen," i.e. in or for a position or situation, etc.). The word, on account of its very composition, is clearly unknown to profane Greek.

Ὁ μ ο λ ο γ έ ω, ὁμολόγησα. The use of this word in Heb. xiii. 15 is peculiar; ἀναφέρωμεν θυσίαν αἰνέσεως τῷ θεῷ τοῦτ' ἐστὶν καρπὸν χειλέων ὁμολογούντων τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ. A dative of this kind after ὁμολ. occurs elsewhere neither in profane nor biblical Greek, in which the word apart from the N. T. is rare, certified only in Jer. li. 25, ὁμολογίας ὁμολογεῖν = *to vow* (ἱν, usually = εὐχομαι), and Job. xl. 9, ὁμολογήσω ὅτι δύναται ἡ δεξιὰ σου σῶσαι = ἡ ἱή, which usually is rendered by ἐξομολογεῖσθαι. This last stands mainly with the dative = *to praise*, of the celebration of God's praise expressed in the form of a devout confession, see below. It might be conjectured that the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews chose the more ordinary ὁμολ. instead of this word, which is rarer, and never with this signification in profane Greek. Ὁμολ. itself, indeed, does not occur in this sense in profane Greek, but in Philo it thus appears, *Lib. Alleg.* i. 1, lx. 18, παραχωρεῖν θεῷ καὶ ὁμολογεῖν αὐτῷ; see also ὁμολογία. There appears, however, another reason for the choice of this word. Ἐξομολογεῖσθαι τῷ θεῷ without object is in O. T. Greek a *term. techn.* for thankful adoration. In this sense καρπὸν χειλέων ὁμολογούντων τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ would hardly serve as the practical explanation of ἀναφέρειν θυσίαν αἰνέσεως τῷ θεῷ. This statement is fully met and the connection with ver. 17 explained only upon the supposition that ὁμολ. τῷ ὄν. is chosen in order to give prominence to the element of *confession* or *acknowledgment*, an element which lies in the background in ἐξομολ. τῷ θεῷ or τῷ ὄν., therefore = (with devout praise) *to acknowledge or confess*, so that instead of the acc. or ἐν, we have the simple dative. We must not, of course, think of an abbreviated χάριν ὁμολ. (Lucian, Appian, Josephus).

Ἀ ν θ ο μ ο λ ο γ έ ο μ α ι, only in the middle (*a*) *mutually to agree, to coincide with in reply*, Dem., Polyb., Plut., e.g. τοῖς εἰρημένοις; Plut. *Brut.* xvi. 2, πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἔβλεψαν ἀνθομολογούμενοι διὰ τῶν προσώπων. Also (*b*) *to confess, to allow*, Polyb. xv. 27. 9, πρὸς οὐδὲν τῶν λεγομένων ἀνθομολογούμενος. Hence Josephus, *Ant.* viii. 10. 3, τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἀνθομολογούμενος, given a little before as ἐξομολ. Thus without object of the confession of sins, 3 Esdr. viii. 90, προσευχόμενος ἀνθομολογεῖτο κλαίων; Ecclus. xx. 2, ὁ ἀνθομολογούμενος ἀπὸ ἐλαττώσεως κωλυθήσεται. (*c*) *Of thanks, ἀνθ. χάριν*, Plut. *Aemil. Paul.* xi. 1. In the LXX. and N. T. without χάριν; Ps. lxxix. 14, ἀνθομολογησόμεθά σοι = ἡ ἱή. Luke ii. 38, of Anna, ἀνθομολογεῖτο τῷ θεῷ, corresponding with ὁμολογ. in the sense *to acknowledge*, ἐξομολογεῖσθαι = *to praise*, as in Ecclus. xvii. 22, 23, ἀνθομολόγησις and ἐξομολόγησις are used alternately as thanksgiving and praise; cf. 2 Esdr. iii. 11, of the thanksgiving of the priests, ἀπεκρίθησαν ἐν αἶνῳ καὶ ἀνθομολογήσει; cf. ἐξομολ. ἐναντίον τοῦ θεοῦ, κυρίου, Dan. vi. 10; 2 Chron. vii. 6.

Ἐ ξ ο μ ο λ ο γ έ ω, in the active only in Luke xxii. 6; elsewhere in profane and biblical

Greek only in the middle. It occurs only in later Greek, sometimes in Plut., but not often, mostly in the Hellenic Greek, in Josephus, Philo, and biblical Greek. It denotes full and unreserved *ὁμολογεῖν* (compare *ἐξιλάσκεσθαι*). (a)=**To confess**, Plut. *Stoicor. τρυφῆς*. xvii. (1042 A). *Anton.* lix. 3, *καλῶς πεποιήκας τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἄνευ βασάνων ἐξομολογησάμενος*. Joseph. *Bell. jud.* i. 32. 2, *ἐξομολογοῦμαί σοι τὴν ἐμαντοῦ φρενοβλάβειαν*. *Ant.* viii. 4. 2, *τὰς ἀμαρτίας καὶ τὰς τῶν πατρίων νομίμων παραβάσεις*; viii. 10. 3, *ἐξομολογεῖσθαι πάντες ὥρμησαν ὅτι δικαίως αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς ὑπερόψεται*. Thus not in the LXX., for Dan. ix. 4, *προσευξάμην πρὸς κύριον . . . καὶ ἐξομολογήσαμην καὶ εἶπα*, notwithstanding the confession of sin in ver. 5, is not to be taken as meaning *to confess*, but =*to praise*, for the confession of sin only prepares the way for the acknowledgment of God in ver. 7, *σοὶ κύριε ἡ δικαιοσύνη καὶ ἡμῖν ἡ αἰσχὺν*. In the N. T., on the contrary, with the object, *τὰς ἀμαρτίας*, Matt. iii. 6; Mark i. 5; Jas. v. 16.—(b)=**To own, to grant**, Joseph. *Bell. jud.* v. 10. 5, *ἐξομολογήσαντο δ' ὅπερ ἦσαν εἶναι δούλοι*; xvi. 5. 4, *εἴ τις λόγῳ μὴ θεραπεύοιτο δούλον ἐξομολογούμενος*. Plut. *Num.* xvi. 2, *Ῥωμύλου μὴ βουληθέντος ἐξομολογήσασθαι τῷ μέτρῳ τοῦ οἰκείου τὴν ἀφαίρεσιν τοῦ ἀλλοτρίου*. Lucian, *Hermot.* 75. Herewith, as in the case of *ὁμολογεῖν*, is connected the meaning **to consent, to promise**, in which the active stands in Luke xxii. 6, *συνέθεντο αὐτῷ ἀργύριον δοῦναι καὶ ἐξομολόγησεν*. But in O. T. Greek and in the remaining places in the N. T., it answers (c) as a rule to the Hebrew *הִתְהַלָּל*, denoting *the praise of God*, and this in the form of confession or thankful acknowledgment; cf. mainly its combinations with the acc. of the object, Ps. lxxxix. 6, *ἐξομολογήσονται οἱ οὐρανοὶ τὰ θαυμάσιά σου*. Tob. xii. 22, *ἐξομολογοῦντο τὰ ἔργα τὰ μεγάλα καὶ θαυμαστὰ αὐτοῦ*. (Also compare Acts xix. 18, *ἤρχονται ἐξομολογούμενοι καὶ ἀναγγέλλοντες τὰς πράξεις αὐτῶν*.) In Rev. iii. 5 the Rec. *ἔξομ.* for *ὁμολογήσω* is not supported. Next *ἔξομ. τί τινι*, with acknowledgment to confess something to one=*to praise*, Gen. xxix. 34; Ps. cvii. 15, *ἐξομολογησάσθωσαν τῷ κυρίῳ τὰ ἐλέη αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰ θαυμάσια αὐτοῦ τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρ.*; cf. Tob. xi. 16, *ἐξομολογεῖτο ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν ὅτι*. That the idea of a confession lies at the basis is clear, especially from Ps. xlii. 6, xliii. 5, *ἐξομολογήσομαι αὐτῷ Σωτήριον τοῦ προσώπου μου ὁ θεὸς μου*. Compare also the *ὅτι* which often follows, 1 Chron. xvi. 34; Dan. ii. 29; Ps. liv. 8, xcviii. 3, cxxxix. 14; Eccclus. li. 1. Hence=**adoringly to confess**, Phil. ii. 11, *πάντα γλῶσσα ἐξομολογήσεται ὅτι κύριος Ἰς Χς εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ πατρός*. Cf. 2 Macc. vii. 37; *μετὰ ἐτασμῶν καὶ μαστίγων ἐξομολογήσασθαι διότι μόνος αὐτὸς θεὸς ἐστίν*. Hence we can easily understand the use of the objectless *ἔξομολ. τινί*=*to offer acknowledgment*, only τῷ θεῷ, κυρίῳ, of thankful adoration; cf. Philo, *Lib. Alleg.* i. 1, lix. 40, *ὁ τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ φρονήσεως ἀσκητῆς ἐξομολογεῖτο εὐχαριστικῶς τῷ τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἀφθόνως δωρησαμένῳ*, where, as the connection shows, *εὐχαριστικῶς* is an essential and not a merely accidental element of the *ἔξομ.* So in the remaining places of the LXX. and Apocrypha, e.g. 2 Sam. xxii. 50; 1 Chron. xvi. 8; 2 Chron. v. 12, xxx. 22; very often in the Psalms, vi. 5, vii. 18, ix. 2, xviii. 50, xxviii. 7, xxx. 5, 10, 13, etc. *Ἐξομ. τῷ ὀνίμ. θ.*, 2 Chron. vi. 24; Ps. cxvii. 4, cxlviii. 4, cxl. 14, cxlii. 8; Eccclus. li. 1. Frequently joined with *αἰνεῖν*,

ψάλλειν, εὐλογεῖν.—Absolutely, Eccclus. xxxix. 15.—In the Apocrypha it is rare; besides Tob. xii. 5 sqq. only in a few places, such as Eccclus. li. 12; 2 Macc. viii. 27.—In the N. T. Matt. xi. 25; Luke x. 21, with the dative and ὅτι. Rom. xiv. 11 from Isa. xlv. 23, Alex. Rom. xv. 9 from Ps. xviii. 50.—In the LXX. and Apocrypha ἐξομολόγησις likewise, denoting *thankful adoration*.

Ἐκλέγω. The use of the middle only in biblical Greek is explained from the Hebrew בחר, to which it corresponds. (It is employed only occasionally for other words; for the rarer בור, Ex. xx. 38; Dan. xi. 25, xii. 9; cf. בָּרַר, נָכַר, הִתְבָּרַר, also for לָקַח, Prov. xxiv. 32. For קָבַר, Jer. ii. 16, and a few others. בחר is rarely rendered by αἰρετίζειν, more rarely again by αἰρεῖσθαι, 2 Sam. xv. 15; Job xxxiv. 4; Jer. viii. 3; cf. Prov. xvi. 17, xxii. 1. By προαίρεῖσθαι, Deut. vii. 6, x. 15; Prov. i. 29. By ἐξαίρεῖσθαι, Deut. xxxi. 11; Job xxxvi. 21. By ἐπιλέγειν, Ex. xvii. 9, xviii. 25; Josh. viii. 3; 2 Sam. x. 9, xvii. 1.) But בחר includes two elements—it first gives prominence to the interest or favour of the choosing subject, keeping in view a relation to be established between him and the object. Secondly, it implies a preference for the object above others of its kind, and a choosing it from among many. The interest or favour of the choosing subject appears in בחר, being a synonym with אָהַב, Ps. xlvii. 5, lxxviii. 68; Isa. xli. 8, xlix. 7, 8; with חָפַץ, Isa. lvi. 4, lxv. 11, lxvi. 3, 4; with רָצוֹן, Isa. lviii. 5; with רָחַם, Isa. xiv. 1; חָסַד, Isa. xlv. 9, cf. lxvi. 3; יָדַע, Amos iii. 2, cf. Deut. vii. 6; אָדָּה, Ps. cxxxii. 14; קָרַב, Piel, Ps. lxv. 3; לָקַח, Ps. lxxviii. 70; compare the parallelism of the object with עָבַד, Ps. cv. 26; Isa. xlv. 4; with סָנְלָה, Ps. cxxxv. 4, and the frequent accompanying statement of the qualification of the object for a certain goal in God's redemptive בחר. The selection of the object from among many disappears in so few places that the use of the word thus must be regarded as a weakened sense; cf. Gen. vi. 2; 1 Sam. viii. 18, xii. 13; 2 Sam. xxiv. 12; 1 Kings iii. 8, viii. 44; Neh. ix. 7, and even in these cases the element is traceable; cf. 1 Sam. xx. 13, בָּחַר אֶתְּהָ לְבָרָאִישׁ, where the rendering of the LXX., σὺ μέτοχος εἶ τῷ νόμῳ Ἰησοῦ, is not justified by the relation of this בָּחַר to the preceding בְּנֵי-נָעֻת הַפְּרִדִּית. Elsewhere the thing implied is always a selection, not only when the range out of which the choice is made or the preference is expressly stated, as in Deut. xviii. 5, xxx. 19; Josh. xxiv. 15, 22; 1 Sam. ii. 28; 1 Kings viii. 16, xviii. 23, 25; 2 Kings xxi. 7; 1 Chron. xix. 10, xxi. 10, xxviii. 4, 5; 2 Chron. vi. 5, 6, xxxiii. 7; Ezek. xx. 38 (usually ἐκ, once 2 Sam. vi. 21, ὑπὲρ τινα), but also in other places; cf. e.g. Gen. xiii. 11; Num. xvi. 5, 7, xvii. 5; Deut. iv. 37, vii. 7, xii. 5, xvii. 10, 15, xxi. 5; 1 Sam. x. 24, הָרְאִיתֶם אֲשֶׁר בָּחַרְבוּ יְהוָה בִּי אֶזְרָא בְּכָל-הָעָם; 1 Sam. xvi. 8–10, xvii. 40; 2 Sam. xvi. 18; 1 Kings viii. 48, xi. 13, 34, 36; 1 Chron. xv. 2; Ps. lxxviii. 68, 70, cxxxii. 14; Isa. vii. 15, 16, xl. 20, lvi. 4, lviii. 5, 6, lxv. 11, lxvi. 3, 4; Jer. xxxiii. 24. In ἐκλέγειν this reference to the relation of the object chosen to others of its kind or class is undoubted, and the usage of profane Greek throughout affords no indication of the weakening of the preposition, so that we

hardly need the example in Xen. *Hell.* i. 6. 19, ἐξ ἀπασῶν νεῶν τοὺς ἀρίστους ἐρέτας ἐκλέξας; Plat. *Rep.* vii. 535 A, μέμνησαι οὐκ τὴν προτέραν ἐκλογὴν τῶν ἀρχόντων οἷους ἐξελέξαμεν, . . . τοὺς τε γὰρ βεβαιοτάτους καὶ τοὺς ἀνδρειοτάτους προαιρετέον; Aristot. *Rhet. ad Alex.* 23, τὰ μέγιστα ἐκλέγων; Polyb. iii. 93. 4, τῶν ἐργατῶν βοῶν ἐκλέξαντες ἐκ πάσης τῆς λαίας τοὺς εὐρωστοτάτους; *ibid.* cxiv. 1, οὓς πάντας Ἀννίβας ἐν τοῖς τῆς προγεγεννημένης σκύλοις ἐκλέξας κατακεκοσμήκει, a passage specially appropriate as indicating the conception of choice or selection which lies in the word. The same is the case in the middle, Xen. *Mem.* i. 6. 14, τοὺς θησαυροὺς τῶν πάλαι σοφῶν ἀνδρῶν, οὓς ἐκεῖνοι κατέλιπον ἐν βιβλίοις γράψαντες . . . σὺν τοῖς φίλοις διέρχομαι καὶ ἂν τι ὀρώμεν ἀγαθὸν ἐκλεγόμεθα; Plat. *Legg.* ii. 670 D, ἐκλέγεσθαι τὰ προσήκοντα, ἃ τοῖς τηλικούτοις πρέπον; Plat. *Tim.* 24 C, ἡ θεὸς . . . ἐκλεξαμένη τὸν τόπον ἐν ᾧ γεγέννησθε; Dem. *de cor.* xviii. 261, xlv. 64, *et al.* The middle differs from the active in this, that the purpose for which the object is chosen is a purpose for the choosing subject; the subject chooses out something for himself. The middle therefore, ἐκλέγεσθαι, combines in itself the two references which are contained in the Hebrew **קָח**, to take or set apart something in preference to another for oneself, to seek out or choose out something for oneself; and it is unwarranted to give special prominence either to the element of selection from among others, or to that of preference above others. The main import is appointment for a certain object or goal. And it is just this, namely, that there is no need to give this prominence, which distinguishes ἐκλέγεσθαι from its synonym αἰρεῖσθαι. In αἰρεῖσθαι the main point is "to appoint for oneself," and if this is done by selection a further statement is necessary; but with ἐκλέγεσθαι this is not requisite; and hence it is only very seldom that the Hebrew **קָח** is rendered by αἰρεῖσθαι or the Alex. αἰρετίζειν. One or the other indeed of the two references may be prominent, either the relation of the object to others of its kind from which it is selected, or the setting apart of the object for the subject; but nowhere does either reference wholly disappear. The seeming difficulty arising from the signification to seek out with reference to God's redemptive election is met and solved by the simple mention of the contrast in which the ἐκλέγεσθαι takes place, whether the object is chosen in distinction from others, or whether its election stands in contrast with rejection.

For better review we may distinguish between ἐκλέγεσθαι in general and ἐκλ. in the history of redemption; (a) in general, to select some one or something for oneself, to choose, τί, τινά, with further statement of place, number, etc., Luke vi. 13, προσεφώνησεν τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐκλεξάμενος ἀπ' αὐτῶν δώδεκα, οὓς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασεν; John xv. 19, ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου οὐκ ἐστὲ, ἀλλ' ἐγὼ ἐξελεξάμην ὑμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου; Acts i. 24, ἀνάδειξον ὃν ἐξελέξω ἐκ τούτων τῶν δύο ἕνα; xv. 22, 25; Ezek. xx. 38; 2 Sam. xxiv. 12, τρία ἐγὼ αἶρω ἐπὶ σε· ἐκλεξαι σεαυτῷ ἓν ἐξ αὐτῶν. Without any such further statement = to seek out or select something or some one for oneself. Gen. xiii. 11, ἐξελέξατο ἑαυτῷ Λωτὶ πᾶσαν τὴν περίχωρον τοῦ Ἰορδάνου; Luke xiv. 7, πρωτοκλισίας ἐξελέγοντο; Isa. lxvi. 3, ἐξελέξαντο ἃ ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτῶν ἠθέλησεν. With these we may

also class Deut. xxx. 19, ἔκλεξαι τὴν ζωὴν ἵνα ζῇς σύ; Josh. xxiv. 15, ἐκλέξασθε ὑμῖν σήμερον τίνι λατρεύσητε, εἴτε . . . εἴτε . . .; cf. ver. 22, *to choose some person or thing for oneself and to appropriate it*, Luke x. 42, ἀγαθὴν μερίδα ἐξελέξατο; John xv. 16, οὐχ ὑμεῖς μὲ ἐξελέξασθε, ἀλλ' ἐγὼ ἐξελεξάμην ὑμᾶς; vi. 70, οὐκ ἐγὼ ὑμᾶς τοὺς δώδεκα ἐξελεξάμην; καὶ ἐξ ὑμῶν εἰς διάβολός ἐστιν; xiii. 18, οἶδα οὗς ἐξελεξάμην. This may become so weak that the element of selection disappears, and nothing is expressed but the deciding purpose of the subject towards a certain object; cf. Isa. lviii. 5, 6, lxv. 11, lxvi. 3, ἐξελέξαντο τὰς ὁδοὺς αὐτῶν. Further, *to choose some person or thing for a definite object or calling*, e.g. βασιλεία, 1 Sam. viii. 18, with double accusative or some similar qualification, as in 1 Kings viii. 16, τοῦ εἶναι ἡγούμενον; cf. 2 Chron. vi. 5; 1 Chron. xv. 2, αἶρειν τὴν κίβωτον; xxviii. 5, καθίσαι κ.τ.λ. So in the N. T. Acts i. 2, οὗς [ἀποστόλους] ἐξελέξατο; vi. 5, ἐξελέξαντο Στέφανον.—(b) The remaining N. T. passages, Mark xiii. 20, Acts xiii. 17, 1 Cor. i. 27, 28, Jas. ii. 5, Eph. i. 4, refer back to רַבָּה of God's election of Israel, **His preferential choosing out of them from among all nations**, whereby as distinct from these they stand in a special position as belonging to God, Deut. xiv. 2, καὶ σε ἐξελέξατο κύριος ὁ θεός σου γενέσθαι σε αὐτῷ λαὸν περιούσιον ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἔθνων (thus with ἀπό also in Ecclus. xlv. 16, elsewhere ἐκ); cf. cxxxv. 4; xxxiii. 12, μακάριον τὸ ἔθνος οὗ ἐστὶ κύριος ὁ θεὸς αὐτοῦ, λαὸς ὃν ἐξελέξατο εἰς κληρονομίαν ἑαυτῷ; cf. λαός; Deut. vii. 7, προεῖλετο κύριος ὑμᾶς καὶ ἐξελέξατο; cf. ver. 6, σὲ προεῖλετο (רַבָּה) κύριος ὁ θεός σου εἶναι αὐτῷ λαὸν περιούσιον παρὰ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη; Ps. xlvii. 5.

Ἐκλεκτός occurs often in the LXX. as = רַבָּה, *youth*, רַבִּי, רַבָּה, רַבִּי, רַבָּה, Isa. liv. 12; Jer. iii. 19, xxii. 7; Ezek. xxxi. 16; Gen. xli. 2; Hab. i. 16; Hag. ii. 8; but usually as = רַבָּה. The passages in Isaiah where this word occurs, Isa. xli. 8, xlii. 1, xlv. 4, cf. xliii. 20, liv. 12, lxv. 8, 9, 15, 22, 25, lead the way for the use of ἐκλεκτοί in the N. T. to denote persons who not only are the objects of the divine election in distinction from those not yet chosen (not withal rejected), but who also have a position of their own within Israel itself in contrast with those who had been chosen but who are rejected; see ἐκλείγεσθαι. This **new contrast**, which does not elsewhere appear in the O. T., but which of necessity becomes manifest in the course of the history of God's relations to Israel, finds expression in the words of Christ, Matt. xx. 16, xxi. 14, πολλοὶ κλητοί, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοί. Being the issue of the O. T. development, this is not indeed a new representation, but it now first comes into prominence as the result of the previous history, and it is specially significant in Matthew's Gospel. In this contrast with those whose election has been in vain (2 Pet. i. 10), and who therefore are designated only κλητοί, this contrast of those whose election has become an abiding reality = the *non-rejected*, the word designates all true members of the N. T. community as distinct from persons opposed both to it and to its Lord, Matt. xxiv. 22, 24, 31; Mark xiii. 20, 22, 27; Luke xviii. 7,—the Church as distinct from the world (for in the N. T. the distinction is

no longer between Israel and the ἔθνη, but between ἐκκλησία and κόσμος, or κόσμος οὗτος, or υἱοὶ τῆς ἀπειθείας), Rom. viii. 33; Col. iii. 12; 2 Tim. ii. 10; Titus i. 1; 1 Pet. i. 1, ii. 9; cf. Rev. xvii. 14, κλητοὶ καὶ ἐκλεκτοὶ καὶ πιστοί.

Α ὕω in the LXX. = η̅η̅, Isa. lviii. 6, λυέ πάντα σύνδεσμον ἀδικίας.—Λύτρον, also = 𐤀𐤣𐤏, Ex. xxi. 30, xxx. 12; Num. xxxv. 31, 32; Prov. vi. 35, οὐκ ἀνταλλάσσεται οὐδενὸς λύτρον τὴν ἐχθράν. In Matt. xx. 28, ἀντὶ πολλῶν is to be taken with λύτρον and not δοῦναι.—Λυτρόω in the LXX. = 𐤀𐤣𐤏 (which sometimes is = ῥύεσθαι, *et al.*), also = η̅η̅, which is rendered by ῥύεσθαι more rarely than is 𐤀𐤣𐤏. Λυτρόω answers to 𐤀𐤣𐤏, *e.g.* in Ex. vi. 6, xv. 13; Isa. xli. 14, xliii. 1, 14, xliv. 22–24, lii. 3, lxii. 12, lxiii. 9; Jer. i. 34; Lam. iii. 57; Hos. xiii. 13; Micah iv. 10; Ps. lxxii. 14, lxxiv. 2, lxxvii. 16, ciii. 4, cvi. 10, cxix. 159, and here always of God's act of redemption (very seldom otherwise), = η̅η̅, in like manner mostly of God's redemption of His people, Deut. vii. 8, ix. 26, xiii. 5, xv. 15, xxi. 8, xxiv. 18; 2 Sam. vii. 23; 1 Chron. xvii. 21; Neh. i. 10; Ps. xxv. 22, xxvi. 10, xxxi. 6, xxxiv. 23, xlv. 27, cxxx. 8; Isa. li. 10; compare also Ps. xlix. 8, lxxi. 23; Ex. xiii. 15; Lev. x. 20, xxvii. 29. The word denotes Christ's saving work according to O. T. phraseology as a liberation from bondage under a hostile power, a freeing from soul-destroying oppression. Ἀντίλυτρον occurs in Orph. *de lapid.* 587, and according to Origen in a version of Ps. xlix. 9, and in a Codex of the Hexapla in ver. 8, as a gloss upon ἐξίλασμα. Ἀντίλ. does not occur in the LXX. Ἀπολύτρω = 𐤀𐤣𐤏, to redeem, to free, Zeph. iii. 1.

Μακάριος, α, ον, blessed, a form of μάκαρ appearing in prose and also in the poets, especially Euripides (according to Curtius, from the same root as μακρός, μῆκος, μακεδνός), which in Homer and Hesiod is predicated of the gods as distinct from men, who are liable to poverty and death (*Il.* i. 339, πρὸς τε θεῶν μακαρῶν πρὸς τε θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων), in Hesiod, Plato, Dem. *et al.*; a designation also of the dead. Μακάριος is used both of men and of a state or condition, according to Hesychius and Suidas = ὁ πάντοτε ἐν ἀγαθῷ ὢν, εὐδαίμων, but originally stronger and more ideal than εὐδαίμων, to denote a state belonging to the gods who are exalted above earthly suffering and the limitations of earthly life; see μακαρισμός. This is manifest in Aristotle, with whom the μακάριος as opposed to ἐνδεής is he who lacks no good. In *Ethic. Nicom.* x. 8, he distinguishes between divine and human blessedness by naming εὐδαιμονία as the predicate of the latter, for τοῖς μὲν θεοῖς ἅπας ὁ βίος μακάριος, τοῖς δὲ ἀνθρώποις, ἐφ' ὅσον ὁμοίωμα τι τῆς τοιαύτης ἐνεργείας ὑπάρχει. Xen., Plato, Plut., *et al.*, often combine μακ. καὶ εὐδαίμων as a fuller and more exhaustive phrase; cf. Xen. *Cyr.* viii. 3. 48; Plato, *Rep.* i. 354 A. Plut. *De aud. poet.* 6 (25 A), has εὐδαίμων, εὐδαιμονία only as the word to denote human happiness (with it also the more poetic εὐτυχής and the Homeric and highly poetic ὄλβιος), and in Stobaeus μακάριος does not once occur in the section περὶ εὐδαιμονίας. Still it denotes a state higher than εὐδαιμονία, though the primary idea is the same, namely, ἡ παντελὴς τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἕξις ἣ καὶ τελειότης βίου κατὰ φύσιν εὐροοῦντος (Plut.

l.c.).—As was to be expected, biblical Greek has throughout kept clear of the words *εὐδαίμων*, *εὐτυχής*, not because of their heathen colouring, but from that deeper and more ideal view which instinctively made its choice between *μακάριος* and *δολβιος*, if *εὐδαιμ.* and *εὐτυχ.* were passed by. The highly poetic *δολβιος* was the more unlikely to be adopted, but *μακάριος* was by far the most appropriate term to receive the religious fulness of the biblical view. *Μακάριος* answers to the well-known Hebrew *אֲשֵׁר*, and is used first in a purely earthly sense, syn. with *καλῶς σοι ἔσται*, Ps. cxxvii. 2; opposed to *ἐμπεσεῖν κακοῖς*, Prov. xxviii. 14; compare Gen. xxx. 13; 1 Kings x. 8; 2 Chron. ix. 7; Ps. xxxiv. 9; but it is chiefly employed to denote the state wherein one enjoys the favour and salvation of God; compare Isa. lvi. 2 with ver. 1, *ἤγγικε γὰρ τὸ σωτήριόν μου παραγενέσθαι καὶ τὸ ἔλεός μου ἀποκαλυφθῆναι*. Earthly as is the manifestation of this blessedness, it is essentially more than this, it is the gracious and saving effect of God's favour (Ps. xxxii. 1, 2, xxxiii. 12, lxxv. 4), but is enjoyed only when there is a corresponding behaviour towards God; so that it forms the hoped-for good of those who in the present life are subject to oppression; compare, *inter alia*, Deut. xxiii. 29, Ps. xxxiv. 9 with vv. 10 sqq., xl. 5 with vv. 2-4, lxxv. 5, lxxxv. 16, xciv. 12 with 13 sqq., cvi. 3 with 4, cxii. 1 with 2 sqq., cxlv. 5 with 7 sqq.; Isa. xxx. 18; Mal. iii. 12; nay, inwardly it exists in the enjoyment of grace and fellowship with God, even where the outward condition does not correspond, see Ps. xxxii. 1, 2, lxxxiv. 5 sqq.; Job v. 17. In the Apocrypha the religious element appears only in a few places, *e.g.* Ecclus. xxxiv. 15, l. 28, 29; Wisd. iii. 13; Ecclus. xiv. 1, 2, 20, xxv. 8, 9.

In the N. T. *μακάριος* is quite a religiously qualified conception, expressing the life-joy and satisfaction of the man who does or shall experience God's favour and salvation, his blessedness altogether apart from his outward condition. Only in Acts xx. 35, xxvi. 2, 1 Cor. vii. 40, cf. 28, does it stand without this reference to saving experience. But otherwise when spoken of man, it always signifies a happiness produced by some experience of God's favour, and specially conditioned by the revelation of grace. In relation to the O. T. representation there is a deepening of meaning answering to the inward spiritual character of the blessing which comes with the N. T. revelation, but not (Achelis on Matt. v. 3) by a transfer of the conception Godwards, as appears in 1 Tim. i. 11, vi. 15. It occurs (*a*) used of God, 1 Tim. i. 11, vi. 15; (*b*) of men. Nearest to profane Greek (except the passages above cited, Acts xx. 35, etc.) comes Rev. xiv. 13, *μακάριοι οἱ νεκροὶ οἱ ἐν κυρίῳ ἀποθνήσκοντες ἀπάρτι*; xx. 6, *μακ. καὶ ἅγιος ὁ ἔχων μέρος ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει τῇ πρώτῃ*. It most closely approaches the O. T. use in the beatitudes, Matt. v. 3-11; Luke vi. 20-22; Rom. iv. 7, 8 from Ps. xxxii. 1, 2; Rev. xxii. 14, *μακάριοι οἱ πλύνοντες τὰς στολὰς αὐτῶν ὅτι κ.τ.λ.* Distinctively N. T. is John xx. 29, *μακάριοι οἱ μὴ ἰδόντες καὶ πιστεύσαντες*. Matt. xiii. 16; Luke x. 23; Matt. xvi. 17; 1 Pet. iv. 14, *μακάριοι, ὅτι τὸ τῆς δόξης καὶ τοῦ θεοῦ πνεῦμα ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἀναπαύεται*. Further, in Matt. xi. 6; Luke vii. 23; Matt. xvi. 17, xxiv. 46; Luke i. 45, xi. 27, 28, xii. 37, 38, 43, xiv. 14, 15, xxiii. 29; John xiii. 17; Jas. i. 12, 25; 1 Pet. iii. 14; Rev. i. 3,

xvi. 15, xix. 9, xxii. 7.—(c) Once with a substantive denoting not a person but a thing, Tit. ii. 13, τὴν μακαρίαν ἐλπίδα (cf. μακαρίζειν, usually = *joyously to praise*, but in Ps. xli. 3, Isa. iii. 12, ix. 16 = *to make happy, to bless*).

Μακαρίζω, fut. μακαριῶ, (a) *to pronounce happy*, Hom., Herod., Xen., Thuc., Plut. *et al.* LXX. = 𐤇𐤌𐤁𐤏, Gen. xxx. 12; Job xxix. 11; Ps. lxxii. 17; Mal. iii. 12, 15; Ecclus. xi. 28, etc. In the N. T. only in Luke i. 48; Jas. v. 11. The construction τινά τινος (Plato, Isocrates, Xen., Plut.) only in 4 Macc. i. 10.—(b) *To make happy*; thus not in profane Greek, but in Ps. xli. 3; Isa. iii. 12, ix. 16; Ecclus. xxv. 23. Hence comes μακαριστός = μακάριος, Prov. xiv. 21, xvi. 20, xxix. 18; 2 Macc. vii. 24.

Μακαρισμός, οὐ, ὁ, *pronouncing as happy or blessed*, Plato, Aristotle, Plut. *Sol.* xxvii. 7, ὃ δ' εἰς τέλος ὁ δαίμων ἔθετο τὴν εὐπραξίαν, τοῦτον εὐδαίμονα νομίζομεν. ὁ δὲ ζῶντος ἔτι καὶ κινδυνεύοντος ἐν τῷ βίῳ μακαρισμὸς ὥσπερ ἀγωνιζομένου κήρυγμα καὶ στέφανος ἔστιν ἀβέβαιος καὶ ἄκυρος. In biblical Greek only in Rom. iv. 6, 9; Gal. iv. 15.

Μαμωνᾶς, ᾰ, ὁ, as all the uncials and most cursive MSS. read instead of the spelling adopted by a few cursives and the Rec. μαμμωνᾶς. Christ thus designates **earthly wealth**, money and goods, Luke xvi. 9, 11, by an expression borrowed from post-biblical Hebrew and Chaldee, employing it as the name of an idol in the words οὐ δύνασθε θεῷ δουλεῦν καὶ μαμωνᾶ (ver. 13; Matt. vi. 24); see von Hofmann on Luke xvi. 9; compare Eph. v. 5, πλεονέκτης ὃ ἐστὶν εἰδωλολάτρης. The Targums use ܡܡܢܐ, ܡܡܢܐ, for the various Hebrew words for money and goods, which designate it according to its nature and value as 𐤇𐤌𐤁, 𐤇𐤌, 𐤇𐤌, or from its origin 𐤇𐤌𐤁, or its design 𐤇𐤌𐤁, 𐤇𐤌, e.g. Gen. xxxvii. 26; Ex. xxi. 30; Judg. v. 20; Isa. xlv. 13, lv. 1; Ps. xlv. 12, xlix. 11, *et al.* See Levy, *Chald. Wörterb. über die Targumim*, s.v.; also his *Neuhebr. u. Chald. Wörterb.* Buxtorf, *Lex. chald. talm. et rabb.* s.v. It is therefore the comprehensive word for all kinds of possessions, earnings, and gains, a designation of *value* like the German "Geld." Against the explanation of the word attempted by Drusius, and named first by Buxtorf, making it a contraction of ܡܡܢܐ from ܡܡܢ, as ܡܡܐ instead of ܡܡܢܐ from ܡܡܢ, is the fact that there is no indication of the original form as in ܡܡܢ, ܡܡܢܐ, ܡܡܢ; moreover, the translation by the LXX. of ܡܡܢܐ in Isa. xxxiii. 6 by *θησαυροί*, and in Ps. xxxvii. 3 by *πλοῦτος*, does not tell for it, because in Isa. xxxiii. 6 it is very doubtful whether *θησαυροί* answers to ܡܡܢܐ, and not rather to the following ܡܡܢ, and in Ps. xxxvii. 3, *ποιμανθήσῃ ἐπὶ τῷ πλούτῳ* = ܡܡܢܐ ܡܡܢ, is perhaps a mistaken paraphrase, or the LXX. have, as often supposed, read ܡܡܢܐ instead of ܡܡܢܐ, ܡܡܢ as in Isa. lx. 5 being = *plenty*, abundance, riches. Gesenius attempts another derivation, *Thesaurus*, s.v. ܡܡܢ = ܡܡܢ = *storehouse, hidden treasure* (so also Meyer on Matt. vi. 24); here there would be occasion to double the second ܡ, a doubling which cannot be proved in the Hebrew and Chaldee expression. Delitzsch, *Hor. Hebr. et Talm.* on Luke xvi. 9 (*Zeitschr. luth.*

Theol. 1876, p. 600), and Levy (*Neuhebr. Wörterbuch*) derive the word from מן, in the sense of מנה, to assign, formed like מָקוֹם from קוּם = well appointed, equipped, able. The same derivation is adopted in a play upon words in a Hagad. Midrash (Tanchuma Matt.) by the inadmissible explanation of the first ט as = מן, מַמּוֹן from מנה, to number (see the passage in Levy, *Neuhebr. Wörterb.* under מ, III.), "מַמּוֹן, that is, what thou numberest, has no value." Hofmann, on the other hand, assumes as probable the LXX. translation of Ps. xxxvii. 3, that it is derived from the same root as מְהֵמֵן, formed like מְשַׁמֵּן or מְסַרְרֵן, and signifies fulness, in the same sense as מְהֵמֵן, Isa. lx. 5. Still the review of the usage given with many examples by Buxtorf and Levy does not point to fulness as the primary idea, but to the value of the possession. As to the statement that among the Syrians a god like Plutus bore the name Mammon, there is not the least sanction for it in the passage cited as an example, Tertul. *adv. Marc.* iv. 33; see Tholuck on Matt. vi. 24. As to the genitive τῆς ἀδικίας and the epithet ἄδικος, see these words. The requirement of our Lord in Luke xvi. 9 is embodied, though with another estimate of the possession, in the rabbinical saying, that "a man must salt his property by kind acts;" מלח מַמּוֹן צדקה, "kindly doing is the salt of riches" (salt being a necessary part of every sacrifice); see Buxtorf as above.

Μαρτυρέω occurs but seldom in the LXX., Gen. xliii. 3; Deut. xix. 18; Lam. ii. 13 = יָעִיד, which is also rendered by διαμαρτύρομαι, Deut. iv. 26, xxx. 19, xxxi. 28; Jer. xxxii. 10, 44; Ex. xix. 21, 23; Ps. lxxxii. 9; Zech. iii. 6. In Gen. xxxi. 48, Deut. xxxi. 21, μαρτυρέω is = יָעִיד; in Num. xxxv. 30 = עָנָה. It is rare in the Apocrypha, 1 Macc. ii. 37; Susannah 40. Ἐπιμαρτύρομαι usually in profane Greek is = to call to witness, and rarely means to testify, Plat. *Phaedr.* 244 B. But in biblical Greek (LXX. and Apoc.) it rarely means to call to witness, Jer. xxxii. 25, and usually = to testify, 1 Kings ii. 43; Neh. ix. 29, 30, xiii. 15; Amos iii. 13; Eccus. xlv. 19; 1 Macc. ii. 56. On the other hand, διαμαρτύρομαι in profane and biblical Greek occurs in both senses; συμμαρτύρομαι (only in Jer. xi. 7, elsewhere neither in profane nor biblical Greek) = to testify.

Συνεπιμαρτυρέω, to bear witness together with, to join in attesting, Aristotle, Polyb., Plut. In biblical Greek only in Heb. ii. 4.

Συμμαρτυρέω, to bear witness with, to witness at the same time,—to confirm a testimony. (a) To bear witness with, Plut. *Thes. et Romul.* vi. 3, ὁ χρόνος ἐστὶ μάρτυς; cf. 4, τῷ δὲ τοσοῦτῳ χρόνῳ συμμαρτυρεῖ καὶ τὰ ἔργα. *De adulat. et amic. discr.* xxiii. (64 C), συνεργεῖν γὰρ δεῖ τῷ φίλῳ, μὴ συμπανουργεῖν καὶ συμβουλευεῖν, μὴ συνεπιβουλευεῖν καὶ συμμαρτυρεῖν, μὴ συνεξαπατᾶν. Plat. *Phileb.* 12 B, ΦΙΛ. μαρτύρομαι νῦν αὐτὴν τὴν θεόν. ΠΡΩ. Καὶ ἡμεῖς σοι τούτων αὐτῶν ξυμάρτυρες ἂν εἴμεν. Cf. *Errp.* ii. 311 E. Here συμμ. = *testimonium alterius suo testimonio confirmare*. It is used also (b) of the confirmation of any declaration, not only of the statement of a witness,

and differs from μαρτυρεῖν as a confirmation differs from a purely authoritative announcement; μαρτυρεῖν serves to establish, συμμ. to confirm; it never stands for the primary testimony, it is = μαρτυρεῖν τινί, to attest something, to witness for some one or something. Hence Plato, *Legg.* iii. 680 D, νῦν μὲν εὖ τῷ σὺ λόγῳ ἔοικε μαρτυρεῖν, of the person addressed, with the answer received, Ναί· συμμαρτυρεῖ γάρ. Homer, who is spoken of, confirms the matter and speaks for it (against Meyer-Weiss on *Rom.* ii. 15). Compare also Plato, *Hipp.* maj. 282 B, συμμαρτυρήσαι δέ σοι ἔχω ὅτι ἀληθῆ λέγεις, "I must confirm thee, thou speakest right," where it is not the testimony of a witness, but simply a view put forth = to assent to. Xen. *Hell.* vii. 1. 35, ἔλεγε δὲ ὁ Πελοπίδας κ.τ.λ. συνεμαρτύρει δ' αὐτῷ ταῦτα πάντα ὡς ἀληθῆ λέγοι ὁ Ἀθηναῖος Τιμαγόρας, confirmation of an account. *Ibid.* iii. 1. 2, ὁ Ποτειδάν ὡς μάλα σευ ψευδομένῳ κατεμίνυσεν . . . συνεμαρτύρησε δὲ ταῦτ' αὐτῷ καὶ ὁ ἀληθέστατος λεγόμενος χρόνος εἶναι, confirmation of an accusation or impeachment. Thuc. viii. 51. 3, οὐδὲν ἔβλαψεν αὐτόν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ξυνεμαρτύρησε μᾶλλον ταῦτ' ἐσαγγείλας; Themistocles witnessed for Phrynichus, since he would have him suspected, and yet only confirmed his statement. The συν never is meaningless, though in this passage συμμ. seems = μαρτυρεῖν τινί. Moreover it never means mere συμφρόνησις between the speaker and him of whom he witnesses (Tholuck), but it denotes the agreement or coinciding of the person witnessing either with other witnesses, or with assertions, opinions, facts stated by others, or in any way made known, which he simply confirms. The συμμάρτυρ. differs from the μάρτυς thus,—the μάρτυς avers or authenticates, the συμμ. confirms,—in other words, συμμαρτυρεῖν never, like μαρτυρεῖν, stands in the first place, but always in the second; it is something coming after. So also in the Tragedians. Eur. *Hippol.* 286, ὡς ἂν παροῦσα καὶ σύ μοι ξυμμαρτυρῆς οἷα πέφυκα δυστυχούσι δεσπόταις = to confirm. In like manner *Iphig. Aul.* 1158. Soph. *Philoct.* 438. *Ant.* 846, ἔμπας ξυμμάρτυρας ὑμῖν ἐπικτώμαι, "nevertheless I call you to witness who shall confirm me." Without reference to a person = to confirm something. Plut. *Conv. disp.* viii. 4. 4 (724 D), σκύλων δὲ Πυθοῖ καὶ ἀκροθινίων καὶ τροπαίων ἀναθέσεις ἄρα οὐ συμμαρτυροῦσιν ὅτι τῆς εἰς τὸ νικᾶν καὶ κρατεῖν δυνάμεως τῷ θεῷ τούτῳ πλεῖστον μέτεστιν; they confirm what was believed and asserted of Apollo. Soph. *El.* 1224, *El.* ὦ φίλτατον φῶς. *Or.* φίλτατον, συμμαρτυρῶ. The distinction between the two significations, to testify together with and to confirm, is justified by usage alone. In biblical Greek only in the N. T., and there only in the Ep. to the Romans. *Rom.* viii. 16, αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα συμμαρτυρεῖ τῷ πνεύματι ἡμῶν ὅτι ἐσμὲν τέκνα θεοῦ, the Spirit of God confirms that of which we ourselves are conscious or believe (cf. 1 Cor. ii. 11, 12; *Rom.* i. 9; *Eph.* i. 13; 2 Cor. i. 22). *Rom.* ix. 1, ἀλήθειαν λέγω ἐν Χρῆ, οὐ ψεύδομαι, συμμαρτυρούσης μοι τῆς συνειδήσεως ἐν πν. ἁγ. The confirmation of that which the apostle asserts, which he receives from his conscience, puts him in a position to add to ἀλήθ. λέγω, οὐ ψεύδομαι.—*Rom.* ii. 15, οἵτινες ἐνδείκνυνται τὸ ἔργον τοῦ νόμου γραπτὸν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις, συμμαρτυρούσης αὐτῶν τῆς συνειδήσεως κ.τ.λ. The συμμ. of the conscience is not the ἐνδειξις, but confirms it. As

in conscience man is his own witness, its action is not *μαρτυρεῖν*, to witness, but *συμμαρτ.*, to confirm, and the relative clause states the fact that is confirmed.

Μάταιος stands in contrast to *σπονδαῖος*, to earnestness, thoroughness, genuineness, and denotes **perfect indifference**, on account of which a person or thing is rejected in its whole being. "And yet it seems as if the word had received this strong meaning only in poetry, the contempt lying in it is, in prose and the language of common life, freed from the admixture of moral unwillingness; cf. Aristotle, *Ethic. Nicom.* iv. 13, of the braggard, *φαύλῳ μὲν ἔοικεν, μάταιος δὲ φαίνεται μᾶλλον ἢ κακός.*" Schmidt, *Die Ethik der Alten Griechen*, Berlin 1882, i. 365. But in biblical Greek the word is in the strongest sense the expression of perfect repudiation, for in the LXX. it is = *נִפְזִי* (also rendered by *ψευδής, κένος*), *לִפְזִי* (see *ματαιιότης*), *נִפְזִי* (*ἄνομος, παράνομος, ἀνομία*), *נִפְזִי* (also *ψευδής*). It says of a person or thing *it is worthless, there is nothing in it*. Compare 1 Kings xvi. 2, *τὰ μάταια* = *נִפְזִי*.—Jonah ii. 9, *φυλασσόμενοι μάταια καὶ ψευδῇ*. Of the false prophets *μαντεύεσθαι μάταια* *נִפְזִי*, Ezek. xiii. 6–9; cf. Zech. x. 2; Lam. ii. 14; Ezek. xxi. 29. So of inner hollowness and emptiness of import and worth, 1 Cor. iii. 20, *κύριος γινώσκει τοὺς διαλογισμοὺς τῶν σοφῶν ὅτι εἰσὶν μάταιοι*, from Ps. xciv. 11; Tit. iii. 9. Cf. *ματαιολογία*, 1 Tim. i. 6; *ματαιολόγος*, Tit. i. 10. Cf. also *נִפְזִי* = *μάταιος*, Isa. xlv. 9, xlv. 19, xlix. 4, lix. 4; likewise Mal. iii. 14, *εἶπατε Μάταιος ὁ δουλεύων τῷ θεῷ* = *נִפְזִי*.

Ματαιολογία, ἡ, **worthless unmeaning talk**, Plut. *de pueror. educ.* 9 (6 F), *τὸ δὲ ἐπὶ παῖδας ὄντας ἔαν ἐπὶ καιροῦ λέγειν ματαιολογίας τῆς ἐσχάτης αἰτίον καθίσταται*. Besides this the only other passage cited is Porphyry, *de abst.* iv. 16. In biblical Greek only in 1 Tim. i. 6, *ὧν τινὲς ἀστοχήσαντες ἐξετράπησαν εἰς ματαιολογίαν*; compare vv. 5 and 7, *μὴ νοοῦντες κ.τ.λ.* Synon. with *κενοφωνία*, 1 Tim. vi. 20, 2 Tim. ii. 16, it does not perhaps, like this word, denote exactly the *having nothing to say*, as in Plut., but answers to the affinity between *μάταιος* and *ψεῦδος*, and characterizes what is said as destitute of all truth (*ψευδής* being *contrary to truth*), totally lacking divine authority and import, and reminding one of *μαντεύεσθαι μάταια*. See under *μάταιος*, Jer. xxiii. 16, *ματαιοῦσιν ἑαυτοῖς ὄρασιν, ἀπὸ καρδίας αὐτῶν λαλοῦσιν καὶ οὐκ ἀπὸ στόματος κυρίου*. In Strabo, *ματαιολογεῖν* is = *foolishly to babble*; Prov. xxx. 8, *μάταιον λόγον καὶ ψευδῇ μακράν μου ποιήσον*.

Ἑπομένω in the LXX. answers mainly to the Hebrew *נָפַח*, Kal and Piel, to denote **waiting, perseveringly waiting upon God for His favour**, usually with the acc. Ps. xxv. 3, 5. *σὺ εἰ ὁ θεὸς ὁ σωτήρ μου καὶ σὺ ἐπέμεινα ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν*, ver. 21, xxviii. 14 (with *ἀρνίζεσθαι, κραταιοῦσθαι*), xxxvii. 9, 34, xl. 1, lii. 11, lvi. 7, lxix. 7, cxxx. 5; Prov. xx. 12; Isa. xl. 31, xlix. 23, li. 5, lx. 9; Jer. xiv. 22; Lam. iii. 25. With the dative, Isa. xxv. 9; Lam. iii. 24; Ps. xxxiii. 20; Micah vii. 7. Synon. *πεποιθέναι*, Ps. xxv. 2; cf. Ps. lxix. 22, *ἐπέμεινα συλλυπούμενον καὶ παρακαλοῦντα*. Further,

see ἐλπίς. It occurs in this sense by itself only seldom in the LXX., Dan. xii. 2, Isa. lxiv. 4 = כַּחֵן; Lam. iii. 21, 26, Job xiv. 14 = לִיְהוָה; while in the N. T. we never find it with God as the object. Accordingly the O. T. usage may be summarized as transitive = **to wait upon** a person, Xen. iv. 1. 31, either in a good or a bad sense; for the latter, see Ps. cxix. 95, ἐμὲ ὑπέμειναν οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ τοῦ ἀπολέσαι με. With the thing as object, *to expect* something, Isa. lix. 9, ὑπομενάντων αὐτῶν φῶς ἐγένετο αὐτοῖς σκότος. Cf. Jer. xiv. 19, ὑπεμείναμεν εἰς εἰρήνην, καὶ οὐκ ἦν ἀγαθὰ, εἰς καιρὸν ἰάσεως, καὶ ἰδοὺ ταραχή.

ὑπομονή in the LXX. = ὑπομονή, ὑπομονή, 1 Chron. xxix. 15; Ezra x. 2; Jer. xiv. 8, xvii. 3; Ps. xxxix. 8; Job xiv. 19; Ps. ix. 19, lxii. 6, lxxi. 5. It is not used so often as ἐλπίς, because the element of hope, of looking to the future, is totally wanting in the ὑπομονή of profane Greek, which denotes simply *endurance, continuance, e.g.* of plants; *perseverance, steadfastness, patience* in bearing, into which hope certainly enters in the biblical sphere. To the usage of the profane sphere, 4 Macc. i. 11, ix. 8 (with κακοπάθεια), corresponds where the word denotes steadfastness under persecution, whereas in Ecclus. ii. 14, xvi. 13, xvii. 18, xli. 2, it is more akin to the Hebrew יִשְׁמַח; cf. 4 Macc. xvii. 4, τὴν ἐλπίδα τῆς ὑπομονῆς βεβαίαν ἔχουσα πρὸς τὸν θεόν.

Μιαίνω, μιανῶ, ἐμίανω, perf. pass. μεμίασμαι, Num. v. 13, and μεμίαμαι, Wisd. vii. 25; Tob. ii. 9; cf. Kühner, § 264. 4. The latter form is adopted by Lachm., Tisch., Treg., West. in Tit. i. 15. As μιαίνω is not one of those verbs which omit ν before a consonant (cf. 1 aor. pass. ἐμίανθην, and the noun μίανσις of the LXX. Lev. xiii. 44), μεμιάσθην is the 3rd sing.; compare Krüger xxxiii. 3. 8. It is = **to stain, to defile, to pollute**, synon. μολύνω, from which it differs in usage as the word employed to denote the moral and religious effect of a wicked act, therefore = **to profane**, whereas μολύνειν is not used religiously, but is simply = *to spoil, to disgrace*. Μιαίνω primarily denotes, not the effect of wickedness upon the evil-doer, the guilt incurred, but chiefly its effect upon others, upon the country, the community to which the evil-doer belongs; cf. Thuc. ii. 102. 5, ὥς τῆς γε ἄλλης (sc. γῆς) αὐτῷ μεμιασμένης; Plat. Legg. ix. 868 A, ὅστις δ' ἂν τῶν ἀποκτεινάντων πάντων μὴ πείθεται τῷ νόμῳ, ἀλλ' ἀκάθαρτος ὢν ἀγοράν τε καὶ ἄθλα καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ἱερὰ μιαίνει; Plut. Sull. xxxv. 2, τὴν οἰκίαν. Hence also with the object θεούς, τὸ θεῖον. Only secondarily is the evil-doer himself μεμιασμένος, because he has burdened himself with the μίασμα; Plat. Rep. x. 621 C, τὴν ψυχὴν οὐ μιανθησόμεθα; Phaed. 81 B, εἰ δὲ μεμιασμένη καὶ ἀκάθαρτος (ψυχὴ) τοῦ σώματος ἀπαλλάττεται; compare Nägelsbach, Nachhomer. Theol. vi. 20, p. 357. The word is rare in prose, even in later writers; not in Xen., Aristotle, Polyb.; once in Thucyd., rare in Plato and Plut., but oftener in the Tragedians, especially Aeschylus; see μίασμα.

From this we may understand the usage of the LXX., which renders כָּטָא, Kal, by ἀκάθαρτος εἶναι, but the Piel and Hithpael by μιαίνειν τινά, τί, and the reflexive Niphal by the passive, e.g. Lev. v. 3, xi. 23, 43, xviii. 24, Ezek. iv. 14, et al., which is very

rare in profane Greek. The object, as a rule, is that which is affected with sin by the evil-doer, not only *e.g.* a dishonoured wife, Gen. xxxiv. 5, 13, 27, *et al.*, but the country in which the sin is committed, Lev. xviii. 28; Num. v. 3; Deut. xxi. 23; Jer. ii. 7; the sanctuary, Lev. xv. 30, xx. 3; hence of the profaning of idolatrous altars, of idols, etc., 2 Kings xxiii. 8, 10, 13; Isa. xxx. 22. The sins by which such pollution is produced are called *βδελύγματα*; cf. Lev. xi. 23; Jer. vii. 29; Judith ix. 4; see *βδέλυγμα*.

In the Apocrypha the word is rare, but the usage is the same; cf. 1 Macc. i. 45; Judith ix. 8, syn. *βεβηλοῦν*; 1 Esdr. i. 47; 1 Macc. iv. 45, xiv. 36. Of Levitical defilement, 1 Macc. i. 63, *ἐπέλεξαντο ἀποθανεῖν ἵνα μὴ μianθῶσι τοῖς βρώμασι καὶ μὴ βεβηλώσωσι διαθήκην ἁγίαν*; vii. 34; 4 Macc. v. 34, vii. 6; Tob. ii. 9. With the expression Wisd. vii. 25, *οὐδὲν μεμιμμένον εἰς αὐτὴν (sc. τὴν σοφίαν) παρεμπίπτει*, cf. Soph. *Ant.* 1044, *θεοὺς μιαίνειν οὗ τις ἀνθρώπων σθένει*; *Test. XII. patr. Benj.* 8.

In the N. T. the word occurs very seldom; John xviii. 28, *ἵνα μὴ μianθῶσιν*, of Levitical or theocratic defilement; Jude 8, *σάρκα μιαίνουσιν*, must, according to usage, denote sins of lust, compare ver. 7, but *σάρκα* likewise, according to usage, is not the literal flesh; Heb. xii. 15, *μὴ μianθῶσιν οἱ πολλοί*, denotes the effect of the sin of apostasy upon the community; compare ver. 16. See also Titus i. 15, *πάντα καθαρὰ τοῖς καθαροῖς τοῖς δὲ μεμιμμένοις καὶ ἀπίστοις οὐδὲν καθαρὸν, ἀλλὰ μεμιάνται αὐτῶν καὶ ὁ νοὺς καὶ ἡ συνειδήσις*, cf. with vv. 14, 16; *βδελυκτοὶ ὄντες* refer to such sins or such behaviour as exclude from fellowship with God and with His people.

Μίασμα, τός, τό, pollution, defilement, impurity, filth; only, it would appear, in an ethico-religious sense, and primarily of defilement of an object by the commission of sin, so that it needs purification, Aeschylus, *Suppl.* 265; Soph. *Oed.* i. 313; *Antiph. Tetral.* iii. 1. 3; thus the murderer is a *μίασμα* in his country. Also of the effect of wickedness upon the evil-doer, and of the wickedness itself; *e.g.* *Antiph.* v. 82, *πολλοὶ ἤδη ἄνθρωποι μὴ καθαροὶ χεῖρας ἢ ἄλλο τι μίασμα ἔχοντες συνεισβάντες εἰς τὸ πλοῖον συναπώλεσαν μετὰ τῆς αὐτῶν ψυχῆς τοὺς ὁσίως διακειμένους τὰ πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς*; cf. Nägelsbach, *Nachhom. Theol.* p. 358; Ps. Dem. lix. 86, *ἵνα μὴ μιάσματα μηδ' ἀσεβήματα γίγνηται ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς*. Rare in the LXX., only in Jer. xxxii. 34 = יִרְעָו; Lev. vii. 8 = יִרְעָו, therefore answering to and in the sense of *βδέλυγμα*; Ezek. xxxiii. 31 = יִרְעָו; Judith ix. 4, *ἐβδελύξαντο μίασμα αἵματος αὐτῶν*; xiii. 16, ix. 2; 1 Macc. xiii. 50. In this sense, as that which is diametrically opposite to fellowship with God, it stands in the only text of the N. T. 2 Pet. ii. 20, *ἀποφυγόντες τὰ μιάσματα τοῦ κόσμου ἐν ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ κυρίου κ.τ.λ.*

Μίασμός, οὗ, ὁ, defilement, wickedness, corresponding to *μιαίνειν*, of wicked deeds which require special expiation; Plut. *Sol.* xii. 3, *ἄγῃ καὶ μiasμοὺς δεομένους καθαρῶν*. In biblical Greek only in the Apocrypha and once in the N. T.—1 Macc. iv. 43, *λίθοι μiasμοῦ*, of the heathen *βωμός* erected upon the *θυσιαστήριον* of the temple; compare

ver. 44, i. 60, vi. 7; *Test. XII. patr. Lev.* 17, ἔσται μiasμός ὃν οὐ δύναμαι εἰπεῖν ἐνώπιον κυρίου καὶ ἀνθρ. In *Wisd.* xiv. 26, ψυχῶν μiasμός is named among the abominations of heathendom in immediate connection with sins of unchastity, without naming what is to be understood as included under it; it evidently does not mean the Platonic τὴν ψυχὴν μαινεσθαι; see above. In the N. T. 2 Pet. ii. 10, τοὺς ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ μiasμοῦ πορευομένους, answering to the σάρκα μαιίνειν, Jude 8.

Ἀμείαντος, *on*, unspotted, pure, in Pindar an epithet of light, in Theognetus of water; *Plat. Legg.* vi. 777 E, ὁ . . . ἀμείαντος τοῦ τε ἀνοσίου πέρι καὶ ἀδίκου σπεῖρειν εἰς ἀρετῆς ἐκφυσιν ἱκανώτατος ἂν εἴη; *Plut. Pericl.* xxxix. 2, εὐμενὲς ἦθος καὶ βίον ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ καθαρὸν καὶ ἀμείαντον Ὀλύμπιον προσαγορεύεσθαι; *Plut. Nic.* ix. 5, ἀμείαντος καὶ ἀπόλεμος βίος. In order to strengthen it, combined with καθαρός, *Plut. Mor.* 383 B, 395 E, *Num.* ix. 5. Accordingly it is not only the negation of μiasμα, of any wickedness, but more general and stronger=far removed from every contamination.—Thus it is also with the use of the word in biblical Greek, especially in the N. T. It does not occur in the LXX. In the Apocrypha in 2 Macc. xiv. 36, xv. 34, reminding us of the use of μαιίνω of idolatrous abominations. In the remaining texts it denotes either unspotted virginity or married integrity, as in *Plut. Num.* ix. 5; so in *Wisd.* iii. 13, ἡ ἀμείαντος ἦτις οὐκ ἔγνω κοίτην ἐν παραπτώματι.—*Heb.* xiii. 4, ἡ κοίτη ἀμείαντος (compare *Rev.* xiv. 4, μολύνειν), or more generally=tainted by no fellowship with sin (more correct than *tainted by no sin*, as answering to μαιίνω); *Wisd.* viii. 19, 20, ψυχὴ ἀγαθή, σῶμα ἀμείαντον; see *Grimm in loc.* *Heb.* vii. 26, ὅσιος, ἄκακος, ἀμείαντος, κεχωρισμένος ἀπὸ τῶν ἀμαρτωλῶν; cf. 2 Cor. v. 21, τὸν μὴ γνόντα ἀμαρτίαν; *Jas.* i. 27, θρησκεία καθαρὰ καὶ ἀμείαντος παρὰ θεῷ. In the same sense, of heavenly treasure, *Wisd.* iv. 2, τὸν τῶν ἀμείαντων ἄθλων ἀγῶνα νικήσασα; 1 Pet. i. 4, εἰς κληρονομίαν ἄφθαρτον καὶ ἀμείαντον καὶ ἀμάραντον, where perhaps it is facultative—"that cannot be defiled" as earthly possessions are by sin; cf. *Wisd.* vii. 25, under μαιίνω.

Μολύνω, perf. pass. μεμόλυνμαι, 2 Macc. xiv. 2, and also in the form μεμόλυσμαι occurring in later writers, 1 Esdr. viii. 80; according to Curtius 370, connected with μέλας, *malus*=to besmear, to defile, synon. with μαιίνω, from which, when applied to the moral sphere, it differs in that it is not like μαιίνω used of the injury to others arising from the evil-doer's crime, nor does it stand in that ethico-religious sense marked by the contrast between μiasμα and κάθαρσις, but is in part confined to sins of lust, μολ. τινά=to violate one, and in part gives prominence to the αἰσχρόν of the behaviour=to disgrace, dishonour, degrade, and is related to μαιίνειν as dishonour is to profanity. In this sense it is used of the effect of the act not so much upon another as upon the actor himself; cf. *Plut. de superstit.* 3 (166 B), τὴν αἰτῶν γλώσσαν διαστρέφοντας καὶ μολύνοντας; *Plato, Rep.* vii. 535 E, ὥσπερ θηρίον ὕειν ἐν ἀμαθίᾳ μολύνεσθαι.

This distinction from μαιίνω disappears in biblical Greek, where the word occurs but seldom. It stands (*a*) literally = לִבַּל, *Gen.* xxxvii. 30; = מִלֵּץ, *Song* v. 4; compare the

free rendering in Ezek. vii. 17, xxi. 7.—(b) Figuratively it answers to the profane use only in Tob. iii. 15, οὐκ ἐμόλυνα τὸ ὄνομά μου καὶ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρός μου = to dishonour. But in all other places in an ethico-religious sense = to defile or profane; of what the category of βδέλυγμα includes, see *μιαίνω*. Jer. xxiii. 11 = 𐤒𐤍𐤕; Isa. lxxv. 4 = 𐤁𐤍𐤁; cf. Jer. xxiii. 15, μολυσμός = 𐤍𐤁𐤏𐤕; xliv. 4, μόλυνσις = 𐤍𐤁𐤏𐤕. Moreover Isa. lix. 3, lxiii. 3 = 𐤁𐤍𐤁, Niphal and Hiphil; Zech. xiv. 2 = 𐤁𐤍𐤁, and Jer. xii. 10 = 𐤁𐤍𐤁. Oftener in the Apocrypha, Ecclus. xiii. 1, ὁ ἀπτόμενος πίσεως μολυνθήσεται καὶ ὁ κοινωνῶν ὑπερηφάνῳ ὁμοιωθήσεται αὐτῷ; cf. xxii. 13, xxi. 28, μολύνει τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχὴν ὁ ψιθυρίζων; cf. ver. 27, parall. καταρᾶσθαι; 1 Macc. i. 37, and 2 Macc. vi. 2, of desecration of the sanctuary by heathen abominations; 2 Macc. vi. 2, μολῦναι τὸν ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις νεῶν καὶ προσονομίσαι Διὸς Ὀλυμπίου; 1 Esdr. viii. 80, γῇ μεμολυσμένη μολυσμῷ τῶν ἀλλογενῶν τῆς γῆς. Accordingly 2 Macc. xiv. 2, ἐκουσίως μεμολυμένος ἐν τοῖς τῆς ἐπιμιξίας χρόνοις of denial and apostasy; cf. vii. 1.—So in the few places in which it occurs in the N. T., of defilement with heathen practices, Rev. iii. 4, οὐκ ἐμόλυναν τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν; cf. ver. 5, ὁμολογήσω τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, with Matt. x. 32, 33.—Rev. xiv. 4, μετὰ γυναικῶν οὐκ ἐμόλυνθησαν, not to be explained by Lev. xv. 18, for it is a difference between ἀκάθαρτος εἶναι or γίνεσθαι and μολυνθῆναι (see *μιαίνω*), but regarding *πορνεία*, cf. ver. 8. Biblical and other usage alike tells against the explanation which makes the reference to conjugal intercourse; cf. Zech. xiv. 4, αἱ γυναῖκες μολυνθήσονται. In 1 Cor. viii. 7 the expression is also chosen with reference to intercourse with heathen ceremonies, ὡς εἰδωλόθυτον ἐσθίουσιν καὶ ἡ συνείδησις αὐτῶν ἀσθενὴς οὖσα μολύνεται. Thus only does this expression receive its full significance.

Μολυσμός, οὐ, ὁ, foulness, defilement, stain; rare in profane Greek, Plut. *Mor.* 779, εὗρε Διόνυσον ὥσπερ βιβλίον παλίψηστον, ἤδη μολυσμῶν ἀνάπλεων. Likewise rare in biblical Greek, and, like the verb, used of defilement through heathen rites. In Jer. xxiii. 15 = 𐤍𐤁𐤏𐤕, ἀπὸ τῶν προφητῶν Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἐξῆλθε μολυσμὸς πάσῃ τῇ γῇ. As to 1 Esdr. viii. 80, see *μολύνω*; 2 Macc. v. 27, πρὸς τὸ μὴ μετασχεῖν τοῦ μολυσμοῦ; Luther, in keeping with the sense, translates "that he must not live among the impure heathen;" compare vi. 2. In the few places of the N. T., 2 Cor. vii. 1, καθαρίσωμεν ἑαυτοὺς ἀπὸ παντὸς μολυσμοῦ σαρκὸς καὶ πνεύματος ἐπιτελοῦντες ἀγιοσύνην ἐν φόβῳ θεοῦ, together with 1 Cor. viii. 7 (see *μολύνω*), determines the reference to sins peculiar to heathendom, and the expression as denoting fellowship with heathen practices; cf. vi. 14-17. The aim is to put an end to everything that hinders or opposes communion with God and salvation, and it is to this that *μολ.* refers; see *μιαίνω*.

Μορφή denotes the thing in its peculiar form or nature; *σχῆμα* signifies the *habitus*; Aristot. *Metaph.* 6, λέγω δὲ τὴν μὲν ὕλην οἶον τὸν χάλκον, τὴν δὲ μορφήν τὸ σχῆμα τῆς ιδέας; *Categ.* 8, τέταρτον γένος ποιότητος σχῆμά τε καὶ ἡ περὶ ἑκάστου ὑπάρχουσα μορφή; *Phys. auscult.* i. 7, γίγνεται πᾶν ἐκ τε τοῦ ὑποκειμένου καὶ τῆς μορφῆς; Beyschlag (*Christol. des N. T.* p. 237) says that *μορφή* θεοῦ signifies "the capacity or

character of the Godhead in a Being conceived in a state of development and therefore historical;" but this is forbidden by the consideration that *μορφή δούλου* does not mean the mere capacity or character of a δούλος; it is also forbidden by the usage, for *μορφή* never signifies what one not yet is, but what one is, according to one's state; compare *σύμμορφος*, Rom. viii. 29, Phil. iii. 21, and the quotations from Philo, Josephus, and the apocryphal literature for *μορφή θεοῦ*, in Bretschneider and Grimm, *e.g.* Josephus *c. Ap.* ii. 22. 3; Phil. *leg. ad Caj.* 14; *Test. XII. patr. Benj.* 10, *προσκυνούντες τὸν βασιλέα τῶν οὐρανῶν τὸν ἐπὶ γῆς φανέντα ἐν μορφῇ ἀνθρώπου ταπεινώσεως*. For more upon the passage, see *ἀρπαγμός*. *Μορφώω* occurs in Isa. xlv. 13, Aquila, and thence into the LXX. text, *ἐμόρφωσεν αὐτὸ (sc. τὸ ξύλον) ἐν παραγραφίδι* = 𐤇𐤏𐤋. *Μόρφωμα* in Gen. xxxi. 19, Aquila, and often = 𐤇𐤏𐤋.

Σύμμορφος, ον, of like form or appearance, very rare in profane Greek. Lucn. *Amor.* 39, *γρᾶες δὲ καὶ θεραπαινίδων ὁ σύμμορφος ὄχλος κ.τ.λ.*; Rom. viii. 29, *οὗς προέγνω, καὶ προώρισεν συμμόρφους τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ κ.τ.λ.*; see *εἰκών*. With the dat. Phil. iii. 21, *μετασχηματίσει τὸ σῶμα τῆς ταπεινώσεως ἡμῶν σύμμορφον τῷ σώματι τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ*.

Συμμορφίζω, Lachm., Tisch., Treg., Westc., Phil. iii. 10, instead of *συμμορφώω*, both forms being foreign to profane Greek, and only elsewhere traceable in ecclesiastical Greek = to fashion exactly alike, to make of the same form; passive, to become like or the same, Phil. iii. 10, *συμμορφιζόμενος τῷ θανάτῳ αὐτοῦ*; cf. 2 Cor. iv. 10; Gal. vi. 17.

Μῦθος, ος, ὁ, (a) in Homer and the Tragedians. Word, speech; thus sometimes even still in Plato, *e.g.* *Erin.* 980 A, *κατὰ τὸν ἡμετερον μῦθον*; *Tim.* 29 D; elsewhere not thus in prose. Once in biblical Greek, Ecclus. xx. 19, *ἄνθρωπος ἄχαρις μῦθος ἄκαιρος*.—(b) In prose = narration, and indeed fabulous narrative, a fable, opposed to λόγος, *i.e.* to what is true, either to attested history or to the import of what is designated μῦθος; cf. Plat. *Legg.* iii. 683 D, *ὥς γε λέγεται τὸ τοῦ μύθου*; *Tim.* 22 C, *τοῦτο μύθου μὲν σχῆμα ἔχον λέγεται, τὸ δ' ἀληθές ἐστι κ.τ.λ.*; 26 E, *μὴ πλασθέντα μύθον, ἀλλ' ἀληθινὸν λόγον*. Especially of the tales of gods and heroes of yore, *Rep.* i. 330 D; *Legg.* ix. 865 D, *οἱ ἀρχαῖοι μῦθοι*; vii. 804 E, *μ. παλαιοί*; i. 636 C; but also of every fiction; Plat. *Phaed.* 61 B, *ὅτι τὸν ποιητὴν δέοι ποιεῖν μύθους, οὐ λόγους* (therefore in contrast with bare literal unfigurative speech, cf. *Prot.* 320 C, 324 D); of Æsop's fables, *Phaed.* 60 C; of the "fable" of tragedy. The μῦθος is altogether destitute of historical truth, Plut. *Thes.* xxviii. 1, *περιφανῶς ἔοικε μύθῳ καὶ πλάσματι*, cf. xxix. 1, *εἰσὶ μέντοι λόγοι κ.τ.λ.*, yet not of a germ of truth whose clothing it is; therefore μῦθος has its place in the education of children, Plat. *Rep.* ii. 377 A, *πρῶτον τοῖς παιδίοις μύθους λέγομεν. τοῦτο δέ που, ὡς τὸ ὅλον εἰπεῖν, ψεῦδος, ἐνὶ δὲ καὶ ἀληθῇ*; x. 887 D. Hence, on the one hand, μῦθος and ἀλήθεια are opposed; Aristot. *Hist.*

an. ix. 12 of the pigmies, οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶ τοῦτο μῦθος, ἀλλ' ἐστὶ κατὰ τὴν ἀλήθειαν γένος μικρόν; but, on the other hand, truth may be portrayed ἐν σχήματι μύθου; Aristot. *Metaph.* xi. 8, παραδέδοται δὲ παρὰ τῶν ἀρχαίων καὶ παμπалаίων ἐν μύθου σχήματι καταλείμμενα τοῖς ὕστερον ὅτι θεοὶ τέ εἰσιν οὗτοι καὶ περιέχει τὸ θεῖον τὴν ὅλην φύσιν. τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ μυθικῶς ἤδη προσήκται πρὸς τὴν πείθω τῶν πολλῶν καὶ πρὸς τὴν εἰς τοὺς νόμους καὶ τὸ συμφέρον χρήσιν; cf. *de an.* i. 3, κατὰ τοὺς Πυθαγορικοὺς μύθους. As compared with πλάσμα, which denotes the intentional fable as a work of art, μῦθος is the fable growing up of itself from of yore, and to this may be added as a further difference what is stated by Sext. Emp. *contra math.* i. 263 (ed. Bekker, 658. 21 sqq.), τῶν ἱστορουμένων τὸ μὲν ἐστὶν ἱστορία τὸ δὲ μῦθος τὸ δὲ πλάσμα. ὧν ἡ μὲν ἱστορία ἀληθῶν τινῶν ἐστὶ καὶ γεγονότων ἔκθεσις . . . πλάσμα δὲ πραγμάτων μὴ γενομένων μὲν ὁμοίως δὲ τοῖς γενομένοις λεγομένων . . . μῦθος δὲ πραγμάτων ἀγενήτων καὶ ψευδῶν ἔκθεσις; cf. Pyrrhon. *institut.* i. 147 (xxxiv. 11), μυθικὴ δὲ πίστις ἐστὶ πραγμάτων ἀγενήτων τε καὶ πεπλασμένων παραδοχῇ, as distinguished from the δογματικὴ ὑπόληψις. The word is specially employed to designate religious traditions appearing in the garb of history, stories of gods and heroes, which the Stoics in particular undertook to understand and interpret. The μῦθος as such, i.e. as a story in and for itself impossible and inconceivable, demands an interpretation; cf. Ceb. Tab. 1, ἐν ᾧ (sc. πίνακι) ἦν γραφὴ τις ξένη καὶ μύθους ἔχουσα ἰδίους οὓς οὐκ ἠδυνάμεθα συμβαλεῖν τίνες καὶ πόθεν ἦσαν; *ibid.* 21. Plut. *Mor.* 996 C, of the Dionysus-Mythus, ἀνηγμένος ἐστὶ μῦθος εἰς παλιγγενεσίαν; *ibid.*, *de aud. poet.* 4 (19 B), οὓς (sc. μύθους) ταῖς πάλαι μὲν ὑπονοίαις, ἀλληγορίαις δὲ νῦν λεγομέναις, παραβιαζόμενοι καὶ διαστρέφοντες κ.τ.λ. Hence arose the allegorizing of the Stoics, and under their influence, after the same method, Philo's view of the contents of the book of Genesis, which he turns into myths.

In the N. T. only in the Pastoral Epistles, and 2 Pet. i. 16 likewise in a religious sense; 2 Pet. i. 16, οὐ γὰρ σεσοφισμένοις μύθοις ἐξακολουθήσαντες ἐγνωρίσαμεν ὑμῖν κ.τ.λ. ἀλλ' ἐπόπται γεννηθέντες, where therefore the conception—distinguished by σεσοφ. as artificial myths from those of old tradition; cf. Lucian *de conscr. histor.* 60—is applied to the history of our Lord. In the Pastoral Epp., on the contrary, where, in 2 Tim. iv. 4, οἱ μῦθοι and ἡ ἀλήθεια are contrasted, they are designated, Tit. i. 14, Ἰουδαϊκοῖς μύθοις, and do not mean the heathen tales of gods and heroes, but Jewish traditions, designated in 1 Tim. iv. 7, βέβηλοι καὶ γραῶδεις; compare Plato, *Rep.* i. 350, ὥσπερ ταῖς γραυσὶ ταῖς τοὺς μύθους λεγούσαις; in 1 Tim. i. 4 with γενεαλογίαι, as also in profane Greek the two conceptions akin to each other are combined; see γενεαλογία. It is possible (but not necessary) to understand here extra-biblical traditions as well, for it is not the traditions themselves that are the subject of censure, but their treatment as allegorized history, or, more generally, the use that is made of them.

Μυστήριον is always used in a religious sense in biblical Greek except in Ecclus. xxii. 22, xxvii. 16, xvii. 21; Tob. xii. 7, 11. It does not occur in the O. T.

Νομικός, ἡ, ὄν, (a) concerning or belonging to the laws; in Aristotle in antithesis with ἠθικός; Tit. iii. 9, μάχαι νομικάι, concerning the Jewish law. (b) Of persons, learned in the law or legal practice; Strabo, xii. 539, ἐξηγητὴς τῶν νόμων, καθάπερ οἱ παρὰ Ῥωμαίοις νομικοί (*juris-consulti*). So apparently in Tit. iii. 13, for Ζηνᾶς is not a Jewish, but a Greek proper name. In other places of the Jewish γραμματεῖς as πατρίων ἐξηγηταὶ νόμων, Josephus, *Ant.* xvii. 6. 2, and these together with the Pharisees, Luke vii. 30, xiv. 3; cf. Matt. xxii. 35, εἰς ἐκ τῶν φαρισαίων νομικός, with Mark xii. 28, εἰς τῶν γραμματέων. Further, compare Luke xi. 45, 46, 52, with Matt. xxiii. 23, 25, 27, 29, 30; also Luke x. 25. While in all places where the word is employed legal

questions come into consideration, the scribes appear as authorities in questions also of prophecy, Matt. ii. 4, xiii. 52, *et al.*, and it may be inferred that γραμματεῖς is the generic name, and νομικοί the special, denoting those skilled in law and jurisprudence among them; cf. νομοδιδάσκαλος, Luke v. 17, Acts x. 34, probably the members of the Sanhedrim and the Council learned in the law. Νομοδιδάσκαλος would then denote those νομικοί who were engaged in teaching law; cf. Buxtorf, *Tiberias*, c. 8; *Lex. Rabb. s.v.* נִלְמַד, נִלְמַדָּה, סֹפֵר, רַב, רַבָּא, etc.; Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr.* on Luke x. 25 (*de doctoribus Judaeorum*) and xi. 45; Leyrer, art. "Schriftgelehrte," in Herzog's *Realencycl.* xiii. 731; Schürer, art. "Schriftgelehrte," in Riehm's *Handwörterb. des bibl. Alterthums*, and *N. T. Zeitgesch.* p. 441 sqq.

Νομίμως, conformably to law, 2 Tim. ii. 5, ν. ἀθλεῖν, which refers both to the manner of conflict = *in keeping with the laws of the contest*, and to the preparation for it; compare 1 Cor. ix. 25. For the first, compare Aristid. *de pac.* ii. p. 403 (in Wetstein), ἔξω τῶν νομίμων τρόπων μάχεσθαι. For the latter, Arr. *Epiet.* iii. 10, δός μοι ἀπόδειξιν εἰ νομίμως ἠθλησας, εἰ ἔφαγες ὅσα δεῖ, εἰ ἐγυμνάσθης κ.τ.λ.; Hippocr. i. 15, οἱ νομίμως ἀθλοῦντες ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ ἀρίστου τὸν ἄρτον μόνον ἐσθίουσιν, ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ δείπνου τὸ κρέας.— Besides only in 1 Tim. i. 8, καλὸς ὁ νόμος ἐάν τις αὐτῷ νομίμως χρήται, which is not = *according to the nature of the law*, but = *as law and right demand*; as the connection shows, it refers not to the hearer and doer, but to the teachers, not to the fulfilling but to the application of the law, which should be made only in the case of those whom it concerns; cf. κεῖται, ver. 9. The teachers should consider for whom the law is intended, namely, for transgressors of it.

The adj. is rare in biblical Greek, only in the Apocrypha, 2 Macc. iv. 11; 4 Macc. v. 35, vii. 15, 6; elsewhere only the neuter subs. τὸ νόμιμον, τὰ νόμ., mostly νόμ. αἰώνιον, Ex. xii. 14, 24, xxix. 28, xxx. 31; Lev. vi. 18, 22, vii. 26, x. 9, *et al.* = נֶחֱדֵר, נֶחֱדֵרָה, sometimes = נֶחֱדֵרָה, in this case, however, only in the plural, Gen. xxvi. 5, Ex. xliii. 11, *et al.* Therefore = *legal ordinance, right*. In the Apocrypha, τὰ νόμ. ἀλλότρια, τῶν ἐθνῶν, ἡμῶν, etc.

Παράνομος, *on*, contrary to law, illegal, *c.g.* in Attic usage παράνομα, of legal proposals contrary to existing laws; compare 2 Macc. iv. 11, τὰς μὲν νομίμους καταλύων πολιτείας παρανόμους ἐθισμοὺς ἐκαίνιζεν. (*Ἀντινομία* signifies the contradiction of law with itself, so that ἀντίνομος—a word which does not occur—is = *law stands against law*.) Otherwise in profane Greek of the transgression of law, Plat. *Apol.* 31 E, διακωλύων πολλὰ ἄδिका καὶ παράνομα ἐν τῇ πόλει γίνεσθαι; *vir. civ.* 359 A, παράνομος δόξει γεγονέναι ἐκ νομίμων; 302 E, τὰ κατὰ νόμους ἄρχειν καὶ παρανόμως. Hence = *wicked, treading law under foot*, with δεινός; Plat. *Phaedr.* 254 A; Plut. *praec. ger. reip.* xiii. 807 F, ἐπ' ἔργῳ παρανόμῳ καὶ δεινῷ φεύγοντα δίκην; Plut. *Tit. Flam.* xiii. 1, ἐξωλέστατον καὶ παρανομώτατον τύραννον; Plat. *Phaed.* 113 E, φόνους παρανόμους. In biblical Greek only in the LXX., rarely in the Apocrypha, not in the N. T., because the word is not sufficiently comprehensive and strong religiously to designate sin and the sinner; cf. 2 Thess. ii. 3;

nor indeed does it suit the character of the N. T. In the LXX. = $\lambda\gamma\lambda\eta$ (sometimes also $\alpha\sigma\epsilon\beta\eta\varsigma$, $\alpha\phi\rho\omega\nu$, $\alpha\pi\omicron\sigma\tau\alpha\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$), Deut. xiii. 13; Judg. xix. 22; 2 Sam. xvi. 7, xx. 1, xxiii. 5; 1 Kings xxi. 10, 13; Ps. xli. 9, ci. 3; = $\beta\gamma\gamma$, Prov. ii. 22, xi. 6, xiii. 2, xxi. 18, xxii. 12, xxiii. 2; also variously used as = $\lambda\gamma\lambda\eta$, $\eta\alpha$, $\lambda\lambda\eta$, $\sigma\phi\eta$, *et al.* Usually as an epithet of persons or nouns masc. = *despiser of law*; of things, Ps. xli. 9, ci. 3; Wisd. iii. 16; 2 Macc. iv. 11.

Παρανομέω, to be a *παράνομος*, or as such to act illegally, to despise the law, hence also = to be wicked, to do wrong, both *τί* and *εἰς τι*, with reference to something, *e.g.* *εἰς θεούς*, *εἰς μαντεῖον*. Also *τινά* = to ill-treat one. The word has not a religious colouring in profane Greek, but stands only in a legal sense, as *ἀδικεῖν* does in a social. This explains why, in spite of the frequency of *νόμος*, it is so rare in biblical Greek. In the LXX. Ps. xxvi. 4 = $\epsilon\lambda\gamma$, part. Niph. (*hidden, crafty*). Ps. lxxi. 4 = $\lambda\gamma$, lxxv. 5 = $\lambda\lambda\eta$, cxix. 51 = $\gamma\lambda\eta$, *ὑπερήφανοι παρηνόμεουν ἕως σφόδρα* (for this augmentation, cf. Thuc. iii. 67); 4 Macc. v. 16, xvi. 19, 26, viii. 12. In the N. T. only Acts xxiii. 2, *κρίνων με κατὰ τὸν νόμον καὶ παρανομῶν κελεύεις με τύπτεσθαι*; cf. Plat. *Vir. civ.* 307 E, under *ἄνομος*.

Παρανομία, ἡ, opposition to law, wrong-doing which violates law, Isocrates, 168 C, *ἄρπαγὴ καὶ βιὰ καὶ παραν.*; Lucian, *Tim.* 42, *παρανομία καὶ κατάλυσις τῶν ἐθῶν*. Seldom in the LXX., Ps. xxxvii. 7; Prov. v. 22, x. 27.—4 Macc. ii. 11, iv. 19, ix. 3, *τύραννε παρανομίας*. In the N. T. only in 2 Pet. ii. 16, of Balaam, without special reference to the law, therefore generally = *wickedness*.

Νομοδιδάσκαλος, ὁ, teacher of the law, not in profane Greek nor in the O. T., and only three times in the N. T. Seemingly a late outgrowth of Jewish origin to designate the authoritative teachers of the law, $\nu\mu\lambda\eta$, *doctrina*. Thus Acts v. 34 of Gamaliel (cf. xxii. 3; Luke ii. 46); Luke v. 17, *φarisαῖοι καὶ νομοδιδάσκαλοι . . . ἐκ πάσης κόμης κ.τ.λ.* In 1 Tim. i. 7 the reference is to the false teachers of the Alexandrine school referred to in ver. 4, different from those named in the Epistle to the Galatians, who set themselves up as authorities with reference to the O. T., as persons instructed by the Pharisees.

Ἀνόητος only occasionally in the LXX. = $\lambda\gamma\lambda\eta$, $\eta\alpha$, Prov. xv. 21, xvii. 29; $\lambda\gamma\lambda\eta$, xix. 1; cf. Jer. x. 8.

Ἀνομία, ας, ἡ, ignorance, folly, opposite to *νοῦς*, Plato, *Phaedr.* 270 A; *Tim.* 86 B, *δύο ἀνοίας γένη, τὸ μὲν μανίαν, τὸ δ' ἀμαθίαν*, thus implying a reproach; *Gorg.* 514 E, *εἰς τοσοῦτον ἀνοίας ἐλθεῖν*; Luke vi. 11; 2 Tim. iii. 9; LXX. Prov. xxii. 15; Eccles. xi. 10.—Wisd. xv. 18, xix. 3; 2 Macc. iv. 6, opposed to *πρόνοια*, parallel with *μαίνεσθαι*, ver. 4.—Ver. 40, xiv. 5, xv. 33; 3 Macc. iii. 16, 20.

Δυσνόητος, ον, difficult to understand, Lucian, *Alex.* 54, *χρησμός*; Diog. Laert. ix. 1. 13, *καταβέβλησαι λόγον . . . δυσνόητόν τε καὶ δυσεξήγητον*. So 2 Pet. iii. 14.

Διάνοια does not occur in the LXX. so often as classical usage would lead us to expect. Gen. xvii. 17, xxiv. 45, xxvii. 41; Isa. xxxv. 4, lvii. 11; Num. xv. 37; Deut. vii. 17, xxix. 18; *will, willingness*, Ex. xxxv. 21, 24. With *σοφία, σύνεσις*, Ex. xxxv. 33; *σοφὸς τῇ διανοίᾳ*, Ex. xxviii. 3, xxxv. 9, 24, xxxvi. 1; Job ix. 4, cf. Prov. ii. 10; *ἐκστασις διανοίας*, Deut. xxviii. 28, cf. Gen. xlv. 26.—*Ἔννοια*=נִיָּא, Prov. iv. 1, xxiii. 4; נִיָּא, Prov. xviii. 15; נִיָּא, Prov. i. 4, iii. 21, v. 2, viii. 12; נִיָּא, Prov. xxiii. 19.

Εὐνοέω, to be well-disposed to, to wish well; sometimes in Herod., Xen., the Tragedians, Plutarch; upon the whole, however, seldom. In the LXX. Dan. ii. 43, οὐκ ἔσονται ὁμονοῦντες οὔτε εὐνοοῦντες ἀλλήλοις, Theodotion προσκολλώμενοι, Add. Esth. vi. 18 opp. to ἐπιβουλεύειν. 3 Macc. vii. 11. In the N. T. only Matt. v. 25, ἴσθι εὐνοῶν τῷ ἀντιδίκῳ σου ταχύ. As it everywhere stands of well-intentioned inclination, it does not here signify merely inclination of will towards the claim of the ἀντίδικος, but prescribes a change from the previous relationship to the very opposite, so as to strengthen διαλλάγηθι τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου, ver. 24. This is in keeping with Elsner's remark (in his *Commentar*, see Tholuck, *Sermon on the Mount, in loc.*), that hostile powers swore, in making a covenant of peace, in future ἀδόλως εὐνοήσεν τῷ ἄλλῳ.

Εὐνοία, ας, ἡ, goodwill, kindness, love, often in Attic and later Greek, in biblical Greek only in the books of the Maccabees, e.g. πρὸς τινα, 1 Macc. xi. 33; 2 Macc. xii. 30, *et al.*; εἰς τινα, 2 Macc. ix. 26, xv. 30; thus once in the N. T. Eph. vi. 7, ὑπακούετε τοῖς κατὰ σάρκα κυρίοις . . . μετ' εὐνοίας δουλεύοντες ὡς κυρίῳ; Elsner, *observ.*, here refers to Lucn. *bis accus.* 16, ἀνδράποδον ὃ μόνον εἶχεν εὐνοὺν καὶ πιστόν, *et al.* Moreover, the Rec. reads in 1 Cor. vii. 3, τῇ γυναικὶ ὃ ἀνὴρ τὴν ὀφειλομένην εὐνοίαν ἀποδιδότω, instead of the now generally adopted τὴν ὀφείλην, according to a usage by no means frequent, for which Wetstein, and Loesner *observ. philon.*, cite examples.

Κατανοέω, only exceptionably intransitive=*to be in the mind* (Hippocrates), otherwise as a rule transitive (see *κατηχεῖν*)=*to direct the mind to, to consider, to ponder, to learn, to discern*, also in a weakened sense *to perceive, to observe*. Often in profane Greek, not so often in the LXX.=נִיָּא, Hiphil and Hithpael, נִיָּא, Hiphil, נִיָּא, and occasionally for other words. (a) *To look upon, to view*, Ex. xxxiii. 8, κατενοούσαν ἀπ' ὀφθαλμοῦ Μωυσῆ ἕως τοῦ εἰσελθεῖν αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν σκηνήν; Acts vii. 31, 32, xi. 6; Jas. i. 23, 24; *to note*, Matt. vii. 3; Luke vi. 41; Isa. v. 12; Heb. x. 24; *to consider, to take note of*, Isa. lvii. 1, ἄνδρες δίκαιοι αἰρῶνται καὶ οὐδεὶς κατανοεῖ, parall. ἐκδέχεται τῇ καρδίᾳ; Ps. cxix. 15, κατανοήσω τὰς ὁδοὺς σου; Judith viii. 14; Luke xii. 24, 27; Xen. *Cyrop.* viii. 1. 14. On Heb. iii. 1, Rom. iv. 19, where the participle added to the object tells what in the object is to be specially observed, therefore=*to contemplate something in the object*, cf. Thuc. ii. 3. 2, κατενόησαν οὐ πολλοὺς τοὺς Θηβαίους ὄντας; iii. 6. 6. 1, κατανοήσαντες ἡμᾶς ὀλίγους ὄντας.—(b) *To perceive, to understand*, Ps. cxix. 18; Luke xx. 23; Acts xxvii. 39.

Μετανοέω, in the sense of *to repent*, occurs in Xen. *Hell.* i. 7. 19, οὐ μετανοήσαντες ὕστερον εὐρήσετε σφᾶς αὐτοὺς ἡμαρτηκότας τὰ μέγιστα ἐς θεοὺς τε καὶ ὑμᾶς αὐτούς. Lucn. *de saltat.* 84, ἀνανήψαντα μετανοῆσαι ἐφ' οἷς ἐποίησεν, ὥστε καὶ νοσῆσαι ὑπὸ λύπης. Cf. Ign. *ad Smyrn.* 9, ἀνανῆψαι καὶ εἰς θεὸν μετανοεῖν. Often in Plut. both by itself and μ. τί, ἐπὶ τινι, περί τινος, also with the aor. part. Camill. xxix. 3, συγγνώμην τε δεομένοις δοῦναι καὶ δίκην εἰ μὴ μετανοοῦσιν ἐπιθεῖναι τοῖς αἰτίοις; Ag. xix. 5, ἠρώτησεν εἰ μετανοεῖ τοῖς πεπραγμένοις, but also ἐπὶ τινι. Galb. vi. 4, μετανοεῖν περὶ τῶν γεγονότων. De adulator. 36 (74 C), βελτίον δὲ τὰς ἁμαρτίας φυλάττεσθαι τοῖς συμβουλευούσι πειθόμενον ἢ μετανοεῖν ἁμαρτόντα διὰ τοὺς κακῶς λέγοντας. Pueror. ed. 14 (10 F), et al. It never denotes a change of the moral bearing, or of the manner of life in general, but always refers to some particular points of behaviour. But it is otherwise in Biblical Greek. In the N. T., with rare exceptions, e.g. Luke xvii. 3, 4, 2 Cor. xii. 21, it is used in the Synoptics, especially Luke, Acts also and Rev. in which alone it occurs, excepting a few places (see μετάνοια), in an ethico-religious sense with reference to the entire conduct, the character, and the tendency of personal life as a whole. The synonym ἐπιστρέφειν lays stress upon the position taken, a forsaking of sin and a return to God. The act which begins with μετάνοια is completed in a relationship into which the μετανοῶν is brought by converting grace; see ἐπιστρέφειν. Acts iii. 19, μετανοήσατε οὖν καὶ ἐπιστρέψατε; xxvi. 20, μετανοεῖν καὶ ἐπιστρέφειν εἰς τὸν θεόν. Cf. Acts xx. 21.

Μετάνοια is rare in better Greek, oftener in Polyb., Lucian, and especially Plutarch—(a) **change of mind**, Thuc. iii. 36. 3, τῇ ὕστεραία μετάνοιά τις εὐθύς ἦν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἀναλογισμὸς κ.τ.λ.; Polyb. iv. 66. 7. It is also used of change of mind on God's part, who, instead of punishing, forgives (Jonah iv. 3; Joel ii. 13), ver. 7, σὺ γὰρ εἰ κύριος ὑψιστος, εὐσπλαγχνος, μακρόθυμος, μετανοῶν ἐπὶ κακίαις ἀνθρώπων. Σὺ κύριε κατὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῆς χρηστότητός σου ἐπηγγείλω μετάνοιαν καὶ ἄφεσιν τοῖς ἡμαρτηκόσιν σοι, καὶ τῷ πλήθει τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν σου ὥρισας μετάνοιαν ἁμαρτωλοῖς εἰς σωτηρίαν; ver. 8, σὺ οὖν κύριε ὁ θεὸς τῶν δικαίων οὐκ ἔθου μετάνοιαν δικαίοις . . . τοῖς οὐχ ἡμαρτηκόσιν σοι, ἀλλ' ἔθου μετάνοιαν ἐπ' ἐμοὶ τῷ ἁμαρτωλῷ. It also stands as a synonym for ἄφεσις, Wisd. xii. 19, εὐέλπιδας ἐποίησας τοὺς υἱούς σου, ὅτι δίδως ἐπὶ ἁμαρτήμασι μετάνοιαν, and xi. 24, ἐλεεῖς δὲ πάντας, ὅτι πάντα δύνασαι, καὶ παρορᾷς ἁμαρτήματα ἀνθρώπων εἰς μετάνοιαν. Nevertheless, xii. 10, κρίνων δὲ κατὰ βραχὺ ἐδίδους τόπον μετανοίας οὐκ ἀγνοῶν . . . ὅτι οὐ μὴ ἀλλαγῇ ὁ λογισμὸς αὐτῶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, makes this interpretation doubtful, and it is better to compare xi. 24 with Acts xvii. 30, and include the passage under (b).—(b) **Repentance, amendment**, Polyb. xviii. 16. 7, as opposed to ἡ ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖρον μεταβολή. The association of the word with λύπη is necessary to complete the idea. The μετανοῶν bewails the past as failure; cf. Plut. *Mor.* 961 D, αὐτοὶ δὲ καὶ κύνας ἁμαρτάνοντας καὶ ἵππους καλᾶζουσιν, οὐ διακενῆς, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ σωφρονισμῷ, λύπην δι' ἀλγῆδονος ἐμποιοῦντες αὐτοῖς, ἦν μετάνοιαν ὀνομάζομεν. The μετάν. is indeed μετάν. τῆς γνώμης, but not this only, not simply identical with τροπὴ γνώμης, it includes at

the same time feeling and remembrance, τῶν πεπραγμένων μ. (Plut. *Alex.* xi. 4); cf. Plut. *Mor.* x. 4, ἔσχε μὲν τις τροπὴ γνώμης καὶ μετάνοια τὸν βάρβαρον; xxxix. 3, πάντας οὖν ἐκπληξίς ἔσχεν, εἴτ' οἶκτος καὶ μετάνοια τῆς γνώμης καὶ κατάμεμψις ἑαυτῶν κ.τ.λ. *Timol. et. Aem. P. parall.* ii. 6, μετανοία καὶ λύπη ταπεινωθεῖς. Lucn. *de calum.* 5, of an image of Μετάνοια: ἐπεστρέφετο ἐς τοῦπίσω δακρύουσα καὶ μετ' αἰδοῦς πᾶν τὴν Ἀλήθειαν προσιοῦσαν ὑπέβλεπεν. So *de merc. cond.* 42. Cf. Plut. *de adulat.* 12 (56 A), 28 (68 F), τὸ νοθετοῦν καὶ μετάνοιαν ἐμποιοῦν; *Ceb. tab.* 9. Also *Wisd.* xii. 10 (and xi. 24, xii. 19); *Ecclus.* xlv. 15, Ἐνώχ—ὑπόδειγμα μετανοίας ταῖς γενεαῖς. In like manner, often in Philo, *Quod det. pot. ins.* i. 210. 4, δέχεσθαι μετάνοιαν, *parall.* μετακλαίειν καὶ μεταστένειν τῆς παλαιᾶς διωίτης ἑαυτοῦς. *De monarch.* ii. 220. 46, Ἐνιοὶ δὲ τοσαύτην κέχρηται μανίας ὑπερβολῇ, ὥς οὐδ' ἀναχώρησιν ἑαυτοῖς πρὸς μετάνοιαν ἀπολιπόντες. *De trib. virt.* ii. 405.

Προνοέω, to observe or consider beforehand, especially to be provident; Xen. *Mem.* ii. 10. 3, *προνοεῖν καὶ προβουλεύεσθαι*, syn. with *ἐπιμελεῖσθαι*, the preposition having a weakened force = to care for, to take thought for. Cf. the Latin *providere*. Very frequent in the middle. The active as a rule is used of divine care or providence, but the noun *πρόνοια* oftener than the verb. In biblical Greek very seldom. In the LXX. Job xxiv. 15 = 𐤒𐤔, where, however, A reads *προσνοεῖν*; Prov. iii. 4, *προνοοῦ καλὰ ἐνώπιον κυρίου*, where the LXX. have read 𐤒𐤔 for 𐤒𐤔. Dan. xi. 37, ἐπὶ τοὺς θεοὺς τῶν πατέρων οὐ μὴ *προνοηθῇ* καὶ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ γυναικὸς οὐ μὴ *προνοηθῇ*, Theodot. οὐ *συνήσει* = 𐤒𐤔, to trouble oneself concerning. In the Apocrypha the active *προνοεῖν* τινός = to care for one, *Wisd.* xiii. 16, the middle with the aor. pass. 2 Macc. xiv. 9; with following *μήποτε*, 3 Macc. iii. 24; ὅπως, 1 Esdr. ii. 25. Once the active, of divine providence, *Wisd.* vi. 8, *μικρὸν καὶ μέγαν αὐτὸς ἐποίησεν ὁμοίως τε προνοεῖ περὶ πάντων*. See *πρόνοια*.—In the N. T. Lachm., Tisch., Treg., Westc. read the active *προνοοῦμεν γὰρ καλὰ* κ.τ.λ. (from Prov. iii. 4) instead of the Rec. *προνοούμενοι*, as in Rom. xii. 17; but in 1 Tim. v. 8, Tisch., Treg., Westc. read *εἰ δὲ τίς τῶν ἰδίων . . . οὐ προνοεῖται* for *προνοεῖ*, Lachm.

Πρόνοια, ας, ἡ, (a) foresight, thus, however, very seldom. The force of the prep. is specially retained in the phrase *ἐκ προνοίας*, with forethought, often in Herod., Plato, etc. Thus Joseph. xx. 3 attested by a few MSS. only, τῷ πατάξαντι ψυχὴν ἀκουσίως ἄνευ *προνοίας* = 𐤒𐤔 𐤒𐤔 𐤒𐤔 𐤒𐤔. Then (b) with weakened force of the prep. forethought, providence, e.g. *πρόνοιαν ἔχειν* τινός, to have a care for any one or anything. So Rom. xiii. 14, τῆς σαρκὸς *πρόνοιαν* ποιείσθε εἰς ἐπιθυμίας; 2 Macc. iv. 6, ἄνευ βασιλικῆς *προνοίας* ἀδύνατον τυχεῖν εἰρήνης; Acts xxiv. 3, διωρθωμάτων *γινομένων* τῷ ἔθνει τούτῳ διὰ τῆς σῆς *προνοίας*.—(c) Of God's providence manifest in the purposeful arrangement and ordering of nature (rarely, and almost only in the poets, of divine care over particular persons, and not till late, e.g. in Dion. Hal., of the divine working in history; see Nägelsbach, *Nachhom. Theol.* i. 58). Thus in Herod. iii. 108. 1, τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ *προνοία*, ὥσπερ καὶ οἶκός ἐστι, εὐδῶσα σοφὴ, ὅσα μὲν ψυχὴν τε δειλὰ καὶ ἐδώδιμα, ταῦτα μὲν πάντα πολὺγόνα

πεποιήκε, ἵνα μὴ ἐκλείπη κατεσθιόμενα, ὅσα δὲ σχέτλια καὶ ἀνιηρά, ὀλιγόγονα. Xen. Mem. i. 4. 6, iv. 3. 6; Plat. Tim. 30 C, τόνδε τὸν κόσμον . . . διὰ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ γενέσθαι πρόνοιαν; 44 C, περὶ σωμάτων κατὰ μέρη τῆς γενέσεως καὶ περὶ ψυχῆς, δι' ἧς τε αἰτίας καὶ προνοίας γέγονε θεῶν. Not in Aristotle. But very often in Plutarch, and with reference to history as well as nature; Consol. ad Apoll. 34 (119 F), κατὰ τὴν τῶν ὄλων πρόνοιαν καὶ τὴν κοσμικὴν διάταξιν. De def. oracul. 47 (436 D), "though Plato explains seeing and hearing physically, he does not deny τὸ κατὰ λόγον καὶ προνοίας ὁρατικούς καὶ ἀκουστικούς γεγονέναι." De puer. educ. 5 (3 C). He especially speaks of it in Cur Pythia nunc non reddat oracula and De def. orac.; he designates it either ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ πρόν. or absolutely ἡ πρόν., he joins it with εἰμαρμένη, so that it seems almost as if the word were the neutralized name for God, like "Providence" in the language of diplomatists and of the tame Atheism of our day. Cf., however, especially de Def. orac. 29 (426 F), τίς ἀνάγκη πολλοὺς εἶναι Δίας, ἂν πλείονες ὦσι κόσμοι, καὶ μὴ καθ' ἕκαστον ἄρχοντα πρῶτον καὶ ἡγεμόνα τοῦ ὅλου θεὸν ἔχοντα καὶ νοῦν καὶ λόγον, οἷος ὁ παρ' ἡμῖν κύριος ἀπάντων καὶ πατὴρ ἐπονομαζόμενος; ἡ τὴν κωλύσει τῆς τοῦ Διὸς εἰμαρμένης καὶ προνοίας ὑπηκόους πάντας εἶναι καὶ τοῦτον ἐφορᾶν ἐν μέρει καὶ κατευθύνειν ἐνδιδόντα πᾶσιν ἀρχὰς καὶ σπέρματα καὶ λόγους τῶν περαινομένων; Polyb. xxv. 1. 10, μετὰ τῆς τῶν θεῶν προνοίας, answering to ἐὰν ὁ κύριος θελήσῃ καὶ ζήσομεν, Jas. iv. 15. The conception does not appear in Aristotle. It is very characteristic that it is likewise strange to Holy Scripture, notwithstanding that Scripture maintains a *providentia Dei specialissima* in nature and history. But how little the word answers to this last-named sense appears when we note how in some places in the Apocrypha it bars and weakens the conception of God's elective love in the economy of redemption, Wisd. xiv. 3, ἡ δὲ σὴ πάτερ διακυβερνᾷ πρόνοια, ὅτι ἔδωκας καὶ ἐν θαλάσῃ ὁδὸν κ.τ.λ. (Ex. xiv. 21); xvii. 2, φυγάδες τῆς αἰωνίου προνοίας ἔκειντο (Ex. x. 21); 3 Macc. iv. 21, τοῦτο δὲ ἦν ἐνέργεια τῆς τοῦ βοηθοῦντος τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ἐξ οὐρανοῦ προνοίας ἀνικητοῦ; v. 30; 4 Macc. ix. 24, δι' ἧς (sc. εὐσεβείας) ἡ δικαία καὶ πάτριος ἡμῶν πρόνοια τῷ ἔθνει γενηθεῖσα τιμωρήσειεν τὸν ἀλάστορα τύραννον; xiii. 18, ἅπερ (sc. τῆς ἀδελφότητος φιλτρα) ἡ θεία καὶ πάνσοφος πρόνοια διὰ πατέρων τοῖς γεννωμένοις ἐμέρισε κ.τ.λ.; xvii. 22, διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τῶν εὐσεβῶν ἐκείνων καὶ τοῦ ἱλαστηρίου τοῦ θανάτου αὐτῶν ἡ θεία πρόνοια τὸν Ἰσραὴλ προκακωθέντα διέσωσε. The conception expressed by πρόνοια differs from the action of God's elective love in redemption, just as the N. T. conception of Father differs from the extra-biblical; see πατήρ and ἐκλέγεσθαι. As connected with the Scripture range of thought, πρόνοια would be more in keeping with Acts xiv. 16, 17, xvii. 26, 27, 30, but it is inadequate to express God's relation to the Old and New Testament redeemed community.

Ἵππονόεω, (a) to think or conjecture unobserved or in quiet, Herod., Plato, Plutarch; Ecclus. xxiii. 21; Dan. vii. 25, ὑπονοήσει τοῦ ἀλλοιωῶσαι καιροὺς κ.τ.λ. = כבד, "he will think thereupon, endeavour, to change," etc. (the middle in Judith xiv. 14). In the N. T. Acts xiii. 25, xxvii. 27. (b) Especially in *malam partem*, to cherish

suspicion, to suspect, τὶ εἰς τινα; but also τινά, περί τινος, to suspect one, Thuc., Plut. *et al.* Tob. viii. 16. With a neuter object, Acts xxv. 18, οὐδεμίαν αἰτίαν ἔφερον ὧν ἐγὼ ὑπενόουν πονηράν.

ἹΠόνοια, ας, ἡ, (a) conjecture, opinion, as ungrounded, and in opposition to ἀλήθεια, Thuc. ii. 4. In Ecclus. iii. 23, ὑπ. πονηρά (parallel with ὑπόληψις), of self-presumption = conceit. (b) Suspicion, surmise, Dem., Plato, *et al.* Thus ὑπ. πονηραί, 1 Tim. vi. 4, where the meaning *suspicion* is not owing to the adj., for the thing itself is designated as evil; Hofmann's attempt to distinguish πον. from ὑπον. is a failure, because ὑπόνοια in itself signifies a suspicion of what is bad.

Παροικέω, (a) to dwell beside, Judg. v. 17; Alex. Ἀσὴρ παρώκησεν παρ' αἰγιαλὸν θαλασσῶν (compare the transitive in Isoc. 74 D, Ἑλλήνες τὴν Ἀσίαν παροικοῦσιν, "occupy or dwell in the coasts of Asia"); to dwell with one, Judg. xvii. 11, cf. Ps. lxi. 5; to dwell as neighbour, often in Thuc. Thus in biblical Greek only in Ps. xciv. 17, παρὰ βραχὺ παρώκησεν τῷ ἄδῃ ἡ ψυχὴ μου (here = עֲנִי). In all other places in biblical Greek it stands (b) in a sense unknown in the classics, and appearing first in later Greek, of strangers, who dwell anywhere, without citizen rights or home title, Diod. Sic. xiii. 47, οἱ παροικοῦντες ξένοι. Julian, c. Christ. 209 D, δουλεύσαι δὲ ἀεὶ καὶ παροικῆσαι. In this sense the LXX. render the Hebrew נָזַח by this word (seldom otherwise, e.g. κατοικεῖν, προσέρχεσθαι, and other words), sometimes עָנִי also. Compare Gen. xii. 10, xix. 9, xxxv. 27, xlvii. 4; Ex. vi. 4; Ruth i. 1; 2 Sam. iv. 3; Judg. xvii. 8, 9; 2 Kings viii. 1; compare Ps. lxi. 4, Isa. xvi. 4, Jer. xlv. 14, therefore = to dwell anywhere as a stranger. (Twice also transitively, Gen. xvii. 8; Ex. vi. 4, τὴν γῆν ἣν παρωκήκασιν; cf. under (a).) Thus in the N. T. Heb. xi. 9. In Luke xxiv. 18, Tisch., Treg., Westc. read σὺ μόνος παροικεῖς Ἱερουσ., therefore transitive; but the Rec., Lachm. read ἐν Ἱερ., the usual combination in the LXX., sometimes εἰς.

Παροικία, ας, ἡ, only in biblical and patristic Greek = (a) dwelling as a sojourner in a foreign land without home or citizen rights; LXX. = נָזַח, Ps. cxix. 54; נָזַח, Ps. cxx. 5; Wisd. xix. 10, Ecclus. Prol.; Zech. ix. 12.—In the N. T. Acts xiii. 17, and figuratively 1 Pet. i. 17, τὸν τῆς παροικίας ὑμῶν χρόνον; Luther, "so long as ye sojourn here;" cf. i. 1, ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπιδήμοις διασπορᾶς; ii. 11, 12, τὴν ἀναστροφὴν ὑμῶν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν. So Philo, de Cherub. i. 160. 47 sqq., ἕκαστος γὰρ ἡμῶν ὥσπερ εἰς καινὴν πόλιν ἀφίκεται τόνδε τὸν κόσμον, ἧς πρὸ γενέσεως οὐ μετείχε, καὶ ἀφικόμενος παροικεῖ, μέχρις ἂν τὸν ἀπονεμηθέντα τοῦ βίου χρόνον διαντλήσῃ—with reference to Lev. xxv. 23; cf. also *Quis rer. div. haer.* i. 511. 40, in Loesner, *observ. phil.* p. 476; Carpzov, *sacr. exerc. in ep. ad Hebr.* p. 518. (b) A foreign country as the dwelling-place of him who has no home rights there; so 2 Esdr. viii. 34, οἱ ἐλθόντες ἐκ τῆς αἰχμαλωσίας υἱοὶ τῆς παροικίας; Judith v. 9; 1 Esdr. v. 7; cf. Ecclus. xli. 5.

Πάροικος expresses a conception capable of many applications. While in Lev.

xxv. 23, 35, Israel is represented as God's guest, living under His protection (compare Ps. xxxix. 13), Ps. cxix. 19 as compared with Heb. xi. 9, 14 sqq. lays stress upon his earthly homelessness with reference to another future. In 1 Pet. ii. 11 it designates Christians in relation to the world, and in Eph. ii. 19, on the other hand, the heathen in their natural relation to the ἁγίοις, while by conversion they become συμπολῖται with them. It has reference not to the Old, but to the New Testament fellowship of God.

Συνοικοδομέω, to build in common, together, at once; (a) denoting fellowship in the subject = to build together with; 1 Esdr. viii. 65, συνοικοδομήσωμεν ὑμῖν. But in profane Greek usually (b) with reference to the object, to build together; Plut. *Thes. et Rom.* 4, ἐκ πολλῶν ἐν οἰκητήριον; Diod. xiii. 82, συνφικοδομοῦντο οἱ κίονες τοῖς τοίχοις. So figuratively Eph. ii. 22; cf. with ver. 19, συμπολῖται. We must not explain ἐν ᾧ καὶ ὑμεῖς συνοικοδομεῖσθε εἰς κατοικητήριον τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν πν., to become built into, for thus εἰς κατοικ. κ.τ.λ. would not receive its due force.

Οἰκτεῖρω, instead of the future οἰκτερώ, aor. ὤκτειρα, we have always in biblical Greek οἰκτειρήσω, Ex. xxxiii. 19; 1 Kings viii. 50; Ps. cii. 14; Jer. xiii. 14; Micah vii. 19; Lam. iii. 31;—ὤκτειρήσα, Ps. iv. 2, lix. 6, lxvii. 2; 2 Kings xiii. 23, and often; compare Lobeck, *Phryn.* 741 = to commiserate, to pity, from οἶκτος, lamentation, pity, sympathy. It is construed τινὰ ἐπὶ τινι, to mourn for any one, to pity on account of something; Xen. *Oecon.* ii. 4, also τινὸς ἕνεκα, and also simply τινός. Exceptional is Jer. xiii. 14, οὐκ οἰκτειρήσω ἀπὸ διαφορᾶς αὐτῶν. It differs from ἔλεος, ἐλεῖν, in that the latter denotes the helpful action of the pity, οἶκτος only the testifying of it; Pillion, "οἶκτος pitié qui se manifeste par des signes ou une demonstration." Accordingly οἰκτεῖρω denotes the sensation and its manifestation, but not the helpful activity to which it prompts; compare over against it μακαρίζειν, Xen. *An.* iii. 1. 19; Plut. *de aud. poet.* 8 (27 D), οἰκτεῖρειν ἄξιον ἢ βδελύττεσθαι τὴν φιλοπλουτίαν; *De superst.* 1 (165 A), ταύτας (sc. κρίσεις καὶ ὑπολήψεις) ἄξιόν ἐστιν οἰκτεῖρειν ὁμοῦ καὶ δυσχεραίνειν. Hence it appears that it answers to the Hebrew synonyms נח and חס, mainly the latter; נח usually is = ἐλεῖν, less frequently οἶκτ., and in like manner חס, Piel; but οἰκτιρμός as a rule is = חסד, ἔλεος more rarely; just as חסד as a rule is = οἰκτίρμων, only once = ἐλεήμων, while, on the other hand, נח as a rule is = ἐλεήμων, and only once = οἰκτίρμων; compare חסד = τὰ σπλάγχνα, 2 Cor. vi. 12, vii. 18; Prov. xii. 10, τὰ σπλάγχνα τῶν ἀσεβῶν ἀνελεήμονα; Phil. ii. 1, σπλ. καὶ οἰκτιρμοί; Col. iii. 12, σπλ. οἰκτιρμοῦ. In the O. T. it is in other respects quite synon. with ἐλεῖν, and like this denotes the helpful activity of pity, therefore = to be pitiful, to manifest compassion, save that in relation to ἐλεῖν, ἔλεος is the stronger word, giving fuller expression to the affection and laying main stress upon it; compare not only where it is = נח, Ps. iv. 2, lxvii. 1, cii. 14, καιρὸς τοῦ οἰκτειρήσαι αὐτήν, et al., but also = חס, Ps. cii. 14, ἀναστὰς οἰκτειρήσεις τὴν Σιών; ciii. 13; Isa. xxx. 18; Jer. xxi. 7, οὐ φείσομαι ἐπ' αὐτοῖς καὶ οὐ μὴ οἰκτειρήσω αὐτούς; Lam. iii. 31, ὁ ταπεινώσας οἰκτειρήσει; Micah vii. 19; also compare the opposite ὀργή,

ὀργίζεσθαι, but not opposed to θυμός; Ps. lx. 1, ἀπώσω ἡμᾶς καὶ καθεῖλες ἡμᾶς, ὀργίσθης καὶ ὠκτείρησας ἡμᾶς; Ps. lxxvii. 10, οἰκτιρμοὶ . . . ὀργή. Both expressions, ἐλεεῖν and οἰκτεῖρειν, are, like נָחַם and נָחַם, specially used of God, and only seldom of men, of whom we find οἰκτ. in Prov. xii. 10; Ps. xxxvii. 21, cxii. 5; נָחַם, 1 Kings viii. 50; Ps. ciii. 13. Still more than ἔλεος, ἐλεεῖν, οἰκτεῖρειν, οἰκτιρμός retire before χάρις, which is the distinctively N. T. word for God's pitiful and saving love; see ἔλεος, χάρις. Most of all οἰκτεῖρω retires, occurring only once in the N. T. Rom. ix. 15, in a quotation from Ex. xxxiii. 15 (joined with ἐλεεῖν to exhaust the conception), while οἰκτιρμός, οἰκτίρμων occur but a few times. This is in keeping with the fact that οἰκτεῖρειν, like οἶκτος and its derivatives, expresses in profane Greek the sensation only, and in part that οἰκτιρμός, οἰκτίρμων are almost unused in profane Greek.

Οἰκτιρμός, οὐ, ὁ, (a) sympathy, pity, very seldom in profane Greek, often in the LXX., where however, excepting Zech. i. 16, vii. 9, xii. 10, Dan. ix. 18, it is always in the plural, answering to נְחֻמָּה, for which it usually stands. Excepting in Zech. vii. 9 and Dan. iv. 24, it stands only for the compassion of God, in the latter passage strangely with the gen. of the object οἰκτ. πενήτων. Of God, 2 Sam. xxiv. 14; 1 Kings viii. 50; 1 Chron. xxi. 13; 2 Chron. xxx. 9; Neh. i. 11, ix. 19, 27, 28, 31; Ps. xxv. 6, xl. 12, li. 2, lxix. 17, lxxvii. 10, lxxix. 8, ciii. 4, cvi. 46, cxix. 77, 156, cxlv. 9; Isa. lxiii. 15; Lam. iii. 22; Dan. i. 9, ii. 18, ix. 9, 18; Hos. ii. 19; Zech. i. 16. Frequent especially in the Psalms with ἔλεος. Rarer in the Apocrypha, once of men, 4 Macc. vi. 24; of God, in the plural, Prayer of Manasseh 7; 3 Macc. ii. 20, vi. 2; the singular, Ecclus. v. 6; Bar. ii. 27; 1 Macc. iii. 44.—In the N. T. of men, Phil. ii. 1, σπλάγχνα καὶ οἰκτιρμοί; Col. iii. 12, σπλ. οἰκτιρμοῦ (Rec. -ῶν). Of God, Rom. xii. 1, διὰ τῶν οἰκτ. τ. θν.; 2 Cor. i. 3, ὁ πατήρ τῶν οἰκτ. Without any special limitation, Heb. x. 28.—(b) Somewhat strangely yet not inexplicably it appears in the sing. in Dan. ix. 18 with the meaning supplication, prayer, and thus probably also in Zech. xii. 10, πνεῦμα χάριτος καὶ οἰκτιρμοῦ, in both places = נְחֻמָּה.

Οἰκτίρμων, ον, ονος, rare and only in later Greek, sympathizing, compassionate; in the LXX. as a rule = נְחֻמָּה, once = נָחַם, Ps. cxlv. 8; נָחַם, Ps. cix. 12; נְחֻמָּה, Lam. iv. 10; everywhere save in the two last texts of God, and then always with ἐλεήμων to give the fulness of the conception, sometimes also with μακρόθυμος and πολυέλεος besides.—In the N. T. only three times, Luke vi. 36, of men; Luke vi. 36 and Jas. v. 11, of God, with πολύσπλαγχνος in the last-named place.

Ἀπώλεια occurs only seldom in profane Greek; first in Polyb. vi. 59. 5, οἱ μὲν κτησάμενα πρὸς τὴν τήρησιν, οἱ δ' ἔτοιμα παραλαβόντες πρὸς τὴν ἀπώλειαν εὐφυνεῖς εἰσιν. Often in the LXX. = perdition, without representing any one fixed Hebrew word; e.g. it stands for נָכַח, inf., Prov. xi. 10, xxviii. 28; for נָכַח, Deut. xxxii. 35; Job xxi. 30; Jer. xviii. 17, et al.; for נָכַח, נָכַח Hiphil and Niphal, et al.; Plut. Consol. ad Apol. 28

116 C); *Apophth. lacon.* 221 C. In the Apocrypha, especially in Ecclus. ix. 9, xvi. 9, xx. 25, xli. 10, *et al.*; *Wisd.* v. 7. While the Hebrew words for ἀπόλλυμι are hardly used in exactly the same sense as ἀπολ. in Paul's and John's Epistles, in some places they approach very near to the N. T. usage; for example, Ps. i. 6, ix. 4, 6, xxxvii. 20, lxviii. 3, lxxiii. 27, lxxxiii. 18, xcii. 10; Isa. xli. 11, lx. 12. The form ἀπολλύω occurs sometimes in Plato, also Ecclus. xlix. 7; see Rom. xiv. 15.

Ὅμοιος, α, ον, from ὁμός connected with ἄμα, like the Latin *simul*, *similis*. Old High German *sama* (*idem*), "sammt," Curtius 322 = like in kind, of the same kind, like; cf. ποῖος, οἶος; see below. It denotes coincidence in kind or quality, while ἴσος refers primarily to quantity; ὅμοιος compares, ἴσος (Sanskrit *vishu* = according to both sides, Curtius 378) runs on the same lines, but weighs, and denotes equal reckoning, equal possession, etc., and expresses, *e.g.*, the honesty and justice of a judge or judgment, whereas ὅμοιος would compare the judge with others, and would designate the judgment as coinciding with another judgment. Ἰσότης signifies equality in estimating, equal justice, integrity and equity; ὁμοιότης, coincidence or agreement, *e.g.* of nature, kind, look, of a picture, etc.; Plat. *Legg.* viii. 848 B, τὴν τῆς ὁμοιότητος ἰσότητα ἢ νομὴ πᾶσιν ἀποδίδωται τὴν αὐτήν. The verb ἰσοῦν = to make equal; ὁμοιοῦν = to make like or coincident, to liken; cf. Aristot. *Cat.* 6, τὸ λευκὸν ἴσον τε καὶ ἄνισον οὐ πάνυ ἀλλ' ὅμοιον, ὥστε τοῦ πόσου μᾶλλον ἂν εἴη ἴδιον τὸ ἴσον τε καὶ ἄνισον λέγεσθαι. Ὅμοιος and ἴσος do not differ as *similarity* and *equality* in mathematics, as if ὅμοιος were less than ἴσος; they do not indicate a difference in measurement or degree, but denote the same thing from different points of view; so that in many cases they may be interchanged, and very often are combined in order to give full expression to or to strengthen the idea; compare *e.g.* Plato, *Parmen.* 140 E, *et al.* Οἱ ὅμοιοι, for example, was a *term. techn.* in Sparta for those who had equal rights to magisterial offices, as distinct from the ἱπομειόες, among the Persians ὁμότιμοι; cf. Hermann, *Greich. Staatsaltertümer*, § 47. 10; Sturz, *Lex. Xen.*; Xen. *Hell.* iii. 5. 5; *Rep. Lac.* x. 7, *et al.*; οἱ ἴσοι καὶ ὅμοιοι in Thuc., Dem., and others = those having equal rights and position; οἱ ἴσοι by itself does not occur. Elsewhere also οἱ ὅμ., those having like opinions, belonging to the same party, ὁ ὅμ. of a friend, Plat. *Gorg.* 510 B; cf. *Conv.* 195 B. Ὅμοιος is the common, *e.g.* μοῖρα, the common fate or lot, in which many or all have part, which all share; ἴση μοῖρα, the like lot, the same fate, *Il.* ix. 318, xi. 705—a distinction very easily obliterated; Plato, *Rep.* v. 472 D, τὴν ἐκείνοις μοῖραν ὁμοιότητην εἶξεν. Ὅμοιος does not signify a similarity which admits of differences, a mere similarity, but a similarity which consists in coincidence; hence very often ἐν καὶ ὅμοιον = one and the same; compare ὅμοιος with οἶος following, *e.g.* Xen. *Hell.* iv. 2. 11, καὶ ταῦτα ὅμοιος εἰ οἷός περ καὶ τᾶλλα. Where ἴσος and ὅμοιος are distinguished as in mathematics, ἴσος excludes every difference, while ὅμ. not so much makes the difference prominent, but rather denotes the coincidence or agreement in the difference or in spite of it, Aristotle, *Metaph.* ix. 3.

So also throughout biblical Greek = **of the same kind, like**. Not often in the LXX., only once answering to the particle of comparison π , Ezek. xxxi. 8. Oftenest = וְכִי , with $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma$, Lev. xi. 14, 15, 16, 19, 22; Deut. xiv. 13–18.—Gen. ii. 20, $\text{οὐχ εὐρέθη βοηθὸς ὅμοιος αὐτῷ} = \text{וְלֹא נִמְצָא עֹשֶׂה כָמוֹתָיו}$; cf. Job xxxvii. 23, $\text{οὐχ εὐρίσκομεν ἄλλον ὅμοιον τῇ ἰσχύϊ αὐτοῦ}$; Prov. xxvi. 4; Song ii. 9.—Isa. xiv. 14, $\text{ἔσομαι ὅμοιος τῷ ὑψίστῳ} = \text{כְּמֹנִי}$; cf. Dan. iii. 26, $\text{ἡ ὄρασις τοῦ τετάρτου ὁμοία νύφ̄ θεοῦ}$; vii. 5, $\text{θηρίον ἕτερον ὅμοιον ἄρκτῳ}$; Job xli. 25, $\text{οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδὲν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ὅμοιον αὐτῷ} = \text{כְּדָוִד}$. In like manner in the Apocrypha, cf. Wisd. xviii. 11, $\text{ὁμοία δίκη δοῦλος ἅμα δεσπότη κολασθεὶς καὶ δημότης βασιλεὶ τὰ αὐτὰ πάσχων}$; Wisd. xvi. 1, $\text{δι' ὁμοίων ἐκολίσθησαν ἀξίως}$; xi. 14; Judith xii. 3; 3 Macc. xi. 20; Wisd. xiii. 7, $\text{πρώτην φωνὴν τὴν ὁμοίαν πᾶσιν ἴσα κλαίων}$; xv. 16, $\text{οὐδεὶς γὰρ αὐτῷ ὅμοιον ἄνθρωπος ἰσχύει πλάσαι θν.}$; 4 Macc. xiv. 14, $\text{τὰ ἄλογα ζῶα ὁμοίαν εἰς τὰ ἐξ αὐτῶν γεννώμενα συμπάθειαν καὶ στοργὴν ἔχει τοῖς ἀνθρώποις}$. Thus to denote existences of the same kind, xiii. 14, $\text{πᾶν ζῶον ἀγαπᾷ τὸ ὅμοιον αὐτῷ καὶ πᾶς ἄνθρωπος τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ}$; xxvii. 9, $\text{πέτεινα πρὸς τὰ ὅμοια αὐτοῖς καταλύσει}$; xxviii. 4, $\text{ἐπ' ἄνθρωπον ὅμοιον αὐτῷ οὐκ ἔχει ἔλεος}$. Ecclus. xiii. 15, compare ver. 16; Tob. viii. 6. *Of like nature, the like of one*, Ecclus. xxx. 4, $\text{ὅμοιον γὰρ αὐτῷ κατέλιπε μετ' αὐτόν}$; xlv. 19, xlv. 6, xlvi. 4; 1 Macc. ix. 29. Like in appearance, Tob. vii. 2, $\text{ὡς ὅμοιος ὁ νεανίσκος οὗτος τῷ ἀδελφῷ μου}$. See also ὁμοίως . It is not otherwise in the N. T. Thus it places (a) the two commandments, which form the sum of the law, as on a par with each other, Matt. xxii. 38, 39, $\text{αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ μεγάλη καὶ πρώτη ἐντολή. δευτέρα ὁμοία αὐτῇ}$; Mark xii. 31. It denotes the rest that are of the same kind in Gal. v. 21, $\text{καὶ τὰ ὅμοια τούτοις}$, after a list of ἔργα τῆς σαρκός . Compare Jude 7, $\text{τὸν ὅμοιον τρόπον τούτοις ἐκπορνεύσασαι κ.τ.λ.}$. Further, compare John viii. 55, $\text{ἔσομαι ὅμοιος ὑμῶν ψεύστης}$, *a liar like you*; Matt. xi. 16, $\text{ὁμοία ἐστὶν παιδαρίοις}$; Luke vii. 31, 32. So also sameness, not similarity, is meant in Acts xvii. 29, $\text{γένος οὖν ὑπάρχοντες τοῦ θεοῦ, οὐκ ὀφείλομεν νομίζειν, χρυσῷ ἢ ἀργύρῳ ἢ λίθῳ, χαράγματι τέχνης καὶ ἐνθυμήσεως ἀνθρώπου τὸ θεῖον εἶναι ὅμοιον}$; cf. Rom. i. 23; Rev. xviii. 18, $\text{τίς ὁμοία τῇ πόλει τῇ μεγάλῃ}$; xiii. 4; 1 John iii. 2, $\text{ὅμοιοι αὐτῷ ἐσόμεθα}$, where the likeness does not refer to the moral character which in ver. 3 and ii. 29 is only the presupposition of and preparation for likeness with Christ hereafter (ver. 5) in His future manifestation, ii. 28, and in His present state of glory, John xvii. 24.

(b) A difference being granted, ὅμοιος denotes the harmony or concord which exists notwithstanding, as in John ix. 9, $\text{ἄλλοι ἔλεγον ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν, ἄλλοι ἔλεγον οὐχί, ἀλλὰ ὅμοιος αὐτῷ ἐστίν}$, where we must translate *similar* or *resembling*. But the translation *like* is to be retained when the word occurs in parables, Matt. xiii. 31, 33, 44, 45, 47, 52, xx. 1; Luke vi. 47–49, xii. 36, xiii. 18, 19, 21 (in Mark ὡς); Rev. i. 13, 15, ii. 18, iv. 3, 6, 7, ix. 7, 10, 19, xi. 1, xiii. 2, 11, xiv. 14, xvi. 13, xxi. 11, 18.

As in profane Greek it is for the most part construed with the dative; with the gen. only in John viii. 55 (Lachm., Westc. read ὕμῳ), Isa. xiii. 4. The brevity of expression, usual in profane Greek, which does not repeat that which agrees with two subjects, but

puts the word as agreeing with the second subject only, as *ὁμοίαν ταῖς δούλαις εἶχε τὴν ἐσθῆτα*, Xen. *Cyr.* v. 1. 4, occurs also and more frequently in biblical Greek, Job xxxvii. 23; Dan. iii. 26; 4 Macc. xiv. 14 (see above); Wisd. xi. 14; Jude 7; Rev. ix. 7, x. 19, xvi. 13. Compare 1 Esdr. v. 67, *ὁμοίως γὰρ ὑμῖν ἀκούομεν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν*.

Ὁμοίως, like, of equal degree or manner, and denoting *perfect agreement*. In the LXX. rare; Prov. xix. 29; Esth. i. 18; Ezek. xlv. 11. In the Apocrypha, Wisd. vi. 8, *ὁμοίως προνοεῖ περὶ πάντων*; xi. 11, *ἀπόντες καὶ παρόντες ὁμοίως ἐτρύχοντο*; xv. 7; Ecclus. xxiv. 11; Tob. xii. 3; 1 Esdr. v. 66, vi. 30, viii. 20; 2 Macc. x. 36. Wisd. xviii. 9, *τῶν αὐτῶν ὁμοίως καὶ ἀγαθῶν καὶ κινδύνων μεταλήψεσθαι*. 4 Macc. xi. 15, *εἰς τὰ αὐτὰ γὰρ γεννηθέντες καὶ πραφέντες ὑπὲρ τῶν αὐτῶν καὶ ἀποθνήσκουσιν ὀφείλομεν ὁμοίως*. In the N. T. Matt. xxii. 26, *ὁμοίως καὶ ὁ δεῦτερος*; xxvi. 35, xxvii. 41; Mark xv. 31; Luke iii. 11, v. 10, 33, vi. 31, x. 32, 37, xiii. 3, xvi. 25, xvii. 28, 31, xxii. 36; John v. 19, vi. 11, xxi. 13; Rom. i. 27; 1 Cor. vii. 3, 4, 22; Heb. ix. 21; Jas. ii. 25; 1 Pet. iii. 1, 7, v. 5; Jude 8; Rev. ii. 15, viii. 12. Noteworthy is Mark iv. 16, *καὶ οὗτοι ὁμοίως εἰσὶν οἱ κ.τ.λ.*; cf. ver. 15. Luke xvi. 25, *ἀπέλαβες τὰ ἀγαθὰ σου ἐν τῇ ζωῇ σου καὶ Λάζαρος ὁμοίως τὰ κακά*. With Rom. i. 27, *ὁμοίως τε καὶ οἱ ἄρρενες* (Tisch. 8, Treg., Westc.), cf. Xen. *Cyr.* i. 6. 25, *τῶν ὁμοίων σωμάτων οἱ αὐτοὶ πόνοι οὐχ ὁμοίως ἄπτονται ἄρχοντος τε ἀνδρὸς καὶ ιδιώτου*. *De re equ.* i. 3, *ὁμοίως βαίνουνσι τῷ γε ἰσχυροτάτῳ καὶ τῷ μαλακωτάτῳ τοῦ ποδός*. Accordingly it is to be translated *just as* or *like as also the men*, whereas the Alex. reading adopted by Griesb., Lachm., Tisch. 7, *ὁμ. δὲ καί=even so also the men*; compare Polyb. iv. 87. 7, *ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ περὶ τοῦ μέλλοντος διέταξε*.

Ὁμοιότης, τος, ή, likeness, agreement and similarity realized thereby; Plat. *Tim.* Ixxv. D, *τὰ νεῦρα κύκλῳ περὶ τὸν τράχηλον ἐκόλλησεν ὁμοιότητι*. *Charm.* 166 B, *ὁμοιότητά τινα ζητεῖς αὐτῆς ταῖς ἄλλαις*. *Legg.* viii. 836 E, *τὴν τῆς εἰκόνος ὁμοιότητα*. *Tim.* 81 D, *τὰ μὲν τῆς τροφῆς εἰσιόντα οὐκέτι δύναται τέμνειν εἰς ὁμοιότητα ἑαυτοῖς*. Polyb. vi. 53. 5, *ή δὲ εἰκὼν ἔστι πρόσωπον εἰς ὁμοιότητα διαφερόντως ἐξεργασμένον καὶ κατὰ τὴν πλάσιν καὶ κατὰ τὴν ὑπογραφὴν*. Plut. *de aud. poet.* 7 (25 C), *τὴν δὲ ὁμοιότητα τοῦ ἀληθοῦς οὐ προλείπει*. *Ad princ. iner.* 3 (780 E), *ἄρχων δὲ εἰκὼν θεοῦ τοῦ πάντα κοσμοῦντος, οὐ Φειδίου δεόμενος πλάττοντος . . . ἀλλ' αὐτὸς αὐτὸν εἰς ὁμοιότητα θεῷ δι' ἀρετῆς καθιστάς*. Even where some difference is apparent, stress is not laid upon this, but always upon *the agreement or harmony*. In biblical Greek seldom. LXX. only Gen. i. 11 = 17 (see ὁμοιος), *κατὰ γένος καὶ καθ' ὁμοιότητα*. Apocrypha, 4 Macc. xv. 3, *ψυχῆς δὲ καὶ μορφῆς ὁμοιότητα εἰς μικρὸν παιδὸς χαρακτῆρα θαυμάσιον ἐναποσφραγίζοντα*. Wisd. xiv. 9, *ἐξεβιάσατο τῇ τέχνῃ τὴν ὁμοιότητα εἰς τὸ κάλλιον*, here of the image = *similarity*. In the N. T. only in Heb. vii. 15, *καθ' ὁμοιότητα Μελχισ. ἀνίσταται ἱερεὺς ἕτερος*, different from the Levitical priests, of another kind, that of Melchizedek; iv. 15, *πεπειρασμένον κατὰ πάντα καθ' ὁμοιότητα χωρὶς ἁμ.* Luther rightly renders "like as we are."

Ὁμοιόω, ὁμοίωσα, ὁμοίωκα; Rom. ix. 29, ὁμοιώθημεν for ὡμ.; so also the Alex. in Isa. i. 9, like ἐξομολογεῖτο, Tob. xi. 16; ὀνομάσθη, 1 Macc. xiv. 10, *et al.* Sturz, *de dial. mac. et alex.* p. 124, to make like, to make coincident, or in harmony with; in biblical Greek also to esteem like, to hold as like, passive to be like, to resemble. (I.) Active (a) to make like or agreeing with, *e.g.* εἰδωλόν τι; Eur. *Hel.* 33; Plat. *Parm.* 148 B, ὁμοίου δὲ ποῦ τὸ ἕτερον. So LXX.=πρ, Isa. xl. 18, 25, xlv. 5, *τίμι με ὁμοιώσατε*; ἴδετε, *τεχνάσασθε*; Ezek. xxxi. 2; Hos. iv. 5; Wisd. xiii. 14; Ecclus. xxxvi. 17, xxxviii. 27, xlv. 2. Not thus in the N. T. (b) to regard as like, to compare. Very seldom thus in profane Greek, Plut. *Cim. et Lucull.* i. 5, οὐ γὰρ ἄξιον ὁμοιωσαί τῷ νοτίῳ τείχει τῆς ἀκροπόλεως . . . τοὺς ἐν Νέᾳ πόλει θαλάμους κ.τ.λ. Cf. ὁμοίωσις, *comparison*, Lucian. *pro imagin.* 19; cf. ἀφομοιοῦν. LXX.=πρ, Song i. 8; Lam. ii. 13. In the Apoc. Wisd. vii. 9; Ecclus. xxxvii. 24. In the N. T. Matt. vii. 24, xi. 16; Mark iv. 30; Luke vii. 31, xiii. 18, 20.—(II.) Very often both in profane and in biblical Greek the passive ὁμοιοῦσθαι=to be made like, to become like, in the historic tenses = to regard as like, to liken, Plato, *Rep.* vi. 498 E, ἄνδρα ἀρετῇ παρισωμένον καὶ ὁμοιουμένον. Thuc. iv. 92. 6, ὡν χρηὴ μνησθέντας ἡμᾶς τοὺς τε πρεσβυτέρους ὁμοιωθῆναι, v. 103. 2, ὃ ὑμεῖς . . . μὴ βούλεσθε παθεῖν, μηδὲ ὁμοιωθῆναι τοῖς πόλλοις. So in the LXX.=πρ, Niphāl, Isa. i. 9, ὡς Γόμορῶρα ἂν ὁμοιώθημεν; Ezek. xxxi. 18; Hos. iv. 6, xii. 10; Zech. i. 12; Ps. cxliv. 4, ἀνθρωπος ματαιότητι ὁμοιώθη, αἱ ἡμέραι αὐτοῦ ὥσεί σκιά παράγουσι. Ps. lxxxix. 7, τίς ὁμοιωθήσεται τῷ κυρίῳ ἐν υἱοῖς θῦ; Ps. lxxxiii. 1, xlix. 13, 21, cii. 7. =פֶּרַע, Niphāl, Ps. xxviii. 1, cxliii. 7. =נָתַן, Niphāl, to concede to, to grant, Gen. xxxiv. 15, ἐν τούτῳ ὁμοιωθήσόμεν ὑμῖν. Ver. 22, ἐν τούτῳ μόνον ὁμοιωθήσονται ἡμῖν οἱ ἄνθρ. Ver. 23, compare οἱ ὅμοιοι, of the like authorized. In images and comparisons=to liken, to be like, Song ii. 17, vii. 7, viii. 14; Ezek. xxxii. 2=פֶּרַע, Niphāl.—In the Apocrypha, Ecclus. xiii. 1, xxv. 11; 1 Macc. iii. 4. Of imitated similarity with deficient resemblance, only in Bar. vi. 39, τοῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρους λίθοις ὁμοιωμένοι εἰσὶ τὰ ξυλινὰ καὶ τὰ περίχρυσα καὶ τὰ περιαργύρια, οἱ δὲ θεραπεύοντες αὐτὰ καταισχυνήσονται.—In the N. T. Matt. vi. 8, μὴ οὖν ὁμοιώθητε αὐτοῖς; Acts xiv. 11, οἱ θεοὶ ὁμοιωθέντες ἀνθρώποις κατέβησαν="as like to men," "as in our likeness;" compare Eur. *Bacch.* 1348, ὀργὰς πρέπει θεοὺς οὐχ ὁμοιοῦσθαι βροτοῖς; Heb. ii. 17, ὥφειλεν κατὰ πάντα τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ὁμοιωθῆναι, not to become like, but to resemble; Rom. ix. 29 from Isa. i. 9. In the parables, ἡ βασιλ. τ. ο. ὁμοιώθη, ὁμοιωθήσεται *τινι*, Matt. xiii. 24, xviii. 23, xxii. 2, xxv. 1; cf. vii. 26.

Ὁμοίωσις, εως, ἡ, (a) active, the making like, assimilation; in the latter sense Lucian, *pro imag.* 19; in the former, Plato, *Epin.* 990 D, τῶν οὐκ ὄντων ὁμοίων ἀλλήλοις φύσει ἀριθμῶν ὁμοίωσις. Usually and in biblical Greek always (b) passive, *resemblance*; not the image, the thing itself, but that wherein it coincides with something else, the coincidence, point of resemblance, similarity; Plato, *Theact.* 176 B, φυγὴ δὲ ὁμοίωσις θεῷ κατὰ τὸ δυνατόν ὁμοίωσις δὲ δίκαιον καὶ ὅσιον μετὰ φρονήσεως γενέσθαι.

Aristotle, *De plant.* ii. 6, πολλάκις ἐν φυτοῖς ἄλλο φυτὸν γεννᾶται οὐ τοῦ αὐτοῦ εἶδους καὶ τῆς αὐτῆς ὁμοιώσεως, where ὁμ. is = *likeness of kind, species*; Plut. *De adulat.* 9 (53 C); Sext. Emp. *Hypot. pyrrhon.* 75, καθ' ὁμοίωσιν κρίνειν, according to analogy. Upon the whole not often in profane Greek. In the LXX. = חֲמוּשׁ, Ps. lviii. 5, θυμὸς αὐτοῖς κατὰ τὴν ὁμοίωσιν τῆς ὀφews. Gen. i. 26, κατὰ εἰκόνα ἡμετέραν καὶ καθ' ὁμοίωσιν. So Jas. iii. 9, τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καθ' ὁμοίωσιν θεοῦ γεγονότας. It is not necessary to suppose a meaning such as *image*, even in Ezek. i. 10, ὁμοίωσις προσώπων αὐτῶν προσ. ἀνθρώπου κ.τ.λ., where we should rather call to mind Aristotle, *l.c.*; nor again in Dan. x. 16, ὡς ὁμοίωσις υἱοῦ ἀνθρ. ἤψατο τῶν χειλέων μου = "as one who belongs to the υἱοῖς ἀνθρ." Ezek. viii. 10 (Alex.), πᾶσα ὁμοίωσις ἐρπετοῦ καὶ κτήνους, here = חֲמוּשׁ, viewed in a Greek manner, yet not = *image*, but *the very likeness, or true species of*, etc.

Ὁμοίωμα, τος, τό, that which is made like, image, likeness; Plat. *Parm.* 132 D, τὰ μὲν εἶδη ταῦτα ὥσπερ παραδείγματα ἐστάναι ἐν τῇ φύσει, τὰ δὲ ἄλλα τούτοις εἰκέναι καὶ εἶναι ὁμοιώματα; 133 D, where αἱ ἰδέαι and their ὁμοιώματα are distinguished; cf. *Tim. Locr.* 94 A; *Phaedr.* 250 B, ὁμοιώματα δικαιοσύνης καὶ σωφροσύνης; Aristot. *Eth. Nic.* v. 12; *Hermen.* 1, τὰ παθήματα τῆς ψυχῆς ὁμοιώματα τῶν πραγμάτων, and often. The word is rare in profane Greek; it is never abstract in the sense of *likeness* and *agreement*, but always concrete, *the harmonizing, established likeness*, syn. εἰκόν, save that in ὁμοίωμα the relationship to another, the agreement or harmony with, stands prominent and determines the conception, whereas εἰκόν represents the object; compare Deut. iv. 16, μὴ ποιήσητε ὑμῖν ἑαυτοῖς γλυπτὸν ὁμοίωμα, πᾶσαν εἰκόνα ὁμοίωμα ἀρσενικοῦ ἢ θηλυκοῦ; Isa. xl. 19, εἰκόνα ἐποίησε τέκτων . . . ὁμοίωμα κατεσκεύασεν αὐτόν; compare also Plut. *ad princ. iner.* 3, under ὁμοιότης. Ὁμοίωμα is a stronger word than εἰκόν; εἰκόν may even mean the pattern so far as it represents what is copied, but ὁμ. never. Εἰκόν may indicate but little coincidence or agreement; ὁμοίωμα implies the greatest possible resemblance. In the LXX. it occurs very often. It is the usual rendering for חֲמוּשׁ (rarely ὁμοιώτις, once ὅμοιος, ἰδέα, εἰκόν), in like manner for חֲמוּשׁ (sometimes παράδειγμα, once each ὁμοίωσις μορφή, τύπος), also חֲמוּשׁ (twice = δόξα, once μορφή); while, on the other hand, חֲמוּשׁ is usually = εἰκόν, rarely = ὁμοίωμα. How fully it designates *likeness*, as something made to resemble another, is clear from the passages above cited, Deut. iv. 16; Isa. xl. 19, and Ex. xx. 4, οὐ ποιήσεις σεαυτῷ εἰδωλον οὐδὲ παντὸς ὁμοίωμα ὅσα ἐν τῷ οὐρ. κ.τ.λ.; compare Deut. iv. 25, v. 8. How decidedly the resemblance may be kept in view is evident from Isa. xl. 18, τίνι ὁμοιώματι ὁμοιώσατε αὐτόν (compare ver. 25, τίνι με ὁμοιώσατε), where it is not like εἰκόν = *pattern, archetype*, but = "what likeness will ye liken me to, where is there a likeness to which ye might compare me?" Hence may be explained the transference to the meaning *form*, even where a copy is not meant, as in Deut. iv. 12, ἐλάλησε κύριος πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐκ μέσου τοῦ πυρός . . . καὶ ὁμοίωμα οὐκ εἶδετε κ.τ.λ.; ver. 15, οὐκ εἶδετε πᾶν ὅμοι. ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ. Thus ὁμοίωμα signifies (a) that which is made like, the copy,

image, = תבנית, 2 Kings xvi. 10; 2 Chron. iv. 3; = תבנית, Deut. iv. 16, 17, 18; = תבנית, Ex. xx. 4; Deut. iv. 16, 23, 25, v. 8; = תבנית, 1 Kings vi. 5, 11.—1 Macc. iii. 49; Ecclus. xxxi. 3, xxxviii. 28; likeness, Isa. xl. 11 = תבנית. (b) The form which something has, in which it is seen. Thus = תבנית, Deut. iv. 12, 15; = תבנית, Josh. xxii. 28, ἴδετε ἰμοίωμα τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου κυρίου; cf. 2 Kings xvi. 10, ἀπέστειλεν τὸ ὅμ. τοῦ θυσ. = the pattern of the altar; Ps. cxliv. 12, περικεκοσμημένοι ὡς ὁμοίωμα ναοῦ; = תבנית, Ezek. i. 5, ἐν τῷ μέσῳ ὡς ὁμοίωμα τεσσάρων ζώων καὶ αὐτὴ ἡ ὄρασις αὐτῶν ὁμοίωμα ἀνθρώπου ἐπ' αὐτοῖς; ver. 16, τὸ εἶδος τῶν τροχῶν ὡς εἶδος θαρσείας, καὶ ὁμοίωμα ἐν τοῖς τεσσάρσιν; vv. 22, 26, viii. 2, ὁμοίωμα ὡς εἶδος ἀνθρώπου; x. 1, 10, 21, 22, ὅμ. ὡσεὶ στερέωμα; xxiii. 15, ἰμοίωμα υἱῶν Βαβυλῶνος. Then also Ezek. viii. 3, x. 8, and Ps. cxliv. 12, ἠλλάξαντο τὴν δόξαν αὐτῶν ἐν ὁμοιώματι μόσχου ἔσθοντος χόρτον = תבנית. It is manifest that even in this sense, nay, in it specially, notice is not taken of the difference between likeness and similarity; see ὅμοιος. Only in the signification *copy* the element of comparison vanishes. According to this aspect the N. T. use of the word is to be estimated. Ὁμοίωμα may signify the same as the passive ὁμοίωσις, i.e. *coincidence, similarity*. But this meaning does not appear in the usage. It is in no place necessary. The meaning *copy* likewise is nowhere suitable, but everywhere in the N. T. the word has the meaning *form*, and this not abstract but concrete. Thus Rev. ix. 7, τὰ ἰμοιώματα τῶν ἀκρίδων ὅμοιοι ἵπποις; Rom. i. 23, ἠλλάξαν τὴν δόξαν τοῦ ἀφθάρτου θεοῦ ἐν ὁμοιώματι εἰκόνος φθαρτοῦ ἀνθρ. καὶ πετεινῶν κ.τ.λ., with which compare Ps. cxliv. 12. What here is designated εἰκόν is called ὁμοίωμα in Ex. xx. 4, Deut. iv. 16 sqq.; but that which is put and presents itself in the place of God is a form or likeness, and indeed the form of an image, etc. So also Rom. vi. 5, σύμφυτοι γεγόναμεν τῷ ὁμοιώματι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ, "we have been planted together," not "with the likeness or resemblance," but "after the form of his death;" compare συνετάφημεν, ver. 4; ver. 10, τῇ ἁμ. ἀπέθανεν; ver. 11, λογίζεσθε ἑαυτοὺς εἶναι νεκροὺς μὲν τῇ ἁμ.; Gal. v. 24, οἱ τοῦ Χυ τὴν σάρκα ἐσταύρωσαν; Col. ii. 11, 12. It says not τῷ θανάτῳ, because His death reproduces itself in us in baptism. If the meaning *likeness* is rejected then in Rom. v. 14, τοὺς μὴ ἁμαρτήσαντες ἐπὶ τῷ ὅμ. τῆς παραβάσεως Ἀδάμ, it must also be taken in the meaning *form*; and very significant this is, for sin is meant, which being the *form* of Adam's sin reproduces itself, so that it is ὅμ. παρ. Ἀ.; or, if further qualified, it is such an ὁμοίωμα. It is accordingly impossible to explain the two remaining passages—Rom. viii. 3 and Phil. ii. 7—differently; Rom. viii. 3, ὁ θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ πέμφας ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας. We have not here to think only of a mere similarity, with a surmise of the difference (against which see ὅμοιος), which is never the case with ὁμοίωμα, nor is a *copy* of σ. ἁ. at all admissible. When the Son appeared and manifested Himself, the means of His manifestation was an ἰμοίωμα σ. ἁ. He was, like ourselves, a *form* of the flesh of sin; compare John i. 14, ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο, and ἐν σαρκὶ ἐλελυθώς, 1 John iv. 2. In like manner Phil. ii. 7, ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος, "having become what men become," so that thus He was an ἰμοίωμα ἀνθρώπου, καὶ σχήματι εὐρ. ὡς ἀνθρ. See

especially Holsten in *Jahrb. für prot. Theol.* 1875, p. 451; Holsten, *zum Ev. des Paul. u. Petr.* p. 437, who, however, does not sufficiently regard the difference between *likeness and form*. Zeller in the *Jahrb. für wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1870, p. 301 sqq., attributes to ὁμοίωμα just the two meanings which are to be rejected, namely that of abstract similarity, and that of the difference of likeness; and so most expositors.

Ἀφομοιόω, to copy, to make like; passive, to become like, in the historic tenses, to be like, and indeed as a *copy*, which distinguishes the compound from the simple verb; compare Plato, *Rep.* iii. 395 B, ὦν τὰ μίμητά ἐστιν ἀφομοιώματα. The ὁμοίωμα need not always be an ἀφομοίωμα. This, as well as the difference of meaning between the active and the passive, must be kept in view in explaining the only N. T. passage (Heb. vii. 3) of Melchizedek, ἀφωμοιωμένος δὲ τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ θεοῦ, "as a copy resembling the Son of God," before which all inadequate representations imputed to the writer must give way. The adj. ἀφόμοιος is rare, guaranteed it would seem only in the prologue to *Ecclus.*, εὐρον οὐ μικρὰς παιδείας ἀφόμοιον, either=a translation of no small culture, or expressed after the analogy of τύπος τῆς διδαχῆς, ἔκτυπος, ὑποτύπωσις. The verb ἀφομοιοῦν occurs not very seldom in Plato, Xen., Aristotle, Plutarch, and this (I.) in the active; (a)=to copy; Xen. *Mem.* iii. 10. 2, τὰ καλὰ εἶδη ἀφομοιοῦντες . . . ἐκ πολλῶν συνάγοντες τὰ ἐξ ἐκάστου κάλλιστα, οὕτως ὅλα τὰ σώματα καλὰ ποιεῖτε φαίνεσθαι; Plat. *Crat.* 427 B, C, ἀφομοιοῦν τοῖς γράμμασι τὰ ἔργα, where the dative does not indicate the reference, but is *dat. instr.*=*res literis exprimere*; cf. Aristot. *Metaph.* xiii. 5, ἀφομοιοῦν ταῖς ψήφοις τὰς μορφὰς τῶν φυτῶν. But usually (b) to make like, *τινί*, Xen. *Eq.* ix. 9, τῇ χαλαρότητι λείω δει αὐτὸν ἀφομοιοῦν; Plat. *Rep.* iii. 396 A, οὐδὲ μαινομένοις ἀφομοιοῦν αὐτοὺς ἐν λόγοις οὐδ' ἐν ἔργοις; ii. 382 D, τῷ ἀληθεῖ τὸ ψεῦδος; *Crat.* 424 D, 426 D; Aristot. *Pol.* i. 2, ὥσπερ δὲ καὶ τὰ εἶδη ἑαυτοῖς ἀφομοιοῦσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι, οὕτω καὶ τοὺς βίους τῶν θεῶν; *Rhet. ad Alex.* 8, τοῖς τῶν πολλῶν ἡθεσιν ἀφομοίου τὰς σαντοῦ πράξεις ὅτι μάλιστα. In Plutarch always πρὸς τι; *Alciḃ.* xxiii. 4, ὁ χαμαιλέον πρὸς ἐν ἐξαδυνατεῖ χρῶμα τὸ λευκὸν ἀφομοιοῦν ἑαυτόν; *Aemil. P.* i. 1, ἀφομοιοῦν πρὸς τὰς ἐκείνων ἀρετὰς τὸν βίον; *Dion.* x. 2; *Arat.* i. 2, *ad princ. inerud.* iii. (781 A). Hence (c) sometimes but rarely=to compare; see ὁμοιοῦν; Plat. *Rep.* viii. 564 B, οὓς δὲ ἀφομοιοῦμεν κηφήσι, τοὺς μὲν κέντρα ἔχουσι, τοὺς δὲ ἀκέντροις; *ibid.* vii. 517 B. Connected with the meaning to make like, we have (II.) the passive=to become like, or to present oneself as like; in the historical tenses, to compare. Thus Plat. *Rep.* iii. 396 B, μήτε μαίνεσθαι μήτε μαινομένοις ἀφομοιοῦσθαι; vi. 500 C, ταῦτα μιμῆσθαι τε καὶ ὅτι μάλιστα ἀφομοιοῦσθαι; *Tim.* 50 D, 68 C; *Vir. civ.* 270 E; Aristot. *Hist. animal.* vi. 23, μέγεθος τοῦ σώματος καὶ ἡ ἰσχὺς τῷ θήλει ἀφομοιοῦται (*parall. γίνεται*). In the historic tenses=to liken; see Plat. *Sophist.* 240 A, εἰδωλον—τὸ πρὸς τὰ ληθινὸν ἀφωμοιωμένον ἕτερον; *Tim.* 31 A; *Parmen.* 132 D, καθ' ὅσον αὐτῷ ἀφωμοιώθη; *Rep.* iii. 416 B, ἀντὶ ξυμμάχων εὐμενῶν δεσπόταις ἀγρίοις ἀφομοιωθῶσιν; *Tim.* 46 A. Thus in the few places in biblical Greek; Bar. vi. 71, νεκρῷ ἐρρίμένῳ ἐν σκότει ἀφομοιώνται οἱ θεοὶ αὐτῶν

ξύλινοι κ.τ.λ.; vi. 63, ταῦτα δὲ οὔτε ταῖς εἰδέαις οὔτε ταῖς δυνάμεσιν αὐτῶν ἀφομοιωμένα ἐστίν; vi. 5, εὐλαβήθητε οὖν μὴ καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀφομοιωθέντες τοῖς ἀλλοφύοις ἀφομοιωθῆτε; compare the passive of ὁμοιοῦν, δικαιοῦν. Thus also in Heb. vii. 3, ἀφομοιωμένος; see above.

Εὐπρόσωπέω, not attested in profane Greek, first appearing in ecclesiastical and Byzantine writers, from εὐπρόσωπος, *one who has a fair aspect*, which is not rare in profane Greek, Xen. *Mem.* i. 3. 10; Plato, *Alc.* i. 132 A; *Charm.* 144 D. Suidas = εὐμορφος. Also applied figuratively to word and speech, and here in the contrast between appearance and reality = *making a show*, e.g. Herod. vii. 168. 2, ὑπερκρίναντο μὲν οὕτω εὐπρόσωπα; Dem. xix. 149, λόγους εὐπροσώπους καὶ μύθους. Hence = *to have a fair appearance*, Gal. vi. 12, θέλουσι εὐπροσώπησαι ἐν σαρκί; see σάρξ, and Matt. xxiii. 28; likewise ἀρέσκω.

Ἀφορίζω, to fix limits, e.g. τὸ ὄρος, Ex. xix. 23; Plato, *Crit.* 110 E, καταβαίνειν τοὺς ὄρους . . . πρὸς θαλάττη ἀφορίζοντας τὸν Ἄσωπον. Hence to mark off, to separate, (a) absolutely to separate, divide, cut off something from another, so that it shall be by itself, and not together with the other. Thus often in Plato, Aristotle. Plato, *Hipp. maj.* 298 D, ἀφωρίσατε τοῦ ἡδέος τὸ ταύτη ἡδὺ ἢ λέγετε καλόν. In the LXX. it answers to no Hebrew word in particular; it stands for לָרַב, Hiphil, with the more usual διαστέλλειν, also διαχωρίζειν, διορίζειν = רָבַח, Hiphil, with the usual ἀφαιρῆν; = רָבַח, usually rendered ἀποκλείειν; = רָבַח, Hiphil, with ἐπιβάλλειν, ἀναφέρειν, ἀναιρῆν, and others. Mainly absolute = to separate, to put asunder, for רָבַח, Lev. xiii. 4, 5, 11, 21, 26, 31, 33, 50, 54, xiv. 38, 46; Num. xii. 14, 15. Cf. = לָרַב, Deut. iv. 41; Josh. xvi. 9; Isa. lvi. 3, ἀφορισμῶ ἀφοριεῖ με κύριος ἀπὸ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ; cf. Lev. xiii. 11, ἀφοριεῖ αὐτὸν ὅτι ἀκάθαρτός ἐστιν. So in the N. T. Matt. xiii. 49, τοὺς πονηροὺς ἐκ μέσου τῶν δικαίων; xxv. 32, τὰ πρόβατα ἀπὸ τῶν ἐρίφων. Cf. Acts xix. 9, ὡς δέ τινες ἐσκληρύνοντο καὶ ἠπειθουν κακολογοῦντες . . . ἀποστὰς ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἀφώρισεν τοὺς μαθητάς. In 2 Cor. vi. 17 the middle with pass. aor., ἐξέλθατε ἐκ μέσου αὐτῶν καὶ ἀφορίσθητε, from Isa. lli. 11. Without further description of the place, Gal. ii. 12, ὑπέστελλον καὶ ἀφώριζεν ἑαυτόν; Luke vi. 22, ὅταν ἀφωρίσωσιν ὑμᾶς, syn. ἀποσυναγωγοὺς ποιήσωσιν ὑμᾶς. No other examples of this use occur; the meaning is indicated by the connection, for it follows, καὶ ὀνειδίσωσιν καὶ ἐκβάλωσιν τὸ ὄνομα ὑμῶν ὡς πονηρόν. We must bear in mind Lev. xiii. 11; Isa. lvi. 3, especially לָרַב = διαστέλλειν, 2 Esdr. x. 8, ἀναθεματισθήσεται πᾶσα ἡ ὑπαρξίς αὐτοῦ καὶ αὐτὸς διασταλήσεται ἀπὸ ἐκκλησίας τῆς μετοικίας. Further, ἀφωρισμένον = רָבַח, Lev. xxvii. 21, which elsewhere is = ἀνάθεμα, which see. (b) Relatively, to separate for a definite purpose, so especially τί, τινὰ ἔναντι κυρίου = רָבַח, Hiphil, and τῷ κυρίῳ = רָבַח, both of the so-called *heaving*, הָרַח, Ex. xxix. 24, 26; Lev. x. 15, xiv. 13; Num. xviii. 24; Ezek. xlv. 1, 13, xlvi. 9; cf. Num. viii. 11, ἀφοριεῖ Ἀαρὼν τοὺς Λευίτας ἀπόδομα ἔναντι κυρίου παρὰ τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσρ. Further, Lev. xiii. 11, ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν ὁ ἀφορίσας ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἔθνων εἶναι μοι; compare regarding the

cities of refuge, Deut. iv. 41 (לְעָרֵי בְּרִיחַ) and Josh. xxi. 27, 32, πόλεις ἀφωρισμέναι = בְּרִיחַ. So Acts xiii. 2, ἀφορίσατέ μοι τὸν Βαρνάβαν καὶ Σαῦλον εἰς τὸ ἔργον ὃ προσκέκλημαι αὐτούς; Rom. i. 1, κλητὸς ἀπόστολος ἀφωρισμένος εἰς εὐ. θεοῦ, cf. ver. 5; Gal. i. 15, εὐδόκησεν ὁ ἀφορίσας με ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου καὶ καλέσας . . . ἵνα εὐαγγελίζωμαι κ.τ.λ. Here it is not synon. with ἀγιάζειν, side by side with which it only seldom appears (Ex. xix. 23, xxix. 27), but rather with ἐκλέγεσθαι in its distinctively biblical use, cf. Lev. xiii. 11, and denotes **separation and appointment to special service**, like לְעָרֵי בְּרִיחַ = διαστέλλειν, Num. viii. 14; 1 Chron. xxiii. 13; Ezra viii. 24. Ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου does not designate the place whence, but is a statement of time, like בְּרִיחַ, Judg. xvi. 18; Isa. xlv. 2, xlix. 1, 5; compare Jer. i. 5, πρὸ τοῦ με πλάσαι σε ἐν κοιλίᾳ, with Isa. xlix. 5, ὁ πλάσας με ἐκ κοιλίας, therefore = "ever since I was in my mother's womb."

Ἀποδιορίζω occurs in profane Greek only in Aristotle, *Pol.* iv. 4, with the meaning *to define more exactly*, to determine with reference to each individual, not to divide even to individuals; it answers to διορίζειν in the sense to determine, *discernendo definire*, so that ἀπό makes prominent the holding apart from each other of the several portions or elements, and thus strengthens the διά. Accordingly Hofmann explains Jude 19, οὗτοι εἰσιν οἱ ἀποδιορίζοντες, making the word dependent on the preceding τῶν ἀσεβ., as = "philosophers of ungodliness who make their wickedness the subject of an all-defining mental activity." But the import of ἀποδιορίζειν does not necessitate this forced arrangement of the words (cf. vv. 12, 16). The signification of the word here is in keeping with that of διορίζειν, and there is no reason for limiting it according to the sense which the passage in Aristotle suggests. Ἀποδιορίζειν relates itself to διορίζειν, not only as ἀποδιαιρεῖσθαι, "to distinguish from each other in each division" (διαίρ.), "to make a subdivision," does to διαιρεῖσθαι, but also as ἀποδιαστέλλω, = to separate from one another, does to διαστέλλω. These double compounds with both ἀπό and διά are very rare, and are evidently made to meet a want in expression, and could not strain to this side or to that the established meaning of a word. But διορίζειν occurs quite as often in a different sense from *defining*. Like ἀποδιορ. here without an object (for the addition ἑαυτούς is ever since Lachm. universally rejected), διορίζειν occurs in Josh. xv. 47, ἡ θάλασσα διορίζει = *makes the boundary*; 2 Chron. xxxii. 4, ἐνέφραξε . . . τὸν ποταμὸν τὸν διορίζοντα διὰ τῆς πόλεως = *which makes a division in the city through which it flows*; compare also the translation of the Hebrew מִזְבֵּחַ, probably the building at the back of the temple intended for base, common purposes, by τὸ διόριζον, Ezek. xli. 12 sqq. Now οἱ ἀποδιορίζοντες describes the ἐμπαῖκται in their relation to the church as persons who set on foot divisions, separations (Luther = Rottenmachen, "make factions"), in antithesis with ver. 20, ὑμεῖς δὲ ἐποικοδομοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς τῇ ἀγ. ὑμ. πίστει; compare 2 Pet. ii. 1, ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι οἵτινες παρεισάξουσιν αἰρέσεις ἀπωλείας, and ver. 2; Gal. v. 20; 1 Tim. iv. 1 sqq. The analogy of linguistic usage—and this only, not the use of the word itself, can here be brought forward—does not forbid this

explanation, for any transitive verb may stand without object, provided the conception only which it expresses is to be brought into consideration; compare Eccles. iii. 4, 6, *καιρὸς τοῦ καθελεῖν, καὶ καιρὸς τοῦ οἰκοδομεῖν . . . τοῦ φυλάξαι . . . τοῦ ἐκβαλεῖν*. But an accusative *ἐαυτούς* cannot in this case be admitted, which would give the verb a determinate reference.

Ὁρθός, ἡ, ὄν, **straight**; (I.) erect, upright, in antithesis with prostrate, in combination with *στῆναι, ἰστάναι*; so in the N. T. Acts xiv. 30. Cf. Bar. vi. 27; 1 Esdr. ix. 46; Ezek. i. 7. Hence in contrast, *e.g.*, with overthrown; cf. Bar. vi. 27. Figuratively of stedfastness, good courage, joyous expectation. Thus in biblical Greek only in Micah ii. 3, *οὐ μὴ πορεύητε ὀρθοί* = *הָיִיתֶם יְשָׁרִים*; 4 Macc. vi. 7, *ὀρθὸν εἶχε καὶ ἀκλινῇ τὸν λογισμὸν*.—(II.) **Straight**, in opposition to crooked or bent, *σκολιόν*; compare 1 Kings xx. 11, over against *κυρτός*; hence as to *direction* = **straight on**. (a) Literally, Heb. xii. 13, *τροχῶς ὀρθὰ ποιήσατε*, after Prov. iv. 11; Jer. xxxi. 9, *ὁδός*, with which it is conjoined in Prov. xii. 15, xiv. 12, xvi. 25. Prov. iv. 25, *οἱ ὀφθαλμοί σου ὀρθὰ βλέπωσαν* = *יָשָׁר*, although, as the parallel *δίκαια* shows, the LXX. did not understand it literally in conformity with the Hebrew. (b) Very often figuratively = **upright, true, right, good**, synon. with *ἀληθινός, δίκαιος*, *e.g.* *λόγος, μαρτύς, νόμος, κατὰ τὸ ὀρθὸν δικάζειν, et al.* Thus in the LXX. = *יָשָׁר* (usually rendered *εὐθύς*, rarely *δίκαιος*, occasionally by some other word), also *יָשָׁר, יָשָׁרִים*, Prov. viii. 6, over against *σκολιόν*, ver. 5, xxi. 8; over against *παράνομος*, xi. 6; *δόλιος*, xii. 6; *ἀπαίδευτος*, xv. 15; xvi. 13, *λόγος ὀρθούς*, parallel with *χείλη δίκαια*; cf. Micah ii. 7; Prov. xxiii. 16; Micah iii. 9, *τὰ ὀρθὰ διαστρέφειν*, parallel with *βδελύσσεσθαι κρίμα*. Cf. *ὀρθῶς κρίνειν*, Wisd. vi. 5; *λογίζεσθαι*, vi. 4; *λαλεῖν*, Deut. v. 28, xviii. 17 = *יָשָׁר*; Num. xxvii. 7; Gen. xl. 16; Ex. xviii. 17 = *יָשָׁר*; Gen. iv. 7, *ὁ προσφέρειν*; 1 Macc. xi. 43, *ποιεῖν*; Prov. xiv. 2, *πορεύεσθαι* = *יָשָׁר*; Ezek. xxii. 30, *ἀναστρέφεσθαι*. Not thus in the N. T. nor *ὀρθοῦν* in the LXX. Esth. vii. 9; 2 Esdr. vi. 11; Gen. xxxvii. 7, in a literal sense, as also Ecclus. xxvii. 14; Bar. vi. 27. Figuratively, 1 Esdr. i. 21, *ὀρθώθη τὰ ἔργα Ἰωσίου ἐνώπιον τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοῦ ἐν καρδίᾳ πλήρει εὐσεβείας*.

Ἀνορθόω, to set up, Herod., Xen., Plato, Thuc. *et al.*, and (a) to make a thing stand and last, LXX. = *בָּן*, for instance of the throne of David, 2 Sam. vii. 13, xvi. 26; 1 Chron. xvii. 12, 14, *et al.*; Jer. x. 11, xxxiii. 2; Ps. xx. 9. (b) To make a thing stand again, LXX. = *הָרָג*, Ps. cxlv. 14, cxlvi. 8, *κύριος ἀνορθοῖ πάντας τοὺς κατερραγμένους*; Ecclus. xi. 12, *ἐκ ταπεινώσεως*. So in the N. T. Heb. xii. 12, *τὰ παραλελυμένα γόνατα*; Acts xv. 16, *τὴν σκηνὴν Δαυεὶδ τὴν πεπτωκυῖαν*, parallel with *ἀναστρέφειν*, from Amos ix. 11, where LXX. *ἀνοικοδομεῖν*; passive, Luke xiii. 13, *ἀνορθώθη* for *ἀνωρθώθη*, as often in the LXX., especially in verbs beginning with *ο*, *e.g.* *ὁμοιοῦν, ὁμολογεῖν*. See Buttmann, p. 30; Sturz, p. 124.

Διόρθωσις, εως, ἡ, from *διορθόω*, to bring into the right position, direction, order,

answering to the sense of ὀρθός, either generally into the right direction, Aristotle, *de part. animal.* iv. 9; order, Isocr. iv. 181; hence *to establish firmly*, LXX. Isa. xvi. 5, lxii. 7 = 𐤒𐤓𐤁, *to make right or straight*; ὁδοός, Jer. vii. 2, 4 = 𐤏𐤓𐤁𐤏, Wisd. ix. 18 (διορθώτης, Wisd. vii. 14), or = *to set up again, to re-establish, to set right*, so especially in later Greek, Polyb., Plut., Diod. *et al.*; ἀδικήματα, Polyb. iv. 24. 4 = *to blame, to correct*. The middle oftener than the active. Hence διόρθωσις (a) **right arrangement, right ordering**, Plut. *Legg.* i. 642 A; Polyb. i. 1. 1; thus, however, seldom; usually (b) **restoration, amendment, bringing right again**. Aristot. *Pol.* vi. 8; Polyb. iii. 118. 12, τῶν πολιτευμάτων, also in a moral sense, *e.g.* Polyb. i. 35. 6, where διορθ. is explained as = ἡ ἐπὶ τὸ βέλτιον μετάθεσις; ii. 56. 14, τύπτεσθαι — ἐπὶ διορθώσει καὶ μαθήσει; Diod. i. 75; punishment is described as ἀρίστη διόρθωσις τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων; Joseph. *Ant.* ii. 4. 4, μετάνοια ἐπ' ὁδύνῃ γεννησομένη, οὐκ ἐπὶ διορθώσει τῶν ἁμαρτημένων, here in the moral sense = *delictorum emendatio*; cf. *ibid.* x. 4. 1, τὰ ἁμαρτήματα διορθοῦν συνετῶς; Plut. *Lyc.* xxv. 2, ἐπαινεῖν ἢ ψέγειν εἰς νοθεσίαν καὶ διόρθωσιν; *De rat. aud.* 40 D, πρὸς τινα διόρθωσιν ἢ φυλακὴν τῶν ὁμοίων, *sc.* ἁμαρτημάτων. In biblical Greek only once, Heb. ix. 10, δικαιώματα σαρκὸς μέχρι καιροῦ διορθώσεως ἐπικείμενα, and here, perhaps, answering to the preceding παραβολή . . . τελειῶσαι, ver. 9, in the first sense = *right, right order*, so that it cannot be likened to the expression χρόνοι ἀποκαταστάσεως, Acts iii. 21. The connection only can decide whether διορθ. is to be taken in the first or second meaning. On the other hand, διόρθωμα, which Lachm., Tisch., Treg., Westc. read in Acts xxiv. 3, instead of κατήρθωμα = *amendment, correction*; cf. Aristotle, *Pol.* i. 13; Plut. *Num.* xvii. 4, τὸ περὶ τὸν νόμον διόρθωμα = *correctio legis, amendment of a law*.

Ἐπιδιορθόω, in Tit. i. 5, and borrowed from thence in ecclesiastical Greek, verified only in an inscription, Boeckh. *Inscr.* ii. 409. 9, αἱ δέ τι κα δόξη . . . ἐπιδιορθῶσαι, which supports the active, whereas in Tit. i. 5 the reading wavers between the active and the middle form; Tisch., Treg., Westc. read, ἀπέλιπόν σε ἐν Κρήτῃ ἵνα τὰ λείποντα ἐπιδιορθώσῃ; Lachm. ἐπιδιορθώσης. As both forms of διορθοῦν occur, though the middle is more usual, ἐπιδιορθώσῃ is seemingly to be preferred. Two things help us to decide as to the meaning, namely, the use of ἐπιδιόρθωσις in rhetoric, and the object τὰ λείποντα in Tit. i. 5. This latter points to the meaning *setting right, amending*, because what is wanting is a defect which must be remedied, and not simply a remainder not yet made up; διορθοῦν τὰ λείποντα suggests the thought of a defect as distinguished from τὰ λοιπά; cf. Philo, in *Flacc.* ii. 535. 15, χρηστὰς ὑπογράφεις ἡμῖν ἐλπιδας καὶ περὶ τῆς τῶν λειπομένων ἐπανορθώσεως, where the meaning *reparatio eorum quae nobis desunt* is clear from the connection. The word, moreover, is used by rhetoricians to denote a rhetorical figure in contrast with προδιόρθωσις, whereby the speaker corrects or rectifies (beforehand, προδ., or after) a pointed expression intended or applied by him; compare Herodian. *de figurio* in Walz, *Rhet. Graeci*, viii. 596; *Tiber. ibid.* 535; *Anonym. ibid.* 698.

Accordingly ἐπιδιορθοῦσθαι τὰ λείποντα = to bring to rights again what was defective. The ἐπί by no means refers to what the writer had already done, whereupon what Titus was commissioned to do was to follow, but, as in ἐπαγορθοῦν, to a previous or different, but better condition of the object, to which it was to be restored.

Ὀφείλω, ὀφειλήσω, ὄφελον, Epic ὄφελον, which in this form became a conjunction (= *utinam*, 1 Cor. iv. 8, 2 Cor. xi. 1, Rev. iii. 15 with the preterite indic., Gal. v. 2 with the future indic.) = to owe, to be obliged.—(I.) (a) to owe, primarily to have to pay a money debt, Matt. xviii. 28; Luke vii. 41, xvi. 5, 7; Philem. 18.—LXX. in this sense only Deut. xv. 2; Isa. xxiv. 2; ὁ ὀφείλων, the debtor (Aristotle), Ezek. xviii. 7. In the Apocrypha, 1 Macc. x. 43, xiii. 15, 39. Τὸ ὀφειλόμενον, the debt, Xen., Plato; Matt. xviii. 30, 34. Akin to this (b) the use of the word, very rare in profane Greek, to denote punishment which a man by law and equity owes as a debt to be paid, e.g. δίπλην τὴν βλάβην ὀφείλειν, Lys. i. 32; cf. Plato, *Crat.* 400 C, ἕως ἂν ἐκτίσῃ τὰ ὀφειλόμενα, as parallel to the preceding δίκην δίδοναι. Usually, however, it is the derived ὀφλισκάνω that is thus used. In this sense ὀφείλω is used as signifying to owe, to be in debt to, to be liable to punishment; in the LXX. in the misunderstood passage Prov. xiv. 9, οἰκίαι παρανόμων ὀφειλήσουσι καθαρισμόν, οἰκίαι δὲ δικαίων δεκταί. In the Apocrypha, Wisd. xii. 15, τὸν μὴ ὀφείλοντα κολασθῆναι καταδικάσαι ἀλλότριον ἡγούμενος τῆς σῆς δυνάμεως; 4 Macc. xi. 15, ἀποθνήσκειν ὀφείλομεν; ver. 3, περὶ πλειόνων ἀδικημάτων ὀφειλήσης τῇ οὐρανίῳ δίκῃ τιμωρίαν; Tob. vi. 13, ὀφειλήσει θάνατον κατὰ τὴν κρίσιν τῆς βίβλου Μωσέως. The dat. Wisd. xii. 20, ὀφειλόμενοι θανάτῳ, who are doomed to death (cf. Plut. *Luc.* xxi. 6, Μιθριδάτην ἀπάξων ὀφειλόμενον τοῖς Λουκούλλον θριάμβοις), contains the opposite representation, as does xii. 15, ὀφείλων κολασθῆναι, not they owe death, but they belong to death, they are due to it. In the N. T. John xix. 7, ὀφείλει ἀποθανεῖν. Absolutely, Matt. xxiii. 16, ὃς ἂν ὁμώσει ἐν τῷ ναῷ οὐδὲν ἔστιν ὃς δ' ἂν ὁμώσει ἐν τῷ χρυσῷ τοῦ ναοῦ, ὀφείλει, and in like manner ver. 18, in connection with which may be named ὀφ. τινί, to have a debt standing against some one (through neglect or failure), Luke xi. 4, which is akin to the primary meaning under (a); see Rom. xiii. 8, μηδενὶ μηδὲν ὀφείλετε εἰ μὴ τὸ ἀλλήλους ἀγαπᾶν, compare ver. 7. It is just here that we see clearly the connection of this usage, peculiar to O. T. Greek, and in the N. T. and especially the Gospels (in which, moreover, ὀφείλειν does not occur in the meaning (II.), except in John xiii. 14, Luke xvii. 10), for which there are no analogies in later Greek, with post-biblical Hebrew, wherein one and the same word נָחַץ stands for the positive obligation and for imprisonment for debt; thus נָחַץ signifies both he who is obliged to do something, and he who is guilty or punishable on account of transgression of law; see ὀφείλημα. In the first sense it answers to ὀφείλω (II.), to be under obligation, must, ought, synon. δεῖ, which designates more the necessity; while ὀφ. denotes the personal moral obligation; δεῖ the necessity, the must; ὀφ. what is claimed or demanded, the ought. In the LXX. and Apocrypha not in this sense, but in the N. T. with the present inf.

following, John xiii. 14; Rom. xv. 1; 1 Cor. vii. 36, ix. 10, xi. 7, 10; 2 Cor. xii. 11, 14; Eph. v. 28; 2 Thess. i. 3, ii. 13; Heb. v. 3, 12; 1 John ii. 6, iii. 16, iv. 11; 3 John 8; with aor. infin. Luke xvii. 10; Rom. xv. 27; 1 Cor. v. 10; Heb. ii. 17. With the accus. Rom. xiii. 8, cf. 1 Cor. vii. 3, the reading τῇ γυναικὶ . . . τὴν ὀφειλομένην εὐνοίαν ἀποδιδότω instead of ὀφείλῃν.

Ὀφείλῃ, ἦς, ἥ, only in N. T. Greek (cf. Lobeck, *Phryn.* p. 89 sq.), (a) **debt**, which must be paid, Matt. xviii. 32; (b) **obligation**, a service which one **owes** any one, Rom. xiii. 7; 1 Cor. vii. 3.

Ὀφειλέτης, ου, ό, in profane Greek in Plato, Plutarch, *et al.*, only = **the debtor**, never **the guilty**; in biblical Greek only in the N. T. and in both meanings.—(I.) (a) **The debtor**, Matt. xviii. 24, ὁφ. μυρίων ταλάντων. More generally = *the duty or service which one owes*, with the dative, Rom. i. 14, Ἑλλησι; viii. 12, σαρκί. With the gen. Rom. xv. 27. (b) **The guilty**, Matt. vi. 12, ἀφήκαμεν τοῖς ὀφειλέταις ἡμῶν, those who have wronged us and who are therefore our debtors, owing us satisfaction; see ὀφείλημα; Luke xiii. 4, δοκεῖτε ὅτι αὐτοὶ ὀφείλονται ἐγένοντο παρὰ πάντας ἀνθρ., with reference to a supposed divine punishment that had occurred (the weaker ἀμαρτωλός significantly stands in ver. 2), like מַחֲבִיב, passive part. of חָבַב, denoting not only those legally under obligation to a certain duty, but specially those declared guilty, become guilty and liable to punishment; חָבַב in the Targums signifies those laden with guilt, the wicked as distinguished from the righteous or sinless, נָכַר; thus, for example, the kingdom of this world in Amos ix. 8 is called מַלְכוּתָא חַיִּיבָתָא, the sinful kingdom, and in another place Constantinople קְרָתָא חַיִּיבָתָא, the guilt-burdened city; cf. Levy, *Chald. Wb. über die Targumim*, i. 253; *Neuhebr. u. Chald. Wb. über die Talmudim*, ii. 20, 43. For this we find in profane Greek ὀφλῶν, ὀφληκώς.—(II.) **He who is under obligation**, the obliged in a moral sense, answering to ὀφείλω (II.); Gal. v. 3, μαρτύρομαι παντὶ ἀνθρώπῳ περιτεμνομένῳ ὅτι ὀφειλέτης ἐστὶν ὅλον τὸν νόμον ποιῆσαι. As the subject-matter here, however, is the requirement of the law with reference to sacrifice, the expression perhaps answers to the post-biblical חַיִּב, for this in the Talmud stands for him who on account of some sin committed is bound to offer sacrifice, e.g. חַיִּבִי הָטָאתָ, to bring a sin-offering, כָּל דְּרֵאָתָהּ חַיִּב אֲשַׁכָּח, *quisquis debet, reus est, aut tenetur offerre sacrificium reatus*, Buxtorf, s.v. חֹב. Thus the connection with ver. 4 becomes the more striking, κατηργήθητε ἀπὸ Χυ οἷτινες ἐν νόμῳ δικαιοῦσθε, τῆς χάριτος ἐξέπεσατε. Delitzsch, מְחִיב הוּא לְשֹׁמֵר אֶת-כָּל-הַתּוֹרָה.

Παῖς, δός, ό, child, boy; sometimes also ἡ παῖς, daughter, maiden, often in Homer, elsewhere rarer, Xen., Plut.; cf. Xen. *Cyrop.* iv. 6. 2, ἄπαις εἰμὶ ἀρρένων παίδων. In biblical Greek sometimes, Gen. xxiv. 28, cf. ver. 57, xxxiv. 12; Deut. xxii. 15, 16, 23, 25, 28 = נַעֲרָה. Ruth ii. 6 = נַעֲרָה; Luke viii. 51, 54. (a) With reference to descent, **child, son**, e.g. παίδων παῖδες, *children's children*. Thus very rarely in biblical Greek as = בֶּן, Prov. iv. 1, xx. 7; יָלֵד, 2 Kings ii. 24; Eccles. iv. 13; נַעֲרָה, Prov. xxix. 15; 3 Macc.

v. 49, often in 4 Macc., where also we find the expression οἱ Ἀβραὰμ παῖδες, vi. 17, 22; compare ix. 18, xviii. 1, 23, where the LXX. has υἱοί. In the N. T. only John iv. 51. (b) With reference to age = child, boy, *Od.* xviii. 62, παῖς ἐτ' ἐών. *Xen. Hell.* vii. 5. 15, καὶ παῖδας καὶ γεραιτέρους. *Plat. Conv.* 204 B, δῆλον . . . τοῦτό γε ἤδη καὶ παιδί. *Tim.* 22 B, Ἕλληνες αἰεὶ παῖδές ἐστε, γέρον δὲ Ἕλλην οὐκ ἔστιν. *Lucen., Dial. meretr.* iv. 3, ἄπειρός ἐστι καὶ παῖς ἔτι. Thus as referring to age παῖς is distinguished from υἱός or τέκνον; while τέκνον emphasizes the descent, and υἱός the relationship (see τέκνον), παῖς denotes children as the younger, young people as distinct from old. Hence according to the contrast in which it stands, whether with γέρον or with those grown up, it is used not only of children in childhood, but also as synon. with νεανίας, νεανίσκος, though not so often; e.g. παῖς κόρη, a young maid. In biblical Greek compare ἐκ παιδός, from youth up, *Gen.* xlvi. 35; 2 Macc. vi. 23, xv. 12. In the N. T. = child, boy, *Matt.* ii. 16; Ἰησοῦς ὁ παῖς, *Luke* ii. 43. Further, *Matt.* xvii. 18, xxi. 15; *Luke* ix. 42. Against this it occurs as = young man, *Acts* xx. 12, synon. with νεανίας, ver. 9. Thus in the LXX. = נָעַם, *Gen.* xviii. 7, xxii. 3, 5, 19; *Num.* xxii. 22; 1 Kings xx. 15; *Neh.* vi. 5; *Job* i. 15, 17, xxix. 5; *Prov.* i. 4, xxix. 15, 21; still oftener = παιδάριον, also = παιδίον, νεανίσκος, νέος, and also נָעַם (see above), side by side with νεάνις, παιδίσκη, κοράσιον, παρθένος. Lastly, (c) in connection with the distinction of age (cf. *Xen. Mem.* iii. 16. 6, and נָעַם as = παῖς; but where the relationship of service is not present παιδίον, παιδάριον occurs), and with the subordination which difference of age involves (compare also the superiority in rank expressed in πρεσβύτερος), involving also the duty of obedience, παῖς signifies servant; not often, however, upon the whole in profane Greek, mainly in direct address, παῖ, παῖδες, *Xen. Cyneq.* vi. 18; *Plato, Charn.* 155 A; *Conv.* 212 C; not until later Greek fully synon. with δούλος; *Plut. Alcib.* iv. 5; *De adulat.* 24 (65 C), 31 (70 E), et al. Not in *Thuc.*, *Dem.*, *Aristotle*, *Lucian*. It seems to be a milder expression than δούλος and its synonyms, emphasizing only subordination, whereas δούλος implies bondage and subjection. Now in biblical Greek this is the prevailing use of the word in the LXX., for it occurs as often as δούλος as answering to the Hebrew נָעַם. Hardly any difference can be traced; εἶναι, γίνεσθαι τινι δούλον, εἰς δούλον, is more frequent than παῖδα, εἰς παῖδα, but this last occurs also, e.g. *Gen.* xlvii. 19, 25; 2 Chron. x. 7, xii. 8; *Jer.* xxxiv. 11, 16. That the relation of the παῖς to the master is closer, the distance of δούλος greater, is clear from 2 Sam. xii. 24, πορευθήτω δὴ ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ οἱ παῖδες αὐτοῦ μετὰ τοῦ δούλου σου (compare 1 Sam. xxv. 41), but this only seldom appears. In some books δούλος is prevailingly used (*Samuel*, *Kings*, *Psalms*), in others παῖς (*Genesis*, *Chron.*, *Isaiah*, *Jeremiah*, *Ezekiel*). Thus in particular the expression הָיָה נָעַם is rendered both by δούλος and by παῖς κυρίου, compare *Josh.* i. 1, 7, 13, xii. 6, xiii. 8, xiv. 7, xxii. 2, 4, 5. In 2 Sam. vii. 5 sqq., 1 Kings viii. 23 sqq., we find accordingly δούλος κυρίου; in 1 Chron. xvii. 4 sqq. δούλος κ. and παῖς κ. alternate. In the *Psalms* we have, with few exceptions (xviii. 1, xxxvi. 1, lxix. 18, lxxxvi. 16), δούλος; in *Isaiah*, on the contrary, with few exceptions

(xlviii. 20, xlix. 3, 5, lxiii. 17, lxn. 8), *παῖς κυρίου*, xx. 3, xxii. 20, xli. 8, 9, xlii. 1, xliii. 10, xliv. 1, 2, 21, 26, xlv. 4, xlix. 6, l. 10, lii. 13. In the Apocrypha, where *παῖς* is often = *servant*, *παῖς θεοῦ, κυρίου*, is less frequent than *δοῦλος κυρίου, θεοῦ*, cf. Wisd. ix. 4, 5, xii. 7, 20, xix. 6; Bar. i. 20, ii. 20, 24, 28, iii. 36; 1 Esdr. vi. 27; but, upon the whole, neither expression is frequent.—In the N. T. *παῖς* is = *servant* (oftener indeed than in the sense *child*), Matt. viii. 6, 8, 13, xiv. 2; Luke vii. 7, xii. 45, xv. 26; *παῖς κυρίου*, Luke i. 54; *Ἰσραήλ*, i. 69, and *Δαβὶδ* in Acts iv. 25. In the remaining places it is used of Christ with reference to the O. T. prophecy of the *נְתִיב עֲבָד*, Matt. xii. 18 (from Isa. xlii. 1); Acts iii. 13, 26, iv. 27, 30. But in the other books, especially in the Pauline Epistles, *δοῦλος* is used for the special relation in which the Christian stands to the God of the New Covenant, and in the Revelation for the members of the New Covenant collectively.—*Παιδίσκη* only in the LXX. and N. T. = *maid*; *παιδίον, παιδάριον* in both = *child* or *boy*. Compare Höhne, *Neutest. Sprachgebr.* ii. *υἱός, τέκνον, παῖς*, in Luthardt's *Zeitschrift für kirchl. Wissenschaft*, etc., 1882, p. 57 sqq.

Παιδεύω, originally *to bring up a child*, thus, however, seldom, e.g. Xen. *Rep. Lac.* i. 3; usually *to educate*, of activity directed to the moral and spiritual nurture and training of the child, to influence conscious will and action, *π. τινὰ κακόν, σώφρονα, εἰς, πρὸς ἀρετὴν, τέχνην, et al.* Plat. *Apol.* 24 E, *οἶδε τοὺς νέους παιδεύειν οἱοι τ' εἰσὶ καὶ βελτίους ποιεῖν*. Xen. *Mem.* i. 3. 5, *διαίτη δὲ τὴν ψυχὴν ἐπαιδεύσει καὶ τὸ σῶμα*. With *νοθετεῖν*, Plut. *de aud. poet.* iv. (20 E), also with the acc. of the thing, *π. τὰ προσήκοντα*, Xen. *Mem.* iv. 2. 23; of all influence tending to this goal by means of management, direction, teaching, Xen. *Rep. Lac.* ii. 8, but mainly of intellectual influence; and hence *to instruct, to teach*, synon. with *διδάσκειν*, Plato, *Theag.* 122 E; hence *πεπαιδευμένος* = *cultured*, in antithesis with *ἀπαιδευτος, ἰδιώτης*, especially of philosophers, Plato, *Prot.* 342 E, *et al.* The biblical usage differs very significantly from this. In the sense (I.) of *instruction, culture*, it does not occur at all in the O. T. nor in the Apocrypha. Only in Acts vii. 22, *ἐπαιδεύθη Μωϋσῆς ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ Αἰγυπτίων*; xxii. 3, *παρὰ τοὺς πόδας Γαμαλιὴλ πεπαιδευμένος κατὰ ἀκριβείαν τοῦ πατρῶου νόμου*. Throughout it rather takes its signification (II.) from the Hebrew *יָדַע, יָדַע*, for which the LXX. usually employ it (save in Job iv. 3 = *νοθετεῖν*), answering to the frequent combination of this with *יָדַע* (mostly = *ἐλέγχειν*, Prov. iii. 12 = *παιδεύειν*), as = *to educate in the right way, to exercise discipline, to chastise*, a sense quite foreign to profane Greek, and having reference to the moral and religious life in an ethico-religious sense and purpose; thus, except in the Apocrypha, it rarely means *instruction by word and teaching*, but denotes *influence brought to bear by act* = *to chastise*. Only in the Apocrypha, specially in Ecclus., it is = *to instruct*; see also *παιδεία*. (a) *To admonish*, Deut. iv. 36, *ἐκ τοῦ οὐρ. ἐγένετο ἡ φωνὴ αὐτοῦ παιδεύσαι σε*. Parallel with *διδάσκειν*, Ps. xciv. 10, *ὁ παιδεύων ἔθνη οὐχὶ ἐλέγξει, ὁ διδάσκων ἄνθρωπον γνῶσιν*; ver. 12, *μακάριος ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὃν ἂν σὺ παιδεύῃς κύριε καὶ ἐκ τοῦ νόμου σου διδάξῃς αὐτόν*. For it always concerns an *ἀποστρέφειν* or *ἐπιστρέφειν*.

Ezek. xxiii. 48 ; Jer. xxxi. 18 ; Ecclus. xviii. 12 ; cf. Prov. xxix. 19, λόγους οὐ παιδευθήσεται οἰκέτης σκληρός. Thus, according to Prov. ix. 7, παιδεία befits not the κακός but the σοφός; for the κακὸς τιμωρία is appropriate. While in Ecclus. and Wisdom παιδεία has the signification *admonition*, as limited to *ethico-religious instruction*, παιδεύειν hardly ever loses its reference to that which this instruction is intended to rebuke. Only in the perfect, future, and aorist passive this reference here and there disappears, yet without vanishing altogether. Thus Ecclus. xl. 29, ἀνὴρ ἐπιστήμων καὶ πεπαιδευμένος φυλάσσεται ; vi. 31, ἐὰν θέλῃς παιδευθῇς ; xxi. 12, 23, ἀνὴρ πεπ., as contrasted with ἄφρων ; xxvi. 14, οὐκ ἔστιν ἀντάλλαγμα ; Tob. iv. 14, ἴσθι πεπαιδευμένος ἐν πάσῃ ἀναστροφῇ σου ; Wisd. vi. 26 ; cf., however, xxi. 15, ἄνθρωπος συνεπιζόμενος λόγοις ὀνειδισμού ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἡμέραις αὐτοῦ οὐ μὴ παιδευθῇ ; xxxi. 9, ἀνὴρ πεπαιδευμένος ἔγνω πολλά, καὶ ὁ πολὺπειρος ἐκδιηγῆσεται σύνεσιν ; xxxiv. 19, xlii. 8 ; cf. Ps. ii. 10, 11. In most cases it is (δ) = **to chasten**, parall. with ἐλέγχειν, Ps. vi. 2, xxxviii. 1, μὴ τῷ θυμῷ ἐλέγξης με, μηδὲ τῇ ὀργῇ σου παιδεύσης με ; xciv. 10, xxxix. 12, ἐν ἐλεγμοῖς ὑπὲρ ἀνομίας ἐπαίδευσας ἄνθρωπον ; Prov. ix. 7 ; Jer. ii. 19, and indeed usually of chastisement by means of divine judgments, Lev. xxvi. 18, ἐὰν ἕως τούτου μὴ ὑπακούσητέ μου, καὶ προσθήσω τοῦ παιδεύσαι ὑμᾶς ἐπτάκις ἐπὶ ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ὑμῶν ; vv. 24, 28 ; Isa. xxviii. 26 ; Jer. vi. 8 ; Hos. vii. 12 ; Ezek. xxiii. 48 ; Jer. xxxi. 18, whose design, answering to the import of God's judgment (see κρίνειν, κρίσις), is not ruin, but salvation ; Jer. x. 24, παιδεύσον ἡμᾶς κύριε, πλὴν ἐν κρίσει καὶ μὴ ἐν θυμῷ ; xxx. 11, παιδεύσω σε ἐν κρίσει, רַעַיָה ; Jer. xlv. 28, εἰς κρίμα ; Ps. cxviii. 18, παιδεύων ἐπαίδευσέ με ὁ κύριος καὶ τῷ θανάτῳ οὐ παρέδωκέ με ; Wisd. xi. 9, ὅτε γὰρ ἐπειράσθησαν καί περ ἐν ἐλέει παιδευόμενοι ἔγνωσαν πῶς μετ' ὀργῆς κρινόμενοι ἀσεβεῖς ἐβασανίζοντο, cf. ver. 10 ; iii. 5, xii. 22, ἡμᾶς οὖν παιδεύων τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ἡμῶν ἐν μυριότητι μαστιγοῖς, ἵνα σου τὴν ἀγαθότητα μεριμνῶμεν κρίνοντας, κρινόμενοι δὲ προσδοκῶμεν ἔλεος. Even so 2 Macc. vi. 16. Hence in the N. T. 1 Cor. xi. 32, κρινόμενοι δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου παιδευόμεθα ἵνα μὴ σὺν τῷ κόσμῳ κατακριθῶμεν. Everywhere here παιδεύειν is = **to chastise**, as distinct from *to punish*, therefore = **to exercise correction** ; the conception of chastisement in relation to nurture, and in distinction from punishment, has grown out of this biblical παιδεύειν, for it of necessity affects him who is to be taught, making him πεπαιδευμένος, δουλεύων τῷ κυρίῳ. Hence also of *human training by means of chastisement*, Prov. xix. 18, παίδευε υἱόν σου ; xxix. 17 ; Ecclus. vii. 23, παίδευσον τὰ τέκνα, κάμψον ἐκ νεότητος τὸν τράχηλον αὐτῶν, compare Jer. xvii. 23 ; Ecclus. xxx. 2, 12, 13. Cataphorically in the sense of *μαστιγοῦν*, 1 Kings xiii. 11, 14 ; 2 Chron. x. 11 ; cf. Deut. xxi. 18, xxii. 18.

In the N. T., apart from the passage already cited, 1 Cor. xi. 32, in the same sense of *chastisement in order to training*, Heb. xii. 6, ὃν γὰρ ἀγαπᾷ Κύριος παιδεύει ; vv. 7, 10 ; Rev. iii. 19, ὅσους ἂν φιλῶ ἐλέγχω καὶ παιδεύω. So likewise in the Pastoral Epistles, except that in 2 Tim. ii. 25, ἐν πραΰτητι παιδεύοντα τοὺς ἀντιδιατιθεμένους, μὴποτε δόξῃ αὐτοῖς ὁ θεὸς μετάνοιαν εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας ; Tit. ii. 12, ἡ χάρις . . . παιδεύουσα ἡμᾶς ἵνα ἀρνησάμενοι . . . σωφρόνως καὶ δικαίως καὶ εὐσεβῶς ζήσωμεν,

it denotes *pastoral instruction* (not only *admonition*, cf. Ps. xvi. 7); on the other hand, in 1 Tim. i. 20, οὗς παρέδωκα τῷ σατανᾷ ἵνα παιδευθῶσιν μὴ βλασφημεῖν (compare 1 Cor. v. 5), it signifies *divine chastisement*. In a non-religious sense as synonym with *μαστιγοῦν*, Luke xxiii. 16, 22 (cf. John xix. 1). 2 Cor. vi. 9, ὡς παιδευόμενοι καὶ μὴ θανατούμενοι, as in 1 Kings xii. 11, 14; 2 Chron. x. 11. Παιδεύειν can only be understood in an ethico-religious sense of chastisement in order to education, if viewed with reference to the influence which divine truth, *i.e.* revealed religion, brings wherever it is taught or preached.

Παιδεία, *as, ἡ*, actively, education, instruction, teaching, culture; then passively both the sphere of instruction as a whole and the culture obtained, with the limitations pointed out under *παιδεύειν*. In biblical Greek, on the other hand, it answers to the biblical use of *παιδεύειν*, yet differing in so far as in the Apocrypha the element of chastisement in order to training lies in *παιδεία* more in the background than in *παιδεύειν*. Yet even when it denotes the habitus of the *πεπαιδευμένος*, or that which is presented as instruction, it will not bear any rendering but *discipline*, standing as it always does in the ethico-religious sense. (*a*) Actively, **discipline**, both **admonition** and **chastisement**; in the LXX. usually = רִּצְוָה, which only occasionally is rendered by *νουθέτημα*, *διδασκαλία*, *νόμος*, *σοφία* (also *ὑπήκοος*, *παιδευτής*, *παιδεύειν*). It never signifies *instruction* simply, not even in Ecclus. i. 27, παιδείαν συνέσεως καὶ ἐπιστήμης ἐχάραξα ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τούτῳ, for it is at the same time intended for the ἀπαιδευτοί, li. 23; see ἀπαιδευτος. It is parallel with ἔλεγχος, Prov. xii. 1, ὁ ἀγαπῶν παιδείαν . . . ὁ μισῶν ἐλέγχους; Prov. xv. 10; cf. xiii. 19, xv. 5, 32, iii. 11, μὴ ὀλιγώρει παιδείας κυρίου μηδὲ ἐκλύου ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἐλεγχόμενος; v. 12, vi. 23, xxii. 15, ῥάβδος καὶ παιδεία, as in Ecclus. xxx. 33; Job xx. 3, π. ἐντροπῆς μου; Deut. xi. 2; Ps. l. 17; Prov. xv. 5. Hence with θλίψις, Isa. xxvi. 16, ἐν θλίψει μικρᾷ ἡ παιδεία σου ἡμῖν. Compare Jer. v. 3; Prov. xxiv. 32, ὕστερον ἐγὼ μετενόησα, ἐπέβλεψα τοῦ ἐκλέξασθαι παιδείαν. This meaning is so pervading that even Isa. liii. 5 is not otherwise to be explained, παιδεία εἰρήνης ἡμῶν ἐπ' αὐτόν. From the Apocrypha (especially Ecclus. and Wisdom) compare Ecclus. xxii. 6, μάστιγες καὶ παιδεία; xxiii. 2, li. 26, τὸν τράχηλον ὑμῶν ὑπόθετε ὑπὸ ζυγὸν καὶ ἐπιδεξάσθω ἡ ψυχὴ ὑμῶν παιδείαν; xlii. 5, μὴ αἰσχυνθῆς περὶ παιδείας τέκνων πολλῆς; compare xviii. 13 with ver. 12, xxxv. 14 with ver. 17. The combinations with δέχεσθαι, ἐκδέχεσθαι, λαμβάνειν, ἐκλέγεσθαι, μισεῖν παιδείαν, *et al.*, are = *to receive admonition or correction, to love reproof, etc.*, Prov. iii. 11, iv. 1, 13, v. 12, viii. 10, 13, xii. 1, xv. 5, 32, xix. 20, 27, xxiii. 23, xxiv. 32; Jer. ii. 30, v. 3, vii. 28, xvii. 23, xxxii. 33, xxxv. 13; Zeph. iii. 3, 8. With φόβος τοῦ κυρίου, Zeph. iii. 8; Ecclus. xxxv. 14. The design is αἴσθησις, γνῶσις, μετάνοια, Prov. xii. 1, viii. 10, xxiv. 32; cf. Jer. xvii. 23, ἐσκήρυναν τοῦ μὴ δέξασθαι παιδείαν; Ecclus. xxiii. 2, 3. If the correction be an actual chastisement, we have 2 Macc. vi. 12, λογίζεσθαι τὰς τιμωρίας μὴ πρὸς ὀλεθρὸν ἀλλὰ πρὸς παιδείαν τοῦ γένους ἡμῶν εἶναι;

vii. 33, εἰ δὲ χάριν ἐπιπλήξεως καὶ παιδείας ὁ ζῶν κύριος ἡμῶν βραχέως ἐπ' ὀργισται καὶ πάλιν καταλλαγήσεται τοῖς ἐαυτοῦ δούλοις. Accordingly in the N. T. Heb. xii. 5, 7, 8, 11, of chastisement; Eph. vi. 4 and 2 Tim. iii. 16 = *correction*—these are the only passages in the N. T. In the Apocrypha it occurs also (*b*) passively, both of that wherein or for which the chastisement is inflicted, and of the *habitus* of the πεπαιδευμένος. The former, Ecclus. xxi. 19, πέδαι ἐν ποσὶν ἀνοήτου παιδεία. Ver. 21, ὡς κόσμος χρυσοῦ φρονίμῳ παιδεία; ix. 1, μὴ διδάξης ἐπὶ σεαυτὸν παιδείαν πονηράν. The latter, Ecclus. i. 14, σοφία καὶ παιδεία φόβος κυρίου, viii. 10, μανθάνειν π.; Wisd. i. 5, ἄγιον πνεῦμα παιδείας φεύξεται δόλον κ.τ.λ.; compare ii. 12, iii. 11.

Παιδευτής, οὗ, ὁ, instructor, teacher. Plut. *Lyc.* xii. 4, ἐλευθερίας; *Camill.* x. 3, π. καὶ διδάσκαλος. Often in Plato. Rare in biblical Greek; Ecclus. xxxvii. 19, ἀνὴρ πανούργος πολλῶν παιδευτής. In the few remaining places, answering to the biblical παιδεύειν in an ethico-religious sense, 4 Macc. ix. 6, and = *the corrected, the chastised*, Hos. v. 2 (= 7912). Heb. xii. 9, πατέρας εἶχομεν παιδευτάς; Rom. ii. 20, π. ἀφρόνων, διδάσκαλον νηπίων, where παιδευτής and διδάσκαλος are distinguished, as are ἄφρ. and νήπ.

Ἀπαίδευτος, ον, uncultured, uninstructed, Xen., Plato, Dem. *et al.* In the LXX. in an ethico-religious sense, perhaps = *unchastened, one who has received or receives no chastisement*, Prov. xvii. 22, υἱὸς ἀπ. = 722; xv. 13, οὐκ ἀγαπήσει ἀπαίδευτος τοὺς ἐλέγχοντας = 727; v. 23, viii. 5, xxiv. 8. Compare ἀπαιδευσία, Hos. vii. 15. In like manner, Ecclus. xxii. 3, αἰσχύνῃ πατὴρ ἐν γεννήσει ἀπαιδευτού; Wisd. xvii. 1, αἱ κρίσεις σου δυσδιήγητοι, διὰ τοῦτο ἀπαιδ. ψυχὰι ἐπλανήθησαν; Ecclus. vi. 19, viii. 4, x. 3, xx. 18, 23, li. 23. Cf. ἀπαιδευσία, Ecclus. iv. 25, xxi. 24; cf. ver. 22 sq., xxiii. 13. In the N. T. only in 2 Tim. ii. 23, τὰς δὲ μωρὰς καὶ ἀπαιδευτοὺς ζητήσεις παραιτοῦ, εἰδὼς ὅτι γεννώσιν μάχας. Seldom in such combinations, *e.g.* γνώμη ἐκμελῆς καὶ ἀπ., in Xen.; ἀπ. τροφή, Plato, *Tim.* 86 E; ῥήμα ἀπ., *Phaedr.* 269 B. The ζητήσεις here are questionings of persons not influenced by παιδεία,—here in view of the ethico-religious design,—not subject to holy, religious chastening, hence *unchastened*.

Παιδαγωγός, οὗ, ὁ, primarily the slave who conducted the boys from home to the gymnasium, then teacher, educator, whose task was παιδεία, and was in the position of one not free; so that, *e.g.*, the philosopher was διδάσκαλος, but not παιδαγωγός; whereas the παιδαγωγός might be also διδάσκαλος. In biblical Greek only used by Paul, Gal. iii. 24, ὁ νόμος παιδαγωγὸς ἡμῶν εἰς Χρ., where the εἰς suggests the primary idea of the word; cf. Plut. *Num.* xv. 1, παιδαγωγία πρὸς τὸν θεῖον. Answering to the biblical use of παιδεύειν, παιδεία, and in keeping with the Pauline view of the import and action of the law, Luther's translation, "Zuchtmeister," is most appropriate. Answering to this likewise is ver. 25, ἐλθούσης δὲ τῆς πίστεως οὐκέτι ὑπὸ παιδαγωγόν ἐσμεν (cf. iv. 2). Also in 1 Cor. iv. 15, εἰς γὰρ μυρίους παιδαγωγοὺς ἔχῃτε ἐν Χρ.,

ἀλλ' οὐ πολλοὺς πατέρας κ.τ.λ., this meaning must be retained; compare ver. 14, οὐκ ἐντρέπων ὑμᾶς γράφω ταῦτα, ἀλλ' ὡς τέκνα μου ἀγαπητὰ νουθετῶν. Cf. Plut. *Lycurg.* xvii. 1, προσεῖχον οἱ πρεσβύτεροι . . . οὐ παρέργως ἀλλὰ τρόπον τινὰ πάντες οἰόμενοι πάντων καὶ πατέρες εἶναι καὶ παιδαγωγοὶ καὶ ἄρχοντες, ὥστε μήτε καιρὸν ἀπολείπεσθαι, μήτε χωρίον ἔρημον τοῦ νουθετοῦντος τὸν ἁμαρτάνοντα καὶ κολάζοντος.

Πάλαι signifies the past in contrast with the present = in the past, long ago, of olden time, formerly, also *much longer ago*, in distinction from what has just occurred or just appeared. Thus it stands in antithesis with νῦν, Plato, *Theaet.* 239 B; *Phil.* 15 D; *Tim.* 19 D; also with ἄρτι, Plato, *Theaet.* 142 A; Xen. *Anab.* iv. 5. 5, οἱ ὀφεί προσιόντες . . . οἱ πάλαι ἦκοντες. Seldom in biblical Greek. We must note the distinction between what is over and gone, past away long or longer ago, and what has already now for a long or longer time been in existence. (a) Of yore, in former times, what is past and lies behind. Heb. i. 1, πάλαι ὁ θεὸς λαλήσας τοῖς πατράσιν ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων ἐλάλ. ἡμῖν; 2 Pet. i. 9, λήθην λαβὼν τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ τῶν πάλαι αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτημάτων, differing from τὰ προγεγονότα ἄμ., Rom. iii. 25, in that the ἄμ. are designated πάλαι, not as having taken place in the past, but as belonging to a past which, in consequence of the καθαρισμοῦ, is over and gone. Wisd. xii. 27, xi. 14. Also of *what is past*, not indeed long ago, but nevertheless already past = *now for some time*, Mark xv. 44, εἰ πάλαι ἀπέθανεν (Lachm., Treg., Westc. ἤδη). (b) *This great while, now for a long while*, of what is not over, but of long standing. Thus Add. Esther ii. 7, οἱ πάλαι καὶ νῦν δυσμενεῖς; Xen. *Anab.* iv. 5. 5, οἱ πάλαι ἦκοντες; 3 Macc. iv. 1, τῆς προκατεσκιρρωμένης αὐτοῖς πάλαι κατὰ διάνοιαν, μετὰ παρρήσιας νῦν ἐκφαινομένης ἀπεχθείας. So Jude 4, οἱ πάλαι προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα. Here we must also include Isa. xxxvii. 26, οὐ ταῦτα ἤκουσας πάλαι, ἃ ἐγὼ ἐποίησα; Matt. xi. 21 and Luke x. 13, πάλαι ἂν μετενόησαν; Plat. *Rep.* vi. 506 B, ἦσθα καὶ πάλαι καταφανὴς ὅτι κ.τ.λ.; i. 336 B, τίς ὑμᾶς πάλαι φλυαρία ἔχει;

Παλαιός, ἄ, ὄν, old, both of what had been formerly, and of what is of long standing. (a) What was formerly, what belongs to the past, what had been in times of yore; so especially of men who lived in former times, οἱ παλαιοί, the ancients, Homer, Plato, Plutarch, *et al.* Plato, *Crat.* 418 B, οἱ παλαιοὶ οἱ ἡμέτεροι; cf. Xen. *Mem.* iii. 5. 9, οἱ παλαιότατοι πρόγονοι. *Cyrop.* v. 5. 8, οἱ πάλαι πρόγονοι. Plato, *Legg.* viii. 848 D, οἱ πάλαι ἄνθρ. Thus Wisd. xii. 3, τοὺς παλαιούς οἰκήτορας τῆς ἀγίας σου γῆς μισήσας; 2 Macc. vi. 21, οἱ παλαιοὶ χρόνοι. Thus for the most part in the N. T. 2 Cor. iii. 14, ἡ παλαιὰ διαθήκη. As, however, διαθήκη here is used of the Scriptures of the old covenant (ἐπὶ τῇ ἀναγνώσει τῆς π. δ.), it is rather to be compared with the λόγοι παλαιοί, of myths having their origin in ancient times, Xen. *Cyneg.* xiii. 17; παλαιὸς λόγος, Plato, *Phaed.* 70 C, and often, and therefore to be ranked under (b). (b) What is of long duration, old in years, etc.; of long standing, in antithesis both with καινός and νέος, which see. Thus for the most part in profane Greek, always in the

LXX. and N. T., with *ίμάτιον, σάκκος, ἄσκος, οἶνος, et al.* Lev. xxv. 22, xxvi. 10; Josh. ix. 4, 5; Jer. xxxviii. 11; Matt. ix. 16, 17; Mark ii. 21, 22; Luke v. 36, 37, 39; 1 Cor. v. 7, 8; 1 John ii. 7, *ἐντολὴ παλ. ἣν εἶχετε ἀπ' ἀρχῆς*. Cf. Plato, *Legg.* i. 636 B, π. νόμιμον; ii. 659 B, ὁ π. νόμος; *Lys.* vi. 51, κατὰ τὸ νόμιμον τὸ παλαιὸν καὶ ἀρχαῖον. So also 2 Cor. iii. 14; cf. Heb. viii. 13.—Matt. xiii. 52. Predicated of persons, it affirms what they are or have been from of old, or for long; thus of God, Dan. vii. 9, 13, 22, ὁ παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν (= P¹Π²); compare πεπαλαιωμένος ἡμερῶν, Susannah 52; and for the thing meant, Deut. xxxii. 17, θεοὶ καινοὶ καὶ πρόσφατοι οὓς οὐκ ᾔδεισαν οἱ πατέρες; Ps. lv. 20, ὁ ὑπάρχων πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων. (Cf. on the other hand, Plato, *Phaedr.* 274 C, οἱ παλαιοὶ θεοί, *the gods of old.*) Of men, e.g. φίλος, ξείνος, of one who has been so of old. Thus in the Pauline Epistles, ὁ παλαιὸς ἄνθρ., in antithesis with καινός, Rom. vi. 6; Eph. iv. 22; νέος ἀνακαινούμενος, Col. iii. 9; still here a reference to the past cannot be directly denied. The expression denotes what we (ὁ π. ἡμῶν ἄνθρ., Rom. vi. 6) formerly were, as distinct from our state of salvation wrought by Christ and appropriated in baptism, and what we had been or are said to have been, which belongs, or is said to belong, to the past. The phrase, apart from the presuppositions which the Gospel presents, would be understood, though only approximately, by the Greek, in spite of its strangeness, in connection with the idea of *παλιγγενεσία*, which see; see also *ἄνθρωπος*.

Παλαιότης, τος, ἡ, age, antiquity, length of time, existing a long time, Plato, Aeschines, Dio Cassius; but, upon the whole, very seldom. In biblical Greek only in Rom. vii. 6, *δουλεύειν ἐν καινότητι πνεύματος καὶ οὐ παλαιότητι γράμματος*. As πνεῦμα comes in the place of γράμμα, the latter in relation thereto is something belonging to the past, and if made much of, has no longer any right to be so, because it belongs to a time now past and gone. Compare Heb. viii. 13.

Παλαιόω, to make old; passive, to become old; with both the meanings of παλαιός. The active, as it seems, only in the LXX. (a) To make something obsolete, to cause that it shall belong or be condemned to the past. Thus LXX. = ρηγ, Kal and Hiphil; the latter = active, the former = passive. Job ix. 5, ὁ παλαιῶν ὄρη, parallel with καταστρέφων αὐτά (= ρηγ, Hiph.), therefore = *he makes the mountains something past, things that have been*. In like manner, xxxii. 15, ἐπαλαίωσαν λόγους, *they have ceased to speak*; xiv. 18, ὄρος πίπτειν πεσεῖται καὶ πέτρα παλαιωθήσεται ἐκ τοῦ τόπου αὐτῆς. But especially = *hēb*, to decay, to vanish away; παλαιῶσθαι = to pass away, to wax old; thus of clothes, shoes, but also of persons. Active, Lam. iii. 4, ἐπαλαίωσεν σάρκα μου καὶ δέρμα μου, ὅστᾳ μου συνέτριψεν; Isa. lxxv. 22, τὰ γὰρ ἔργα τῶν πόνων αὐτῶν παλαιώσουσιν οἱ ἐκλεκτοί μου = to use, to consume. Pass., Deut. xxix. 5; Josh. ix. 5, 13; Neh. ix. 21; Ps. cii. 27; Isa. li. 6; Ex. xlvii. 13; Ps. xlix. 15, ἡ βοήθεια αὐτῶν παλαιωθήσεται ἐν τῷ ᾄδει; Ps. xxxii. 3, ἐπαλαιώθη τὰ ὅστᾳ μου. Of persons, Job xiii. 28; Isa. l. 9; Ps. xviii. 46. Cf. Ecclus. xiv. 17, πᾶσα σὰρξ ὡς ἱμάτιον παλαιούται ἡ γὰρ

διαθήκη ἀπ' αἰῶνος Θανάτῳ ἀποθανῆ; Bar. iii. 10, ἐπαλαιώθης ἐν γῇ ἀλλοτρία . . . προσσελογίσθης μετὰ τῶν εἰς ἄδου; Plat. *Conv.* 208 B, τῷ τὸ ἀπιδὺν καὶ παλαιούμενον ἕτερον νέον ἐγκαταλείπειν, as opposed to τῷ παντάπασιν τὸ αὐτὸ αἰεὶ εἶναι; *Tim.* 59 C; Plut. *cur Pythia*, iv. (396 B), ὑφ' ἑαυτοῦ παλαιούμενος ὁ χαλκὸς ἀποπνεῖ καὶ μεθήσιν τὸν ἰόν.—So in the N. T. Luke xii. 33, βαλλάντια μὴ παλαιούμενα; Heb. i. 11 from Ps. cii. 27. (b) To make old; thus the active, Heb. viii. 13, ἐν τῷ λέγειν καινὴν πεπαλαίωκεν τὴν πρώτην, he has made old, what is not yet consigned to the past, but soon must be. Passive, to become old; of what has long been in existence. So often in Plut. οἶνος παλαιούμενος, παλαιούται. *De puer. educ.* viii. (5 E), μόνος γὰρ ὁ νοῦς παλαιούμενος ἀνηβᾷ καὶ ὁ χρόνος τᾶλλα παντ' ἀφαιρῶν τῷ γήρᾳ προστίθῃσι τὴν ἐπιστήμην. So in the LXX. = *ryn*, Job xxi. 7, ἀσεβεῖς ζῶσι, πεπαλαίωνται καὶ ἐν πλούτῳ; Lev. xiii. 10, λέπρα παλαιουμένη = *ṣā*, Niph.; *Ecclus.* ix. 10, xi. 20; *Susannah* 52. For Heb. viii. 13, τὸ δὲ παλαιούμενον καὶ γηράσκον ἐγγὺς ἀφανισμοῦ, cf. Plut. *Conv. disp.* vii. 3. 4 (702 C), τὸ δὲ (*sc.* ἔλαιον) οὐκ ἔχον διαπνοὴν . . . ταχὺ παλαιούται καὶ ἀπογηράσκει, whence it is evident that γηράσκον is not the predicate, but strengthens παλ., while ἐγγὺς ἀφ. is not in apposition, but is a predicate (against Hofmann *in loc.*) = "what is old and antiquated is nigh unto vanishing away."

Πάσχω, ἔπαθον, πείσομαι, πέπονθα (cf. *πένθος*), the opposite of free action = *to bear oneself passively towards some influence from without*, and hence both εὖ πάσχειν and κακῶς πάσχειν, though πάσχειν without any addition always stands in a bad sense; see Passow. Hence = *to experience something evil, to suffer*. Seldom in the LXX.; only Ezek. xvi. 5; Amos vi. 6; *Esth.* ix. 26. Oftener in the Apocrypha.—(I.) (a) To experience something; thus only once in biblical Greek, Gal. iii. 4, τοσαῦτα ἐπάθετε εἰκῇ, where the connection forbids us to think of suffering; compare οὖν, ver. 5. Plut. *adv. Colot.* vii. (1110 D), τοῖς γὰρ οὕτως πάσχουσιν ἔσται τοιούτου (*sc.* χρώμα λευκόν), οὐκ ἔσται δὲ τοῖς μὴ πάσχουσι. Cf. Kypke, *observ. sacr.* ii. 277, who further refers to Joseph. *Ant.* iii. 15. 1, ὑπομνήσαι μὲν ὅσα παθόντες ἐξ αὐτοῦ καὶ πηλίκων εὐεργεσιῶν μεταλαβόντες ἀχάριστοι πρὸς αὐτὸν γένοιντο. Dion. Hal. vii. 51, ταύτας ὑμῖν ὁ δῆμος, ὃ βουλή, τὰς καλὰς ἀμοιβὰς, ἀνθ' ὧν ἔπαθε πολλῶν ὄντων καὶ μεγάλων . . . ἀπέδωκεν. In all other places (b) to suffer something; to experience evil, with the accus. of the object, οὐδὲν κακόν, Acts xxviii. 5; παθήματα, 2 Cor. i. 6; ὀλίγον, 1 Pet. v. 10; πολλά, Matt. xvi. 21, xxvii. 19; Mark v. 26, viii. 31, ix. 12; Luke ix. 22, xvii. 25; τοιαῦτα, Luke xiii. 2; ταῦτα, Luke xxiv. 26; 2 Tim. i. 12; ὅσα, Acts ix. 16; cf. Rev. ii. 11; Heb. v. 8; 1 Thess. ii. 14. But mostly without object = *to suffer*; once κακῶς πάσχειν, Matt. xvii. 15, Lachm. ἔχει (compare Treg., Westc.); οὕτως, Luke xxiv. 46; ἀδίκως, 1 Pet. ii. 19; elsewhere without these modifications, Matt. xvii. 12; Luke xxii. 15; Acts i. 3, iii. 18, xvii. 3; 1 Cor. xii. 26; Heb. ix. 26, xiii. 12; 1 Pet. ii. 20, 23, iii. 17, iv. 1, 15, 19. The cause or occasion is expressed by *διὰ τι*, *διὰ τινα*, Matt. xxvii. 19; 2 Tim. i. 12; 1 Pet. iii. 14; compare 2 Macc. vi. 30, vii. 18, 32; 4 Macc. x. 10;

Esth. ix. 26; 4 Macc. ix. 8, x. 10; *περί τινος*, 1 Pet. iii. 18; in the N. T. mostly *ὑπέρ τινος*, Acts ix. 16, *ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματός μου*; Phil. i. 29, *ὑπὲρ Χυ*; 2 Thess. i. 5, *ὑπὲρ τῆς βασ. τ. θ.*; of Christ's sufferings for us, 1 Pet. ii. 21, iv. 10, *ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν*; iii. 18, *περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν ἔπαθεν δίκαιος ὑπὲρ ἀδίκων* (Lachm., Tisch., Treg., Westc. *ἀπέθανεν* for *ἔπαθεν*). —(II.) Of sensations, impulses, emotions, feelings arising out of impressions from without, in Plato, Thuc. *et al.* Thus Ezek. xvi. 5, *τοῦ παθεῖν τι ἐπὶ σοι* = *ἔπαθον*, and Amos vi. 6, *οὐκ ἔπασχον οὐδὲν ἐπὶ τῇ συντριβῇ Ἰωσήφ* = *ἔπαθον*, Niphāl (in Plato, *πρὸς τινα*, *e.g. Eryx.* 399 C; *Gorg.* 485 A).

Παθητός, ἡ, ὄν, only in later Greek; often in Plut. and usually as opposed to *ἀπαθής* and combined with *θνητός* = subject to impressions or sufferings; thus Plut. *De anim. procreat.* xxvii. (1026 D), *θνητὴ καὶ περὶ τὰ σώματα παθητὴ μέρος τῆς ψυχῆς*. *Amator.* xix. (765 B), *θνητὰ παθητά*. *Pelop.* xvi. 5, *Ἡρακλῆς καὶ Διόνυσος ἐκ μεταβολῆς ἀρετῇ τὸ θνητὸν καὶ παθητὸν ἀποβαλόντες*. *Num.* viii. 7. Very occasionally it seems to denote the bare possibility or susceptibility, *e.g.* Plut. *Plac. phil.* ii. 7 (887 D); *coll.* Sext. Emp. *adv. math.* x. 311. (Cicero, *De nat. deorum*, iii. 12, *π. φύσις, patibilis natura, susceptibility*.) Acts xxvi. 23, *εἰ παθητὸς ὁ Χς*, *εἰ πρῶτος ἐξ ἀναστάσεως κ.τ.λ.*, corresponding with the union of the word with *θνητός* in Plutarch. Often in Justin Martyr, *Dial. c. Tryph.* xxxvi. 39. 68, *αἱ γραφαὶ τὸν Χν καὶ παθητὸν καὶ προσκυνητὸν καὶ θεὸν ἀποδεικνύουσιν, et al.* Ign. *ad Polyc.* iii. 2, *τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς παθητόν, τὸν κατὰ πάντα τρόπον δι' ἡμᾶς ὑπομείναντα*. *Ad Eph.* vii. 2, opposed to *ἀπαθής*.

Πάθημα, τὸ. (I.) Suffering, what is suffered or borne, mostly in the plural; in biblical Greek only in the N. T.; the sing. only in Heb. ii. 9, *διὰ τὸ πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου*, where it is neither necessary nor admissible to take *πάθ.*, in the rare sense *endurance*, as synon. with *ὑπομονή* (Grimm), for the reference is not to the behaviour of Christ, but to what befel Him; compare the preceding *ἡλαττωμένον*. Elsewhere always the plural, Rom. viii. 18; 2 Cor. i. 6, 7; 2 Tim. iii. 11; Heb. ii. 10, x. 32; 1 Pet. v. 9. *Τὰ παθ. Χυ*, 2 Cor. i. 5 and 1 Pet. iv. 13 denote the same as Phil. iii. 10, 1 Pet. v. 1, *what Christ has suffered*; 1 Pet. i. 11, *τὰ εἰς Χν παθήματα, what Christ was to suffer*, chosen on account of ver. 10, *οἱ περὶ τῆς εἰς ὑμᾶς χάριτος προφητεύσαντες*. With Col. i. 24, *ἐν τοῖς παθήμ. ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν*, compare *πάσχειν ὑπέρ*, and 2 Cor. i. 5; Phil. iii. 10.—(II.) Synon. with *πάθος*, of the affections, dispositions; so first in Aristotle, only rarer than *πάθος*; see Bonitz, *Index Aristot.* 554. Arist. *Metaph.* iv. 14, *ἀρετὴ καὶ κακία τῶν παθημάτων μέρος τι*. *Poet.* 1, *ἦθη καὶ πάθη καὶ πράξεις*. *Rhet.* ii. 22, *ἦδη καὶ πάθη καὶ ἔξεις*. *Polit.* i. 5, *τὰ γὰρ ἄλλα ζῶα οὐ λόγου αἰσθανόμενα, ἀλλὰ παθήμασιν ὑπηρετεῖ*. Plut. *Pomp.* viii. 6. Thus Aristotle reckons *ἔλεος* and *φόβος* among the *παθήματα*; see *πάθος*. In itself a *vox media*, and used as such, *παθήματα* in later Greek is employed to denote *wrong affections* or *impulses*, under whose dominion man is a sufferer, Plut. *de occulte vivendo*, ii. (1128 E), *τοὺς νοσώδεις βίους καὶ τὰ τῆς ψυχῆς παθήματα* (as, according to Aristotle, the *παθήματα* need *κάθαρσις*, *Poet.* 6). Accord-

ingly, in Paul's Epistles, τὰ παθήματα τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν, Rom. vii. 5, cf. ver. 14; Gal. v. 24, οἱ τοῦ Χυ τὴν σάρκα ἐσταύρωσαν σὺν τοῖς παθήμασιν καὶ ἐπιθυμίαις. The παθήμ. are the sinful stirrings which gain the mastery over the man and coerce him (cf. Rom. vii. 25), whereas he gives himself up to the ἐπιθ.; the παθήματα enslave him, but by the ἐπιθ. he lets himself be enslaved.

Πάθος, οὖς, τό, (I.) that which one experiences or suffers, as opposed to ἔργον, ποίημα, πράξις, e.g. μακάριον πάθος πάσχειν, Plato, *Hipp. min.* 363 D; usually = suffering. Then (II.), and especially, of the affections of the soul, the sensations and desires, which a man does not of his own accord beget, but by which he is carried away; primarily, in a good as well as a bad sense, Plato, Aristotle; cf. Aristotle, *Eth. Nicom.* ii. 4, τὰ ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ γινόμενα τρία ἐστί, πάθη δυνάμεις ἔξεις . . . λέγω δὲ πάθη μὲν ἐπιθυμίαν, ὀργήν, φόβον, θράσος, φθόνον, χαράν, φιλίαν, μῖσος, πόθον, ζῆλον, ἔλεον, ὅλως οἷς ἔπεται ἡδονὴ ἢ λύπη. Next, by the Stoics, of abnormal and unnatural impulses, the outgo and striving of a corrupt reason, λόγος πονηρός; see Grimm on 4 Macc. i. 1. Akin to this is the Pauline conception in Rom. i. 26, παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς εἰς πάθη ἀτιμίας. 1 Thess. iv. 5, μὴ ἐν πάθει ἐπιθυμίας, compare ver. 4, ἐπιθυμία (which see) being regarded as that which carries the man away, of which he allows himself to be enslaved; see πάθημα. Also in Col. iii. 5, νεκρώσατε οὖν τὰ μέλη τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, πορνείαν, ἀκαθαρσίαν, πάθος, ἐπιθυμίαν κακὴν καὶ τὴν πλεονεξίαν ἥτις ἐστὶν εἰδωλολατρεία κ.τ.λ., it does not mean a special πάθος, in the sphere of so-called sins of the flesh; the expressions form a climax, each word in turn becoming more comprehensive; ἀκαθαρσία embraces more than πορν. (see Rom. i. 24), and πάθος is not to be narrowed into the ἐρωτικὸν πάθος of Plato, *Phaedr.* 265 B, nor into the ἀκрасία, the πυροῦσθαι of 1 Cor. vii. 5, 9, of which there is no example, for the passage cited by Meyer (Plato, *Prot.* 352) contains nothing of any such πάθος, and Dem. 805. 14 (26. 18) forbids the τοῖς ἐξαίφνης μετ' ὀργῆς πάθεσιν ἐπακολουθεῖν. What is meant is the whole range of passion or emotion which enslaves men, beyond which ἐπιθυμία κακὴ in turn extends, inasmuch as in it man directs or enslaves himself. That the highest degree and enhancement of this worldly depravity and estrangement from God should be found in the πλεονεξία is quite in keeping with biblical views. Besides these passages, πάθος in biblical Greek occurs very often in 4 Macc., which is summed up in i. 1, viz. the reply to the question, εἰ αὐτοδέσποτός ἐστι τῶν παθῶν ὁ εὐσεβὴς λογισμός. But the author's notion of the πάθη is not the Stoic nor the Pauline, but the genuinely Judaic-Pharisaic idea of *pura naturalia* which appears in the later semi-Pelagianism; for the πάθη are with him the κινήματα τοῦ σώματος and ὀρέξεις τῆς ψυχῆς, which in themselves are not contrary to the essence and dictates of the reason, but must be "civilised" or kept in bounds thereby (i. 29, ἐξημεροῖ; ver. 35, φιμοῦν), so as not to transgress the law and become sin. See Grimm, *Commentar zu 4 Macc.*

Συμπάσχω, to suffer together with, or at the same time with, or to suffer the like

or the same thing. Plato, *Charm.* 169 C, ταῦτόν τοῦτο. In later Greek (Polyb., Plut.) more frequently than in the classics. In biblical Greek only Rom. viii. 17; 1 Cor. xii. 26.

Συμπαθής, ἐς, feeling together with, feeling alike, and then especially = sympathizing, suffering with; in 1 Pet. iii. 8 it occurs in the former sense, πάντες ὁμόφρονες, συμπαθεῖς, φιλάδελφοι, εὐσπλαγχνοί, ταπεινόφρονες; cf. 1 Cor. xii. 26; Rom. xii. 15. Stob. *Floril.* lxxiv. 61^a (Phint.), δεῖ δὲ τὰν εὐνομούμεναν πόλιν, ὅταν αὐτὰν δι' ὅλας τεταγμέναν, συμπαθέα τε καὶ ὁμοιόνομον ᾗμεν. Polyb. x. 14. 10, πρὸς τὸ θάρσος ἐμβαλεῖν καὶ συμπαθεῖς ποιῆσαι τοὺς παρακαλουμένους; ii. 56. 7. Aristot. *Probl.* xiv. 40, συμπαθὴς ἐστὶν ὁ ἀκροατὴς τῷ ᾄδοντι.

Συμπαθέω, (a) to feel together with, to have the same feeling; τινί, Aristotle, Plut. *et al.*; to suffer at the same time with, Plut. *Coriol.* xxix. 4. (b) To have compassion or pity; in this sense oftener than συμπάσχειν. Plut. *Timol.* xiv. 1. With the dative both of the person and of the thing, Isocr., Dion. Hal. *et al.* Plut. *Marcell.* xix. 1, δακρῦσαι καὶ τῷ μέλλοντι γίνεσθαι συμπαθῆσαι. *De cap. ex inimicis util.* ix. (90 F), τὸν δὲ καὶ πταίσαντι συμπαθήσαντα καὶ δεηθέντι συλλαβόμενον, *et al.* In biblical Greek only Heb. iv. 15, ταῖς ἀσθενείαις; x. 34, τοῖς δεσμοῖς (Lachm., Tisch., Treg., Westc. for δεσμοῖς μου, Rec., Hofmannu).

Μετριοπαθέω belongs, like μετριοπαθής, μετριοπάθεια, to later Greek; given as Aristotelian by Diog. L. v. 31, after a fragment in Stob. *Floril.* i. 71, as already employed by the Pythagorean Archytas, but not appearing in written language till late, Plut., Dion. Hal., Appian, Josephus, Philo. Μετριοπαθής = one who keeps a measure or control over his feelings, Diog. L. v. 31, ἔφη δὲ (ὁ Ἀριστοτ.) τὸν σοφὸν μὴ εἶναι μὲν ἀπαθῆ, μετριοπαθῆ δέ. The same antithesis in Sext. Emp. iii. 235, ἐν μὲν τοῖς δοξαστοῖς ἀπαθὴς εἶναι, ἐν δὲ τοῖς κατηναγκασμένοις μετριοπαθεῖ; 236, ὡς μὲν γὰρ ἄνθρωπος αἰσθητικὸς πάσχει, μὴ προσδοξάζων δὲ ὅτι τοῦτο δὲ πάσχει κακὸν ἐστὶ φύσει, μετριοπαθεῖν. Μετριοπαθής, μετριοπάθεια, μετριοπαθεῖν, in particular, refer to the maintenance of moderation in wrath and in pain, so that the meaning is determined by the connection. Thus, for example, in pain, Plut. *Consol. ad Ap.* iii. (102 D); *de fratern. am.* xviii. (489 C) *et al.*; often in Philo; in wrath, Plut. *de ira cohib.* x. (458 C), οὕτως ἔστιν εἰπεῖν πρὸς τὸν θυμὸν Ἀνατρέψαι μὲν δύνασαι καὶ διαφθεῖραι καὶ καταβαλεῖν, ἀναστήσαι δὲ καὶ σῶσαι καὶ φείσασθαι καὶ καρτερῆσαι πραότητός ἐστι καὶ συγγνώμης καὶ μετριοπαθείας, for which Camillus, Metellus, Aristid., Socrates are cited as examples. *Adv. Col.* xxii. (1119 C). Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* viii. 61, οὐκ ἐπὶ αὐτοῦ τοῖς τρόποις . . . οὐδὲ δὴ τὸ εὐδιάλλακτον καὶ μετριοπαθές, ὅποτε δι' ὀργῆς τῷ γένοιτο. Joseph. *Ant.* xii. 3. 2. That it is not absolutely equivalent to to exercise forbearance, but = to moderate wrath, to control oneself, so that there may be room for forbearance and forgiveness, is clear from Philo, *Allegor.* iii. I. 113. 1, Μωυσῆς δὲ ὅλον τὸν θυμὸν ἐκτέμνειν καὶ ἀποκόπτειν οἶεται

δεῖν τῆς ψυχῆς, οὐ μετριοπάθειαν, ἀλλὰ συνόλως ἀπάθειαν ἀγαπῶν. The μετριοπαθής puts a limit to wrath, instead of giving oneself up to it or allowing it to work itself out, Krebs, *observ. scr. e. Fl. Jos. in loc.*, refers to Josephus, *Ant.* v. 7. 7, εἰς ἰκετείας ἐτρέποντο τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ θυσίας ἐπέφερον, παρακαλοῦντες αὐτὸν μετριάσαντα καὶ πρὸς τὴν δέησιν αὐτῶν ὑπαχθέντα παύσασθαι τῆς ὀργῆς. It has nothing in common with συμπαθής, as some have been led to suppose through the dative in Heb. v. 2; cf. Heb. iv. 15. The μ. is lord over his wrath; his μετριοπαθεῖν tells in behalf of the πλανωμένοις καὶ ἀγνοοῦσιν; he is compassionate towards sinners, whose sinfulness is described, answering thereto, by those expressions which lay claim to indulgence and excuse. As to the dative, with verbs of feeling, see Krüger, xlvi. 8. Cf. Wetstein, Kypke, Krebs, Carpzov, Bleek, *in loc.*

Κακοπαθέω, (a) to suffer misfortune, hardship, generally to suffer, Xen. *Mem.* i. 4. 11, ἤττον κακοπαθεῖν; Polyb. iii. 72. 5, ἐκακοπάθει τὸ στρατόπεδον ὑπὸ τε τοῦ ψυχροῦ καὶ ἐνδείας. Thus Jonah iv. 11 = חָרָה; Jas. v. 13; 2 Tim. ii. 9. (b) To endure evil, Aristotle, *Eth. Nic.* x. 6, πραγματεύεσθαι καὶ κακοπαθεῖν τὸν βίον ἅπαντα τοῦ παίζειν χάριν. Thus in 2 Tim. iv. 5, νῆφε ἐν πᾶσιν, κακοπάθησον, ἔργον ποιήσων εὐαγγελιστοῦ. In 2 Tim. ii. 3, Lachm., Tisch., Treg., Westc. read συνκακοπάθησον ὡς καλὸς στρατιώτης.

Κακοπάθεια, as, ἡ, (a) suffering, hardship, misfortune, Jas. v. 10; Mal. i. 13; 2 Macc. ii. 26, 27, ἡδέως τὴν κακοπάθειαν ὑποίσομεν. Thuc., Polyb., Plut. *et al.* (b) The bearing of suffering, with ὑπομονή, in 4 Macc. ix. 8, ἡμεῖς δὲ διὰ τῆς δὲ τῆς κακοπαθείας καὶ ὑπομονῆς τὰ τῆς ἀρετῆς ἄθλα οἴσομεν; Jas. v. 10, ὑπόδειγμα λάβετε τῆς κακοπαθείας καὶ τῆς μακροθυμίας τοὺς προφ. Κακοπάθεια emphasizes the fact that the suffering is borne, ὑπομ. and μακ. indicate the how. So Plut. *Num.* iii. 5, φύσει δὲ πρὸς πᾶσαν ἀρετὴν εὐ κεκραμένος τὸ ἦθος, ἔτι μᾶλλον αὐτὸν ἐξημέρωσε διὰ παιδείας καὶ κακοπαθείας.

Συνκακοπαθέω, besides 2 Tim. i. 8, ii. 3 (see κακοπαθέω), only in patristic Greek = to endure together, or at the same time with another. In both texts Paul exhorts Timothy to endure with him what had to be suffered and borne in his calling; and he expresses this in the first text by συνκακοπάθησον τῷ εὐαγγ., as he had before indicated how God's testimony and his witnessing had been treated by the world. In ii. 3, ὡς καλὸς στρατιώτης *Xv. Iv.* is not added, because κακοπαθεῖν, κακοπάθεια, -εῖν, are used especially of hardships and fatigues that have to be borne in military service; such a use of the simple verb is not so prevalent as to govern the representation; the words are added in order to introduce a new element in ver. 4.

Πατέω, from πάτος, the trodden way, whence the German "Pfad," path; see Weigand, *Deutsches Wörterb.* ii. 330; Curtius, 270, to tread, to tread upon; LXX. sometimes = תָּרַךְ, also occasionally = תָּרַח, תָּרַח, et al. (a) To tread, to step upon,

τρίβον, Job xxii. 15; Isa. xlii. 16; τόπον, Deut. xi. 24; cf. Isa. xlii. 5. (b) To tread, to walk upon, Amos ii. 7, ἐπὶ τὸν χοῦν τῆς γῆς; Luke x. 19, ἐπάνω ὀφείων; compare καταπατεῖν, Ps. xci. 13. Frequently οἶκον, λῆνον, ἄλωνα, *et al.*, Isa. xxv. 10; Judg. ix. 27; Neh. xiii. 15; Jer. xlviii. 33; Lam. i. 16; Isa. xvi. 10; Joel iii. 13. In the N. T. Rev. xiv. 20, xix. 15. Figuratively, to tread with the foot, as a sign of contempt or of hate, etc., *e.g.* ὀρκία, τιμὰς θεῶν, *et al.* Thus Isa. i. 12, τὴν αὐλήν μου; Rev. xi. 2, τὴν πόλιν τὴν ἁγίαν; Luke xxi. 24. Oftener in this sense καταπατεῖν, to tread down, to crush under foot = *דגל, גגל, קנע, דגל*, Ps. vii. 6; Isa. xxviii. 3, lxiii. 6, 18; Ezek. xxxiv. 18; Isa. v. 11; Ps. lvi. 2, 3, lvii. 4; 1 Macc. iii. 45, 51, τὰ ἄγιά σου καταπεπάτηται καὶ βεβήλωται. In the N. T. Matt. v. 13, vii. 6; Luke viii. 5; Heb. x. 29.

Περιπατέω, (a) literally, to walk round or about, LXX. often = *הלך*, Kal, Piel, and Hithp., for which, however, we usually have πορεύεσθαι. Gen. iii. 8; Ex. xxi. 19; Esth. ii. 11, *et al.*; Eccles. ix. 13, x. 26; Susannah 8, *et al.* In the N. T. παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν, Matt. iv. 18; Mark i. 16; ἐπὶ τῆς θαλ., Matt. xiv. 26; Mark vi. 48, 49; John vi. 19; ἐπὶ τὴν θάλ., Matt. xiv. 25; ἐπὶ τὰ ὕδατα, Matt. xiv. 29; ἐπάνω τινός, Luke xi. 49; ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, Mark xi. 27; John x. 23; ἐν τῇ Γαλιλ., Ἰουδ., ἐν τοῖς Ἰουδ., John vii. 1, 54; ὅπου θέλεις, John xxi. 18. Absolutely, Matt. ix. 5, xi. 5, xv. 31; Mark ii. 9, v. 42, viii. 24, xii. 38, xvi. 12; Luke v. 23, vii. 22, xx. 46, xxiv. 17; John i. 36, v. 8, 9, 11, 12; Acts iii. 6, 8, 9, 12, xiv. 8, 10; Rev. ii. 1, ix. 20. (b) Figuratively, in profane Greek of the educational intercourse of the philosophers with their pupils, to teach and dispute in going round about, as Aristotle was wont to do; περίπατος = *disputation*, also used of the Aristotelian school. But the biblical and, in particular, the N. T. use of the word in a figurative sense has as little to do with this as the signification of ἀκολουθεῖν (which see); cf. παρακολουθεῖν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ, 1 Tim. iv. 6, 2 Tim. iii. 10, with 2 Macc. ix. 27, παρακολουθοῦντα τῇ ἐμῇ προαιρέσει, which has nothing to do with instruction given *ambulando*. The use of the word as = to walk, in the *ethico-religious sense*, more probably arose from the O. T. *הלך*, just as the conception of moral walk peculiar to modern languages sprang entirely from Holy Scripture. While the LXX. usually render the Hebrew *הלך* in this sense by πορεύεσθαι, with additions such as νόμῳ, προστάγμασιν, ἐν νόμοις, ἐν ὁδῷ κυρίου, ὀπίσω βασιλῆα, ματαίων, τῶν ἐνθυμημάτων, ἐνώπιον κυρίου, *et al.*, but very rarely by περιπατεῖν (2 Kings xx. 3; Prov. viii. 20; Eccles. xi. 9, not at all in the Apocrypha), in the N. T. πορεύεσθαι very seldom occurs in this sense (Luke i. 6; Acts ix. 31, xiv. 16; 1 Pet. iv. 3; 2 Pet. ii. 10, iii. 3; Jude 11, 16, 18), but instead of it we have περιπατεῖν, especially in the Pauline and Johannine usage (elsewhere only Mark vii. 5, κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν πρεσβ.; Acts xxi. 21, τοῖς ἔθεσι; Heb. xiii. 9, ἐν βρώμασι). And here again a difference presents itself, for with Paul the psychological character of the walk is emphasized, in the O. T.

Pharisee and the tendency thereof, while John delights in the more figurative

expressions ἐν φωτί, σκοτία, which also occur often in Isaiah and sometimes in the Psalms. We find it (1) in the Johannine usage, ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ, John x. 23; 1 John ii. 11; ἐν τῷ σκότει, 1 John i. 6; compare John xi. 9, 10; Isa. ix. 2, l. 10; ἐν τῷ φωτί, 1 John i. 7; ὡς τὸ φῶς ἔχετε, John xii. 35; διὰ τοῦ φωτός, Rev. xxi. 24; compare Isa. lx. 3; Ps. lxxxix. 16. Otherwise also π. μετά τινος, John vi. 66; Rev. iii. 4; καθὼς ἐκεῖνος, 1 John ii. 6; ἐν ἀληθείᾳ, 2 John 4, 6; 3 John 3, 4. Cf. ὁδῶ ἀληθινῇ, Isa. lxxv. 2; γυμνός, Rev. xvi. 15; cf. Isa. xx. 2; see γυμνός. (2) In Pauline usage figuratively only in Rom. xiii. 13, ὡς ἐν ἡμέρᾳ εὐσχημόνως; Eph. v. 8, ὡς τέκνα φωτός. With adverbial qualification εὐσχημόνως, 1 Thess. iv. 12; ἀκριβῶς, Eph. v. 15; ἀτάκτως, 2 Thess. iii. 6, 11; cf. 1 Thess. iv. 1, ἀξίως τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ καλοῦντος κ.τ.λ.; 1 Thess. ii. 12; cf. Eph. iv. 1; Col. i. 10; 1 Cor. vii. 17; ἐν ἐπιθυμίαις, Eph. ii. 2; ἐν παραπτώμασιν, Eph. ii. 10; Col. iii. 7; ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς, Rom. vi. 4; ἐν σοφίᾳ, Col. iv. 5; ἐν ματαιότητι τοῦ νοός, Eph. iv. 17; ἐν ἀγάπῃ, Eph. v. 2; κατὰ ἀγάπην, Rom. xiv. 15; ἐν Χρῷ, Col. ii. 6; κατὰ σάρκα, Rom. viii. 4; 2 Cor. x. 2; cf. ἐν σαρκί, x. 3; κατὰ πνεῦμα, Rom. viii. 4; πνεύματι, Gal. v. 16; 2 Cor. xii. 18; κατὰ ἄνθρωπον, 1 Cor. iii. 3; διὰ πίστεως, οὐ δι' εἰδους, 2 Cor. v. 7. We have no O. T. examples for these modes of expression; they form an independent extension of the O. T. usage for which πορεύεσθαι was inappropriate.

Πατήρ. Achelis (*Bergpred.* on Matt. vi. 9) rightly draws attention to the fact that in the O. T. this designation of God, and that of Israel as *son* or *children* of God, was employed in order firmly to establish the duty of Israel to be loyal to Jehovah, and to bring out forcibly the contrast in Israel's behaviour between what they were and what they ought to be (Deut. xxxii. 6, 19; Isa. i. 2; Mal. i. 6, ii. 10); and together with this to bring fully to light how undeserved was the mercy of God to faithless and disloyal Israel (Jer. xxxi. 9, 20; Isa. lxiii. 16, xliv. 8); so that the sonship of Israel depended solely upon God's election and call, though Israel's behaviour towards God, and consequently his situation at the time, did not correspond thereto. This explains why it is that this appellation πατήρ is used exactly in "the deepest struggles and cries for redemption" (Ewald), in Isa. lxiii. 16, xliv. 8, and does not become a constant appellation of God. The name further always points to a redemptive future, to which this name distinctively belongs.—As to ὁ πατήρ μου upon the lips of Christ, it is important to observe that Christ never, except in His directions for prayer, says πάτερ ἡμῶν (see Matt. xxvi. 39); ὁ πατήρ μου always denotes, therefore, and in every case a peculiar and unique relation of Christ to the Father (significant for the conception of the ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ).

Παύω, according to Curtius (270) connected with *paulus*, *paucus*, *pauper*, to make to cease, the active only seldom in biblical Greek, in the N. T. only in 1 Pet. iii. 10; LXX. Job vi. 26; Isa. lviii. 12; Ps. xxxiv. 14; Prov. xviii. 18; in the Apocrypha the middle only. (I.) Active, to make to cease, τέ, Job vi. 26 = to put an end to, to terminate,

τινά τινος, to make one cease from, or leave off; in profane Greek more rarely with ἀπό; in biblical Greek, Ps. xxxiv. 14; 1 Pet. iii. 10; rarely with the simple genitive, Prov. xviii. 18, ἀντιλογίας παύει κλήρος; cf. Od. iv. 35; Il. iv. 191.—(II.) Middle and passive = to leave off, to cease; "the middle stands, as a rule, where the leaving off is according to one's own will and free choice, the passive when it is the result of external force or constraint," Passow; (a) with further qualification to leave off from, to cease from, usually with the present participle, Gen. xi. 8, xviii. 33, xxiv. 18, 22, xxvii. 30, and often (= חָלַץ, usually συντελεῖν, often also ἐκλείπειν); Tob. v. 22, xiv. 1; 1 Macc. ii. 23; Ecclus. xxviii. 6, et al. In the N. T. Luke v. 4; Acts v. 42, vi. 13, xiii. 10, xx. 31, xxi. 32; Eph. i. 16; Col. i. 9; Heb. x. 2. With the genitive, Ex. xxxii. 11; Josh. vii. 26; Isa. i. 24; compare the gen. of the infinitive, Jer. li. 58, τοῦ ἀναγινώσκειν; 2 Sam. xv. 24; Ex. ix. 28. Oftener with ἀπό, Ps. xxxiv. 14; Isa. i. 16, ii. 22; Jer. xxvi. 3, 13, 19; also as in later prose with the inf., Jer. xxxi. 36, εἰς τὸ παύσωνται οἱ νόμοι οὗτοι ἀπὸ προσώπου μου, . . . καὶ τὸ γένος Ἰσραὴλ παύσεται γενέσθαι ἔθνος κατὰ πρόσωπόν μου. Once with the dative, Job xxxii. 1, ἐπαύσατο Ἰὼβ ῥήμασιν. Once with ἐκ, 1 Chron. xxi. 22, παύσεται ἡ πληγὴ ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ; cf. Isa. i. 24, οὐ παύσεται μου ὁ θυμὸς ἐν τοῖς ὑπεναντίοις; ii. 22, παύσασθε ὑμῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.—The perf. πέπαυμαι = I cease, I am done, am ready, denoting a continuous state; often in O. T. Greek, but always regarded passively, of that which is brought to an end, or by which it comes to an end, Isa. xxiv. 8, 11, xxvi. 10, xxxii. 10, xxxiii. 8; see (b). It is also to be taken as passive in 1 Pet. iv. 1, ὁπαθὼν σαρκὶ πέπανται ἁμαρτίας. We cannot lexically decide the meaning of this πεπ. ἄμ., because it may either denote a line of conduct, as in Isoc. xix. 6, πεπαυμένοι τῆς ὀργῆς αὐτῶν ἀκροᾶσθε καὶ τοὺς ἐλέγχους ἤδη θελόντες ἀποδέχεσθε, compare παύσασθαι τῆς ὀργῆς, τῆς ὕβρεως, Herodian vii. 10. 9, ii. 4. 1, or a state which has been brought about, as in Aristotle, *Oecon.* 2 (ed. Bekker, 1352, 22a), τοὺς νομάρχους πεπαῦσθαι τῆς προφάσεως; Dio Cass. xlvi. 49, τῆς ἀρχῆς ὡς καὶ παρὰ τὰ πάτρια ἀποδημήσας ἐπαύθη; xlv. 12, πεπαυμένοι τῆς στρατείας ἐπ' αὐτὴν αὐθις ἀνεκλήθησαν, of withdrawal from an office undertaken for a time. Now ἁμαρτία itself makes it probable that the end of a state is meant, not a leaving it off, but a being perfectly done with it; cf. Plat. *Legg.* vi. 784 C, νουθετοῦσαι καὶ ἀπειλοῦσαι παύοντων αὐτοὺς τῆς ἁμαρτίας καὶ ἀμαθίας; cf. *Hipp. Min.* 372 E, where ἁμαρτία and ἀμαθία are regarded not as a doing but as a condition; but the question is decided by what follows in 1 Pet. iv. 2, the final εἰς τὸ μηκέτι . . . βιώσαι, which would be only a synonym for πεπ. ἄμ. if this latter denoted conduct. Not *conduct* or a form of behaviour, but an *experience* which leads on to the conduct expressed by εἰς τὸ κ.τ.λ. The experience is stated in ὁ παθὼν σαρκί, its import by πεπ. ἄμ., and its design by εἰς τὸ κ.τ.λ. We are thus reminded here of Rom. vi. 11, νεκροὺς τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ; compare vv. 6, 7. (See also Bengel, von Hofmann.) (b) Absolutely, to cease, to leave off, to come to rest, etc., according to the connection; e.g. Gen. xlix. 19; Isa. xiii. 21 = 𐤒𐤁; Ex. xxxi. 16; Isa. xvi. 10, xxiv. 8, xxxiii. 8; Jer. xxxi. 36 = 𐤒𐤁 in the last place (see above);

primarily also = עָלַם; Ex. ix. 34, αἱ φωναὶ ἐπαύσαντο καὶ ἡ χάλαζα; ver. 35, πέπνυται ὁ ὑετός = ἔβρι.—Ecclus. xviii. 6, xxiii. 16, xxxiv. 17; cf. Job vi. 7, xiv. 11. Also παύσιν παύεσθαι, Jer. xlviii. 2. The perf. pass. = to be at an end, Ex. ix. 35; Isa. xvi. 10, xxiv. 8, 11, xxvi. 10, xxxii. 10, xxxiii. 8.—In the N. T. Luke viii. 24, ἐπαύσαντο (*sc.* ὁ ἄνεμος καὶ ὁ κλύδων τοῦ ὕδατος), καὶ ἐγένετο γαλήνη; xi. 1, ἐπαύσατο, *sc.* προσευχόμενος; Acts xx. 1, μετὰ τὸ παύσασθαι τὸν θόρυβον; 1 Cor. xiii. 8, γλῶσσαι παύσονται.

Ἀναπαύω, fut. mid. ἀναπαήσομαι, Rev. xiv. 13, Lachm., Tisch., Treg., Westc., ἐπαναπαήσομαι, Luke x. 8, Tisch. 8, Westc., after the analogy of the very late and rare aor. ἐπάην; cf. Buttmann, § 114; Kühner, § 343; to make to cease, τινά τινας, especially to let rest, to bring to rest, mid. to rest; often in O. T., more rare in N. T. Greek. (I.) Active, to make to rest, LXX. = נָחַ (with καταπαύειν also); ἀπό τινας, 2 Sam. vii. 11; 1 Chron. xxii. 9; Isa. xiv. 3. Without addition, τί, to make something rest, Ecclus. xviii. 15; ἀ. τινά, to procure rest, refreshment for one, 1 Chron. xxii. 18, ἀνέπασεν ὑμᾶς κυκλόθεν.—Ezek. xxxiv. 15 = נָחַ, Hiphil; Prov. xxix. 17, παίδευε υἱόν σου καὶ ἀναπαύσει σε; Ecclus. iii. 6, ὁ εἰσακούων κυρίου ἀναπαύσει μητέρα αὐτοῦ; Zech. vi. 8, ἀνέπασαν τὸν θυμόν μου ἐν γῇ βορῶ = נָחַ גִּבְרִי וְהָרַחֵם יִתְנֶה. In the N. T. 1 Cor. xvi. 18, ἀνέπασαν τὸ ἐμὸν πνεῦμα, to refresh. In like manner Philem. 20, ἀνάπασόν μου τὰ σπλάγχχνα; cf. ver. 7; Matt. xi. 28, κἀγὼ ἀναπαύσω ὑμᾶς; see ἀνάπασις. Contrary to the usage of profane Greek, with the dative = to give rest to one, 1 Kings v. 4. (II.) Middle and passive, to rest, (a) from something, ἀπὸ τῶν ἐχθρῶν, 1 Chron. xxii. 9; Esth. ix. 22. Ἀπὸ τῶν πολέμων, Esth. ix. 16; compare ἐκ μακρᾶς ἀναπεπανμένος ὁδοῦ, Plato, *Crit.* 106 A; Rev. xiv. 13, ἐκ τῶν κόπων. Usually, however, (b) as also in profane Greek, absolutely = to rest, to repose, LXX. = נָח, נָחַ, נָחַ, נָחַ, and otherwise occasionally; here primarily to rest from labour or adversity, Ex. xxiii. 12; Deut. v. 14; Esth. ix. 17, 18; Job iii. 13, 17, 26; Isa. xiv. 7, 30, lvii. 20; Jer. xlix. 23; Ezek. xvi. 41. In the N. T. Matt. xxvi. 45; Mark vi. 31, xiv. 41; Luke xii. 19. The pass. Lam. v. 5, ἐδιώχθημεν, ἐκοπιάσαμεν, οὐκ ἀνεπαύθημεν. So the perf. 2 Cor. vii. 13, synon. with παρακέκλησθαι; cf. Philem. 7; see παύω. (Cf. Isa. xiv. 4.) Herewith is connected the signification to come to an end, to have done; Jer. xlii. 10; e.g. of dying, Plut. *Pomp.* lxxx. 4; *Consol. ad Apoll.* 16 (110 F), πότερον συμφερόντως ἀνεπαύσατο τὸν βίον ἐκλιπών. So Ecclus. xxii. 9, xlv. 23; cf. Prov. xxi. 16, ἀνὴρ πλανώμενος ἔξ ὁδοῦ δικ. ἐν συναγωγῇ γιγάντων ἀναπαύσεται; Isa. xiv. 4, πῶς ἀναπέπνυται ὁ ἀπαιτῶν καὶ ἀναπέπνυται ὁ ἐπισπουδαστής. Then apart from what may have gone before = to rest, to remain, to dwell anywhere; also to wait, to stay; the first = נָח, Isa. lvii. 15, ὑψιστος ἐν ἀγίοις ἀναπαυόμενος, parall. κατοικῶν; xiii. 21, xxxii. 16, xxxiv. 17; further = נָח, Prov. xiv. 33, ἐν καρδίᾳ ἀγαθῇ ἀνδρὸς ἀναπαύσεται σοφία, according to some MSS., whereas others leave the word out altogether; Eccles. vii. 10, θυμὸς ἐν κόλπῳ ἀφρόνων ἀναπαύσεται; Isa. xi. 2, ἀναπαύσεται ἐπ' αὐτὸν πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ; cf. Zech. vi. 8 and Prov. xxi. 21. So in the N. T. 1 Pet. iv. 14, τὸ τῆς δόξης καὶ τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ πνεῦμα ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἀναπαύεται; cf. ἐπαναπ., Luke x. 6; Num. xi. 25, 26;

2 Kings ii. 16. In the sense of *to rest*=*to stay*, it stands in Dan. xii. 13, ἀναπαύον ἔτι γὰρ ἡμέραι καὶ ὧραι εἰς ἀναπλήρωσιν συντελείας [καὶ ἀναπαύσῃ] καὶ ἀναστήσῃ εἰς τὸν κληρόν σου εἰς συντέλειαν. So Rev. vi. 11, ἵνα ἀναπαύσωνται ἔτι χρόνον μικρὸν ἕως πληρώσωσιν κ.τ.λ. It seems to be foreign to profane Greek in the last two meanings.

Ἀνάπαυσις, εὖς, ἡ, always passive; (a) termination, end, Xen. Hier. ii. 11, καὶ διὰ σπονδῶν καὶ δι' εἰρήνης γίγνεται πολέμου ἀνάπαυσις. Thus in biblical Greek only in Job vii. 18, xxi. 23, as ἀναπαύεσθαι, of dying. (b) Rest, refreshment, Plut. de puer. educ. xiii. (9 C), ἡ ἀνάπαυσις τῶν πόνων ἄρτυμά ἐστιν. Often in Xen., rare in Plato, several times in Aristotle, Plut., et al. Often in the LXX. = ἡσυχία, ἡσυχία (also rendered καταπαυσις), and as a rule = ἡσυχία, and occasionally otherwise; often in Ecclus. It is used of rest from labour or from past trouble and calamity, Gen. viii. 9; Lam. i. 4; Ruth i. 9; Jer. xlv. 3; Micah ii. 10; Ps. cxv. 7; of the Sabbath, Ex. xvi. 23, xxxi. 14, xxxv. 2; Lev. xvi. 31, xxiii. 3, xxiv. 40, xxv. 4, 5; cf. ver. 8.—Ecclus. vi. 27, xi. 17, xx. 20, and often. Further = repose, stay, without reference to previous unrest or trouble, Ps. cxxxii. 8; 1 Chron. xxviii. 2. In the N. T. rare, Rev. xiv. 11, οὐκ ἔχουσιν ἀνάπαυσιν . . . οἱ προσκυνοῦντες τὸ θηρίον, of the interruption of their torment (not as in Wisd. iv. 7 of the rest of the blessed; compare Ecclus. xxxviii. 23), iv. 8, ἀνάπαυσιν οὐκ ἔχουσιν ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτὸς λέγοντες, without interruption; Plut. Lyc. xxii. 2, μόνοις ἀνθρώπων ἐκείνοις τῆς εἰς τὸν πόλεμον ἀσκήσεως ἀνάπαυσιν εἶναι τὸν πόλεμον. With Matt. xi. 29, εὐρήσετε ἀνάπαυσιν ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὑμῶν; cf. Ps. cxv. 7, ἐπίστρεψον ψυχὴ μου εἰς τὴν ἀνάπαυσίν σου, ὅτι κύριος εὐηργέτησέ σε; vv. 8, 9; Ecclus. vi. 27. On the other hand = to remain, Matt. xii. 43; Luke xi. 24.

Ἐπαναπαύω (fut. mid. ἐπαναπαύσομαι, Luke x. 6, Tisch. 8; Westc.; see ἀνάπ.), only in later Greek and very seldom; the active only in Judg. xvi. 26, according to the Alex., ἐπανάπανσόν με δὴ κ.τ.λ., "let me rest that I may support myself upon," etc. Elsewhere always the middle, LXX. = ἡσυχία, Niph. and ἡσυχία; and thus (a) to rest upon, Hrdn. ii. 1. 2, ἐς ὕπνον κατεφέροντο κατεχούσαις τε ταῖς χερσὶ τὰ δοράτια ἐπανεπαύοντο, "they reposed because they supported themselves upon their hands which," etc. Thus = ἡσυχία, Niph., 2 Kings v. 18, ἐπὶ τῆς χειρός, to support oneself upon the hand, vii. 2, ἐπὶ τὴν χεῖρα; Ezek. xxix. 7; 2 Kings vii. 18, τῇ χειρὶ. Figuratively, 1 Macc. viii. 12, μετὰ δὲ τῶν φίλων καὶ τῶν ἐπαναπανομένων αὐτοῖς, of confederates. Micah iii. 11, ἐπὶ τὸν κύριον ἐπανεπαύοντο; cf. Isa. xiv. 6, ἀνεπαύσατο πεποιθώς. So Rom. ii. 17, εἰ δὲ . . . ἐπαναπαύῃ νόμῳ καὶ καυχᾶσαι ἐν θεῷ. (b) To rest upon, see ἀναπ., LXX. = ἡσυχία, Num. xi. 25, 26, τὸ πνεῦμα τ. θ. ἐπὶ τινα; 2 Kings ii. 16, the perf. in a present sense; see under παύω. So Luke x. 6, ἐπαναπαύσεται ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἡ εἰρήνη ὑμῶν (Matt. x. 13, ἔρχεσθαι ἐπὶ τινα).

Καταπαύω, partly a strengthened form of the simple verb, partly, and so almost always in profane Greek, in a hostile sense = to make to cease, τί, to put an end to something, middle and passive to cease, Homer, Herod., Xen., Plato, Aristotle, Polyb., Plut.,

and later writers. Peculiar to biblical Greek is the use of the active in a transitive and intransitive sense, the latter very seldom in profane Greek, and only poetically, *e.g.* Diod. Sic. xii. 14, in a poetic quotation, and Eurip. *Hec.* 918; while the middle, also infrequent in profane Greek, occurs in biblical Greek only in Ex. xvi. 13; Job xxi. 34. (I.) Transitive, (a) *to cause to cease, to terminate, e.g.* τὴν ὀργήν, Ps. lxxxv. 4 = הקט ; Num. xxv. 11 = בשט ; 2 Chron. xvi. 5, τὸ ἔργον; Neh. iv. 11, vi. 3 = הבשט . To put an end to a person or thing, Deut. xxxii. 26, καταπαύσω ἐξ ἀνθρώπων τὸ μνημόσυνον αὐτῶν; Ezek. xxx. 13, μεγιστάνας; Dan. xi. 18, ix. 26, θυσιαστήριον; Hos. i. 4, βασιλείαν, הבשט . (b) *To bring one to rest, so that he keeps quiet, or leaves off, Acts xiv. 18, κατέπαυσαν τοὺς ὄχλους τοῦ μὴ θύειν αὐτοῖς; cf. τινὰ τῆς ἀρχῆς, Herod. iv. 1. 1, vi. 64; Ex. v. 5, μὴ οὖν καταπαύσωμεν αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων = הבשט . Then (c) to bring one to rest so that he has rest; in this sense it would seem seldom or never with personal object in profane Greek, because the prep. κατά is taken in a hostile sense; but in biblical Greek for the most part so, = to procure rest for one from his enemies and oppressors, conjoined with σώζειν, 2 Chron. xxxii. 22. So Ex. xxxiii. 14; Deut. iii. 20, xii. 10; Josh. i. 13, 15, xxi. 46, xxii. 4, xxiii. 1; 1 Chron. xxiii. 25; 2 Chron. xiv. 7 = הניח . Deut. v. 33, ὅπως καταπαύσῃ σε = הניח . So Heb. iv. 8, εἰ γὰρ αὐτοὺς Ἰησοῦς κατέπαυσεν. In the LXX. also κ. τινί, 1 Chron. xxiii. 25; 2 Chron. xiv. 6, xv. 15, xx. 31. (II.) Intransitive, (a) *therewith to cease, in contrast with ἀρχεσθαι, with the part. pres., Gen. xlix. 32; Ex. xxxi. 17, xxxiv. 33 = הקט ; Josh. xi. 23 = בשט ; cf. inf. with τοῦ, 1 Kings xii. 34 = בשט . (b) Absolutely, to cease, Gen. viii. 22 = שבת ; Josh. x. 20 = הקט , to end; Hos. xi. 6, likewise = הקט ; Lam. v. 14 = שבת . But usually (c) = to rest, as in (I.) (c), not thus used in profane Greek, differing from ἀναπαύεσθαι or παύεσθαι, as to rest differs from to cease; compare Ex. xxxi. 17, τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἐβδόμῃ ἐπαύσατο καὶ κατέπαυσεν (according to the Alex.; the Vat. reads κατεπ. καὶ ἐπ.). So = נוח , Ex. xx. 11; = שבת , Gen. ii. 2, 3; Ex. xxxiv. 21; = שבת , Josh. ii. 1. In the N. T. Heb. iv. 4, from Gen. ii. 3, κατεπ. ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ, not = to cease from, but to rest, because the ἔργα were finished; see above (I.) (a).**

Κατάπαυσις, εὖ, ἡ, (a) in profane Greek active, causing to cease, terminating, *e.g.* τῆς βασιλείης, Herod. iv. 67; τυράννων, v. 38 = *expulsion*. Further = *calming, stilling* (of the wind, Theophr.). In biblical Greek, on the other hand, always (b) passive, rest, and this partly of the state of peace enjoyed by God's people, and secured by the divine guidance and deliverance, Deut. xii. 9; 1 Kings viii. 57 = הנחה (but in Judg. xx. 43, according to Alex. reading = *end, conquest*); 2 Macc. xv. 1, ἡ τῆς κ. ἡμέρα, of the Sabbath, and partly of the presence of God among His people as the goal of his saving purpose, Ps. cxxxii. 14, αὕτη ἡ κ. μου εἰς αἰὼνα αἰῶνος, ὧδε κατοικήσω ὅτι ἡρατισάμην αὐτήν; 2 Chron. vi. 41, καὶ νῦν ἀνάστηθι κύριε ὁ θεὸς, εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσίν σου, σὺ καὶ ἡ κιβωτὸς τῆς ἰσχύος σου, ἱερεῖς σου ἐνδύσαιτο σωτηρίαν, καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ σου εὐφρανθήτωσαν ἐν ἀγαθοῖς; Isa. lxvi. 1, ποῖον οἶκον οἰκοδομήσητέ μοι; καὶ ποῖος τόπος τῆς καταπαύσεως

μου; (compare regarding the ark, 1 Chron. vi. 31; Num. x. 36), and accordingly Ps. xciv. 11, εἰ εἰσελεύσονται εἰς τὴν καταπ. μου. So in the N. T. Acts vii. 49 from Isa. lxvi. 1, and Heb. iii. 11 (from Ps. xciv. 11); ver. 18, iv. 1, 3, 5, 10, 11, of the saving presence of God.

Πείθω. There is a singular distinction between Old and New Testament Greek in the use of this word. **Πεποιθέναι** serves the LXX.,—who have no other forms of **πείθω** save this perfect with its pluperfect, except in Prov. xxvi. 25; 1 Sam. xxiv. 8; 1 Kings xx. 33; Esth. iv. 4,—to render בָּטַח (almost as frequently ἐλπίζω, once θαρρῆν, and the part. = ἀσφάλεια), בָּטַח (side by side with ἐλπίς, εἰρήνη) בָּטַח, more rarely = בָּטַח, usually rendered by ἐλπίζειν, also = נָשָׂא, Niphal (sometimes differently), occasionally also = נָשָׂא, Hiphil, בָּטַח, Piel, *et al.* It specially denotes *hopeful trust in God*, and is in the LXX. the distinctive word for the exercise of trust *in relation to God*. In the place of this comes the N. T. **πιστεύειν** in its more comprehensive meaning, and answering to the N. T. salvation. So for instance 2 Kings xviii. 20, 21, 22; Ps. xxv. 1, cxiv. 16, cxviii. 8, cxxv. 1, cxxxv. 18; Prov. xvi. 20, xxviii. 25, xxix. 25; Isa. xxxvi. 7, l. 10, *et al.* As distinct from **πιστεύειν**, it denotes the confidence of him who **waits for help**, whereas **πιστεύειν** brings with it the **possession of salvation**. In the N. T. this use of **πεποιθέναι** occurs only sporadically in the places cited. It is easy to understand how the word does not occur in profane Greek of religious behaviour, or as the characteristic thereof. Homer knows a **πείθεσθαι** in the signs and wonders of the gods, but it is never the person of the gods whom the **πειθόμενος** **πείθεται**.

Πιστός. It is noteworthy that the members of the Old Covenant, according to their normal bearing towards God, are never designated **πιστοί**. Where this term is applied to them—in the LXX. only in Ps. ci. 8, οἱ ὀφθαλμοί μου ἐπὶ τοὺς πιστοὺς τῆς γῆς; in the Apocrypha, Wisd. iii. 9; Ecclus. i. 12, 21 (Fritzsche, πολλῶν instead of πιστῶν); 1 Macc. iii. 13, ἐκκλησία πιστῶν—it is always = נֶאֱמָר, *trusty*; cf. 2 Macc. i. 2; 1 Macc. ii. 52. The corresponding O. T. word would be יָרֵךְ; see **δσιος**, and for this in the N. T. on the one hand οἱ ἁγ. καὶ ἡγαπημένοι, and on the other, as expressing their bearing towards God, ἁγ. καὶ πιστοί. **Πιστός** in the sense *believing* is altogether a N. T. conception; cf. Gal. iii. 23, πρὸ τοῦ δὲ ἐλθεῖν τὴν πίστιν, which answers to the Pauline view of faith, and occurs only, so to speak, exceptionably in the Johannine writings, John xx. 27; Rev. xvii. 14. To this it may be added that even in 1 Pet. i. 21 the reading is doubtful, and we may regard the conception as of Pauline origin.

Πιστώ. (I.) Active, (a) **to make trusty or faithful**, τινὰ ὅρκους; Thuc. iv. 88, *to make one faithful, or to bind one by an oath*, by making him swear. With the thing as object = *to strengthen or confirm* something, 2 Macc. vii. 24, δι' ὅρκων ἐπίστου . . . ποιήσεν κ.τ.λ. Cf. xii. 25, πιστώσαντος δὲ αὐτοῦ διὰ πλείονων τὸν ὀρισμὸν ἀποκαταστήσαι τούτους κ.τ.λ. Akin to this by an easy turn of the idea (b) = **to establish or**

ratify, and this first with the thing as object, τὸ ῥῆμα δ' ἐλάλησας πίστωσον ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος, 2 Sam. vii. 25 = יִרְמְיָהּ; cf. 1 Kings i. 36, γένοιτο οὕτως! πιστώσαι κύριος ὁ θεὸς τοῦ κυρίου μου = יְהוָה יִמְרָא לִי; and then with personal object, 1 Chron. xvii. 14, πιστώσω αὐτὸν ἐν οἴκῳ μου καὶ ἐν βασιλείᾳ αὐτοῦ ἕως αἰῶνος = יִמְרָא. In this sense the active appears in profane Greek, where it occurs seldom, not easily traceable, but perhaps the middle πιστοῦσθαι τι, to make something credible, to ratify, Plut. *De mus.* 3 (1032 A), *et al.* Connected with this in the LXX. (II.) the passive (a) = to be ratified or established, 1 Kings viii. 26, πιστωθήτω τὸ ῥῆμά σου Δαβὶδ τῷ πατρί μου; 1 Chron. xvii. 23, ὁ λόγος σου . . . πιστωθήτω ἕως αἰῶνος; 2 Chron. vi. 17; 2 Sam. vii. 16, πιστωθήσεται ὁ οἶκος αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ βασ. αὐτοῦ ἕως αἰῶνος ἐνώπιόν μου, parallel with ὁ θρόνος ἀνωρθωμένος. Also τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου, 1 Chron. xvii. 24; 2 Chron. i. 9. Cf. Ps. xciii. 7, τὰ μαρτύριά σου ἐπιστώθησαν σφόδρα, everywhere = נִפְּלָא, Niphal. Hence (b) of persons = to become faithful, to be trusty, Ps. lxxviii. 37, ἡ δὲ καρδιά αὐτῶν οὐκ εὐθεία μετ' αὐτοῦ, οὐδὲ ἐπιστώθησαν ἐν τῇ διαθήκῃ αὐτοῦ. Ver. 7, γενεὰ ἥτις οὐ κατεύθυνεν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῆς καὶ οὐκ ἐπιστώθη μετὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτῆς. In like manner Ecclus. xxvii. 17, xxix. 3. (III.) In profane Greek it is used almost only in the middle = to give mutual security, and thus in manifold applications, *e.g.* τινά, to assure oneself of, τί, both = to answer for something, to confirm, and = to convince oneself, to believe firmly, *et al.*, and akin to this the passive (mostly the aorist ἐπιστώθην), both = to become bail for oneself (medial pass., see Krüger, § 52. 6), and to be convinced, to believe. The change of meaning in biblical Greek has an analogy, *e.g.*, in βδελύσσομαι. In N. T. Greek the word occurs only in 2 Tim. iii. 14, σὺ δὲ μένε ἐν οἷς ἔμαθες καὶ ἐπιστώθης, εἰδὼς παρὰ τίνων ἔμαθες. This may be akin to the active, 1 Chron. xvii. 4 (see above) = to be established or confirmed in, to be assured of. But there is no warrant in O. T. Greek for thus departing from the usage of profane Greek here. Πιστοῦσθαι corresponds to the μανθάνειν, the being convinced, or having been convinced, or believing, answering to the learning (to be distinguished from the middle in the same sense as to have been convinced, from to have oneself convinced). As to the passage quoted in support of the rendering to be assured of, Philo, *L. Alleg.* iii. 1. 128. 48, it stands there simply in the first meaning of the passive to answer for; cf. *ibid.* lin. 37. It may be one of the marks of the peculiar Greek of the Pastoral Epistles (see under καλός, εὐσεβής) that πιστοῦσθαι is here used in this sense, for thus as the correlative of μανθάνειν (not the same as in the Aristotle expression δεῖ πιστεύειν τὸν μανθάνοντα; see under μανθάνω) it expresses the thought more clearly than would have been possible by the term. *techn.*, the defined and religiously coloured πιστεύειν.

Πίστις is related to εἶδος or εἶδεσθαι by way of contrast, 2 Cor. v. 7, διὰ πίστεως γὰρ περιπατοῦμεν, οὐ διὰ εἶδους (see εἶδος). But seeing under certain circumstances does not exclude faith, it begets it; faith does not cease when sight is present or enters, John xx. 27; 1 John i. 1 sqq.; Luke x. 23, 24, *et al.* Compare also the relation

between πιστεύειν and γινώσκειν under γινώσκω.—In the LXX. of men, $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ = ἀλήθεια, 2 Chron. xix. 9, οὕτω ποιήσατε ἐν φόβῳ κυρίου, ἀληθείᾳ καὶ ἐν πλήρει καρδίᾳ; Isa. xi. 5, of the sprout from the root of Jesse, ἀληθείᾳ εἰλημένος τὰς πλευράς. Elsewhere = πίστις, three times of God, Ps. xxxiii. 4; Lam. iii. 23; Hos. ii. 22. As to Hab. ii. 4, the LXX. may have followed another reading named by Jerome, namely, $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$. See Kautzsch, *De Vet. Test. locis a Paulo. ap. allegatis*, Leips. 1869, p. 71 sq. Symm. and Theodot. read ὁ δὲ δίκαιος τῇ ἑαυτοῦ πίστει ζ.; Aquila, καὶ δίκ. ἐν πίστει αὐτοῦ ζ. As to Abraham's faith, Gen. xv. 16, Weber, *Syst. der alt. synag. paläst. Theol.* p. 295, says, "Abraham's faith, as distinct from the $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ of merely taking as true, is, in Beresch. Rabba c. 52, expressly called $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$, a firm assurance, a reliance upon God apart from and taking no account of consequences." Nevertheless it is very significant for the N. T. usage that in the LXX. $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ never signifies faith; and as in the LXX. so also is it in the Apocrypha, where, as a rule, it is = trustiness, usually between man and man, in relation to God only in Wisd. iii. 14; Ecclus. i. 24, xv. 15 (xl. 12 ?), xlv. 4. Also in 4 Macc. xv. 21, xvi. 22, ἡ πρὸς θεὸν π. signifies (cf. xvii. 2) nothing but trustworthiness. In Ecclus. xlix. 10, ἐλυτρώσατο αὐτοὺς ἐν πίστει ἐλπίδος, it can only mean the trust of hope; cf. ver. 6 and xlviii. 20, for redemption did not come till long after. In Josephus $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ occurs with the signification faith, trust, but not in a religious sense, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 13. 3, οὐδὲ τοῖς φίλοις ἔτι $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ ἦν, "they no longer trusted the friends;" *ibid.* v. 13. 3, τὸν δὲ δῆμον πάλιν ἐπὶ $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ προσκαλεῖτο θάρσος δὲ τῷ λαῷ καὶ τοῖς στασιασταῖς ἐκπληξίς ἐμπίπτει πρὸς τὴν ὄψιν αὐτοῦ. Of God's faithfulness, c. *App.* ii. 27. 2, τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ ἰσχυρὰν παρεσχηκότος. That aspect of Judaism which found its expression in the post-biblical literature attaching itself to Holy Scripture, does not present the conception of faith as it is embodied in the substantive $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$, although, as the literature of the synagogue shows, and as appears from the application of the verb πιστεύειν, it was already in existence. Πιστεύειν, as an exponent and affirmation of the religious bearing, and $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$, as the characteristic designation of that bearing towards God, wherein the entire religious life has its focus and point of radiation, are after all very different from one another; compare also the descriptive expression in Ecclus. xxxv. 23, ὁ πιστεύων νόμῳ προσέχει ἐντολαῖς καὶ ὁ πεποιθὼς κυρίῳ οὐκ ἐλαττωθήσεται. $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ is used, and that in its central signification, to denote the religious bearing, in Philo. Compare among others *De migrat. Abr.* i. 456. 38, with reference to Deut. x. 21 (κύριον τὸν θεόν σου φοβηθήσῃ καὶ αὐτῷ μόνῳ λατρεύσεις καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν κολληθήσῃ), τίς οὖν ἡ κόλλα; τίς; εὐσέβεια δῆπου καὶ $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ ἀρμόζουσιν γὰρ καὶ ἐνοῦσιν αἱ ἀρεταὶ ἀφθάρτῳ φύσει διάνοιαν. Καὶ γὰρ Ἀβραὰμ πιστεύσας ἐγγίζειν θεῷ λέγεται. *De Abr.* ii. 39. 39, τὸν δὲ φρονήσεως καὶ σοφίας, τῆς πρὸς θεὸν $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ ἐρασθέντα; *ibid.* 18, τὴν πρὸς τὸ ὄν $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ αὐτῷ (τῷ Ἀβρ.) μαρτυροῦσιν οἱ χρησμοί, τὴν βασιλίδαν τῶν ἀρετῶν; *Quis rer. div. haer.* i. 485. 43, ἡ τελειοτάτη ἀρετῶν $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$. For other quotations see Grotius, Carpzov, Wetstein on Heb. xi. 1; Schneckenburger, *annotatt. in ep. Jac.* 130 sq.; Dähne, *Jud.-Alex. Religions-*

philos. i. 392 ff.; Siegfried, *Philo v. Alex.* 307. But that this Philonic πίστις, psychologically viewed, and also with reference to its object, does not coincide with that of the N. T. is already evident in the expression ἡ πρὸς τὸ ὄν πίστις. It does not escape Philo that faith in God and His promise stands opposed to trust in sensuous and earthly things, *Quis rer. div. haer. l.c.*, μόνῳ θεῷ χωρὶς ἐτέρου προσπαράληψως οὐ ράδιον πιστεῦσαι διὰ τὴν πρὸς τὸ θνητὸν ᾧ συνεζεύγμεθα συγγένειαν, ὅπερ ἡμᾶς καὶ χρήμασι καὶ δόξῃ, καὶ ἀρχῇ καὶ φίλοις, ὑγείᾳ τε καὶ ῥώμῃ σώματος καὶ ἄλλοις πολλοῖς ἀναπείθει πεπιστευκέναι. Yet the object of faith is not the promises in their historical and redemptive meaning, but God as the true and pure Being, τὸ ὄν, and in the case of things visible and invisible alike, faith with Philo is a bearing answering to the contrast between pure being and matter, between spirit and sense. While the N. T. introduces the conception of faith with overwhelming emphasis into religious life and thought, this is in some degree prepared for by what Philo and the synagogal literature—these in themselves contrasted currents of Jewish theology and religious life—witness in connection with the O. T. But it cannot be overlooked that the strictly N. T. conception of faith is by no means covered thereby. Apart from the peculiar phenomenon spoken of under πιστεύειν, that the Gospel and Epistles of John nowhere refer to πίστις, but mention πιστεύειν very often, the synoptic Gospels unmistakably and in a very striking manner cleave to the use of it when they speak of faith, and make a far greater use of the word, and emphasize it energetically, without any differences among themselves with reference to the conception. But in Paul, to whom the substantive specially belongs, the marked and express difference from the synagogue—Philonic philosophemes are first traceable and strongly marked in the Pastoral Epistles—is unmistakable. For the τῷ δὲ ἐργαζομένῳ ὁ μισθὸς οὐ λογίζεται κατὰ χάριν ἀλλὰ κατὰ ὀφείλημα· τῷ δὲ μὴ ἐργαζομένῳ, πιστεύοντι δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν δικαιοῦντα τὸν ἁσεβὴν λογίζεται ἡ πίστις αὐτοῦ εἰς δικαιοσύνην, Rom. iv. 4, 5, has obviously a reference to the Rabbinical doctrine of the מַצְוָה תַּכְוָּה, the merit of faith, since this is regarded as a performance which, co-ordinate with the fulfilling of the law, finds its appropriate reward; cf. Weber, *l.c.* 292, 295.

Πιστεύω is very seldom used in profane Greek in the religious sense of πίστις; still it does occur as the *antithesis of atheism*, as in Plut. *de superst.* 11, see δεισιδαίμων; Aristot. *Rhet.* ii. 17, ὑπερφανώτεροι μὲν οὖν καὶ ἀλογιστότεροι διὰ τὴν εὐτυχίαν εἰσίν, ἐν δ' ἀκολουθεῖ βέλτιστον ἦθος τῇ εὐτυχίᾳ, ὅτι φιλόθεοί εἰσι καὶ ἔχουσι πρὸς τὸ θεῖον πως, πιστεύοντες διὰ τὰ γινόμενα ἀγαθὰ ἀπὸ τῆς τυχῆς. Yet even here it has not in and for itself a religious meaning, the connection only as in Plut. *l.c.* indicates what is believed. In biblical Greek we find also the combinations πιστ. ἐν τινι, in the O. T. Jer. xii. 6; Ps. lxxviii. 22; Dan. vi. 23; Ecclus. xxxv. 21; ἐπὶ τινι, in the O. T. Isa. xxviii. 16; ἐπὶ τινι, Wisd. xii. 2. In the LXX. it answers as a rule to יִשְׁמְעוּ (occasionally = ἐμπιστεύειν ἐν, Deut. i. 32; 2 Chron. xx. 20; in the Apocrypha with the dative, and

εἰς *τινα*, Ecclus. xxxviii. 31; ἐπὶ *τινι*, 3 Macc. ii. 7; also once = καταπιστεύειν ἐν, Micah vii. 5, and once πείθεσθαι, Prov. xxvi. 25), and stands in a non-religious sense in Gen. xlii. 20, xlv. 26; Deut. xxviii. 66; 1 Sam. xxvii. 12; 1 Kings x. 7; 2 Chron. ix. 6, xxxii. 15; Job iv. 18, ix. 16, xv. 15, 22, 31, xxiv. 22, xxix. 24, xxxix. 11, 24; Prov. xiv. 15; Jer. xii. 6, xl. 14; Lam. iv. 12; Hab. i. 5; in the religious sense with the dative, Gen. xv. 6; Ex. iv. 5, 8, 9, 30, xiv. 31, xix. 9; Num. xiv. 11; 2 Kings xvii. 14; Ps. lxxviii. 32, cvi. 12, 24, cxix. 66; Isa. liii. 1; also Jer. xxv. 8 (= *נשׁוּ*); ἐν *τινι*, Ps. lxxviii. 22; Dan. vi. 23; ἐπὶ *τίνι*, Isa. xxviii. 16; absolutely, Num. xx. 12; Ps. cxv. 10; Isa. vii. 9; compare the infin. with τοῦ, Ps. xxvii. 13. In the Apocrypha in a non-religious sense, *τινί*, 1 Macc. vii. 7; Tob. ii. 14; Sus. 41; 1 Esdr. iv. 28; Ecclus. xii. 10, xiii. 11, xix. 15, 36, xxxi., xxxv. 22; ἐν, Ecclus. xxxv. 21; *τινί τι*, Wisd. xiv. 5. The passive, of a thing, 3 Macc. iii. 21, *et al.*; of a person, πιστεύομαι *τι*, *I am confided in*; Add. to Esth. vi. 5, τῶν πιστευθέντων χειρίζειν φίλων τὰ πράγματα; cf. without object = *I find confidence*, 1 Sam. xxvii. 12, ἐπιστεύθη Δαβὶδ ἐν τῷ Ἀγγούσ σφόδρα. In the religious sense *π. τινι*, Wisd. xvi. 26, xviii. 6; Ecclus. ii. 6, 8, xi. 19, xxxv. 23; Judith xiv. 10; 4 Macc. vii. 21; ἐπὶ *τινα*, Wisd. xii. 2. Absolutely, 1 Macc. ii. 59; Ecclus. ii. 13. Whereas in the O. T. the application of the verb to the religious behaviour constitutes only a part, and that not the largest, of the usage, *π.* in the N. T., excepting John ix. 18, and the construction πιστεύομαι *τι* (see above), occurs only in the religious sense. This shows how much more prominent the conception of faith becomes in the N. T. than in the O. T. And answering to this we have a greater variety of combinations; the constructions ἐν *τινι*, εἰς *τινα*, which only occur exceptionably in O. T. Greek, outweigh in the N. T. all the combinations with the dative; more rarely ἐπὶ *τινα*, ἐπὶ *τινι*, frequently *π. ὅτι*, and, above all, the absolute πιστεύειν, whose appearance in the O. T. is very rare. Like πίστις, it denotes that bearing on man's part which alone answers to God's saving revelation, and the question arises whether the main idea is that of confidence or of acknowledgment.

With reference to O. T. Greek there can hardly be any doubt. First we have πιστεύειν *τινι*, where it denotes the relation to a servant of God such as Moses = *to believe him*, what he says or reports, *to let oneself be convinced*, Ex. iv. 5, 8, xix. 9; Isa. liii. 1; cf. Ex. iv. 30, ἐπίστευσεν ὁ λαὸς σημείοις, and ver. 8, ἐὰν δὲ μὴ πιστεύσωσιν σοι μηδὲ εἰσακούσωσιν τῆς φωνῆς τοῦ σημείου τοῦ πρώτου πιστεύουσίν σοι τῆς φωνῆς τοῦ σημείου δευτέρου, and the still more striking combination in ver. 9, ἐὰν μὴ πιστεύσωσιν σοι (*sc. τῷ κυρίῳ*) τοῖς δυσὶ σημείοις. But that more is meant here than the bare taking the words as true (cf. τοῖς λόγοις, ῥήμασιν, λαλοῦσιν, 1 Kings x. 7; 2 Chron. ix. 6; Jer. xxv. 8; Lam. iv. 12; Hab. i. 5), that it is also equivalent *to trust* or *confide in one*, is clear from 2 Chron. xxxii. 15, μὴ οὖν ἀπατάτω ὑμᾶς Ἐζεκίας καὶ μὴ πεποιθῆναι ὑμᾶς ποιείτω κατὰ ταῦτα, καὶ μὴ πιστεύετε αὐτῷ ὅτι οὐ μὴ δύνηται ὁ θεὸς . . . τοῦ σῶσαι τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ κ.τ.λ.; cf. especially Jer. xii. 6, μὴ πιστεύσῃς ἐν αὐτοῖς ὅταν λαλήσουσιν. Weighty sometimes as is the element of acknowledgment, *e.g.*

in Isa. xliii. 10, *ἵνα γνῶτε καὶ πιστεύσητε καὶ συνήτε ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι*, it is never the only idea, indeed hardly anywhere the primary; cf. Prov. xiv. 15, *ἄκακος πιστεύει παντὶ λόγῳ*. The idea may be reduced to this, *e.g.* in Gen. xlii. 20, xlv. 26, Hab. i. 5, but never when it in any way denotes a religious behaviour. *Πιστεύειν* includes the *εἰσακούειν*, and does not merely aim at a bare obedience, as might appear, *e.g.*, from 2 Kings xvii. 4, *οὐκ ἤκουσαν καὶ ἐσκήρυναν τὸν νότον αὐτῶν ὑπὲρ τὸν νότον τῶν πατέρων αὐτῶν*, where the Alex adds *οἱ οὐκ ἐπίστευσαν κυρίῳ θεῷ αὐτῶν*; but neither here nor anywhere in which *π.* stands in the religious sense is this the strict import of the conception; this is not the case even in the strange combinations, Ps. cxix. 66, *ταῖς ἐντολαῖς σου ἐπίστευσα*, and Ecclus. xxxv. 23, *ὁ πιστεύων νόμῳ προσέχει ἐντολαῖς*; cf. in Ecclus. xxxv. 23 the parallel *καὶ ὁ πεποιθὼς κυρίῳ οὐκ ἐλαττωθήσεται*. For here, as everywhere that *π.* is mentioned, a bearing is meant which leads to salvation. The object of the *πιστεύειν* everywhere in the O. T. is *soteriologic*; even in Jonah iii. 5, *καὶ ἐπίστευσαν οἱ ἄνδρες Νινευὴ τῷ θεῷ*, for the flight of Jonah (Jonah i. 1, 2) can be explained only on the supposition that the design of his *κήρυγμα* was the deliverance of Nineveh from the threatened judgment; cf. iii. 10. Accordingly *πιστεύειν* is = *to trust or confide in without contradiction or doubting*, or, according to the context, *to trust or commit oneself to*; compare Ex. xiv. 31, *ἐφοβήθη ὁ λαὸς τὸν κύριον καὶ ἐπίστευσαν τῷ θεῷ καὶ Μωυσῇ τῷ θεράποντι αὐτοῦ*; Deut. ix. 23; Num. xiv. 11, *ἕως τίνος οὐ πιστεύουσίν μοι ἐπὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς σημείοις*; Ps. lxxviii. 32, *οὐκ ἐπίστευσαν τοῖς θαυμασίοις αὐτοῦ*; cf. ver. 22. So also *τῷ λόγῳ τ. κυρ.*, Ps. cvi. 12, 24; Jer. xxv. 8; cf. xii. 6. This particularly appears in the combinations *πιστεύειν τῷ θεῷ*, and in the absolute *πιστεύειν*, the former in Gen. xv. 6; Num. xiv. 11; Deut. ix. 23 (Ex. xiii. 31); 2 Kings xvii. 14; *ἐν τ. θ.*, Ps. lxxviii. 22; Dan. vi. 23; *ἐπὶ* with the dative, Isa. xxviii. 16, *ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ' αὐτῷ* (*sc. λίθῳ κ.τ.λ.*) *οὐ μὴ κατασχυρῇ* (Vat. the absolute *ὁ πιστεύων*); the latter in Num. xx. 12, *οὐκ ἐπίστεύσατε ἀγιάσαι με κ.τ.λ.*; Ps. cxvi. 1; Isa. vii. 9; cf. Ps. xxvi. 13, *πιστεύω τοῦ ἰδεῖν τὰ ἀγαθὰ κυρίου*. The object and goal of the believing is always salvation; in a word, *faith is a Messianic conception*, in so far as all divine guidance and saving action stands connected with Messianic salvation and leads thereto. Hence also the combination of *π.* with *ἐλπίζειν*, Ps. lxviii. 22. For this tendency of *π.* to salvation, see also Deut. xxviii. 66, *φοβηθήσῃ ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτὸς καὶ οὐ πιστεύσεις τῇ ζωῇ σου*; Job xv. 22, *μὴ πιστενέτω ἀποστραφῆναι ἀπὸ σκότους*; ver. 31; Jer. xii. 6, *μὴ πιστεύσης ἐν αὐτοῖς ὅτι λαλήσουσι πρὸς σε καλά*.

In the Apocrypha the reference of the verb to saving promise wanes, but the psychological characteristics remain the same,—the final aim of faith is still salvation, though not in a Messianic sense; *πιστεύειν* is *to trust* and *to confide in*, Wisd. xvi. 26, *τὸ ῥῆμά σου τοὺς σοὶ πιστεύοντας διατηρεῖ*; Ecclus. ii. 6, *πίστευσον αὐτῷ καὶ ἀντιλήψεται σου*, parall. *ἐλπισον ἐπ' αὐτόν*; ver. 8, *οἱ φοβούμενοι τὸν κύριον πιστεύσατε αὐτῷ*, parallel with *ἐλπίσατε εἰς ἀγαθὰ*; xi. 20; 4 Macc. vii. 21, *πεπιστευκὼς τῷ θεῷ*; cf. ver. 19, *πιστεύοντες ὅτι θεῷ οὐκ ἀποθνήσκουσιν ἀλλὰ ζῶσιν θεῷ*; 2 Macc. iii. 12. In

Judith xiv. 10 even this reference cannot be overlooked, *ιδὼν πάντα ὅσα ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς Ἰσραὴλ ἐπίστευσε τῷ θεῷ σφόδρα καὶ περιετέμετο τὴν σάρκα κ.τ.λ. καὶ προσετέθη πρὸς τὸν οἶκον Ἰσρ.* = he was believing; cf. *Wisd. xiv. 5, ἐλαχίστῳ ξύλῳ πιστεύουσι ἄνθρωποι ψυχάς*; *Wisd. xii. 2, τοὺς παραπίπτοντας κατ' ὀλίγον ἐλέγχεις καὶ ἐν οἷς ἀμαρτάνουσιν ὑπομνήσκων νοθετεῖς ἵνα ἀπαλλαγέντες τῆς κακίας πιστεύσωσιν ἐπὶ σέ, κύριε*; *xviii. 6 Absolutely, 1 Macc. ii. 59, πιστείσαντες ἐσώθησαν ἐκ φλογός*; *Ecclus. ii. 13, οὐαὶ καρδίᾳ παρειμένῃ ὅτι οὐ πιστεύει* = *put his trust in God*. In the Apocrypha the conception of faith is generalized as denoting general faith in God,—a generalization of O. T. thought expressed more accurately by, *e.g., πατήρ, ἐκλογή, πρόνοια*; *Josephus, c. App. ii. 16. 6.*

The N. T. *πιστεύειν* connects itself not with the Apocrypha, but with the O. T., wherein the Messianic form of the idea is prominent, and the reference is always to *God's revelation in Christ*, to a present salvation; cf. *John iii. 36, ὁ πιστεύων εἰς τὸν υἱὸν ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον ὁ ἀπειθὼν τῷ υἱῷ οὐκ ὄψεται ζωὴν, ἀλλ' ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ θεοῦ μένει ἐπ' αὐτόν* (this last having reference to the present and future, not to the past). It cannot be thought strange that the idea in this full Messianic form appears only occasionally in the O. T., but becomes pre-eminently one of the fundamental or the fundamental conception of the N. T., so that even *πίστις*, never appearing in this sense in the O. T., takes rank beside it. The verb distinguishes the Johannine writings in their distinctive development from the soil of O. T. thought, so that in them (apart from the Revelation) *πίστις* occurs only once, *1 John v. 5*; *πιστεύειν* everywhere else, as in the O. T., whereas Paul makes a far more comprehensive use of the substantive than of the verb. But the Messianic form of the conception is so decisively expressed in John that the reference of faith to God becomes extremely rare (*John xiv. 1*; *1 John iv. 16, v. 10*), whereas in Paul's usage it is upon a par with the reference to Christ. This Messianic character of the word must be kept in view in deciding the question which element preponderates, acknowledgment or confidence. The connection with the O. T. now pointed out makes the latter probable. Still there is a certain unmistakeable difference between the Johannine and the Pauline usage; for in John, who dwells mainly upon the relation of faith to the Person of the Sent of God, the thought of acknowledgment forms the point of departure whence the further import and full range of the conception unfolds and discloses itself, while with Paul the element of unreserved trust occupies the first place, with the signification "unreservedly, without demur of word or act, to give oneself up to the God of our salvation."—It is of great importance for the right understanding of the Pauline usage to note first, that the connection with the O. T. appears often in express quotations, *Rom. iv. 3 and Gal. iii. 6 from Gen. xv. 6*; *Rom. ix. 33 from Isa. xxviii. 16*; *Rom. x. 16 from Isa. liii. 1*; *2 Cor. iv. 13 from Ps. cxvi. 10*; cf. *πίστις, Rom. i. 17, Gal. iii. 11 from Hab. ii. 4*. Secondly, that we have not, as in John, *πιστεύειν* as directed to the Servant of God or to Christ, but the direct reference of faith to God stands in the foreground; and lastly, that the absolute *πιστεύειν*, which covers a comparatively wider range, denotes this believing in God in his work of salvation. The Pauline idea is that of confidence,

assured and trustful, in God, in His self-affirming work of redemption in and through Christ. While John treats only of the consequence of the relation to the God of revelation or His messengers and witnesses, there lies with Paul in *πίστις* and *πιστεύω* a reference to the re-establishing, we might almost say the creating anew, of a relation to God. For the distinction between conviction and trust, cf. 2 Tim. i. 12, *οἶδα ὃ πεπίστευκα καὶ πέπεισμαι ὅτι δυνατός ἐστιν τὴν παραθήκην μου φυλάξαι*. Faith with Paul has to do with salvation as a present thing, not merely a thing hoped for or expected, but an act of God already accomplished and present (cf. *ἔχομεν τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν*, Eph. i. 7; Col. i. 14); it is therefore not a self-renouncing, but a receptive reliance, a trustful acceptance of the grace of salvation, while the O. T. faith is a trustful expectation of it. *Πιστεύειν τινι* occurs, besides 2 Tim. i. 12, in Rom. iv. 3; Gal. iv. 6, *ἐπίστευσε Ἀβραὰμ τῷ θεῷ*; Titus iii. 8, *ἵνα φροντίσωσιν καλῶν ἔργων προύστασθαι πεπιστευκότες θεῷ*. The O. T. combination *πιστεύειν ἐν* occurs nowhere in the N. T. except Mark i. 15, John iii. 15. In O. T. Greek we have also *ἐμπιστεύειν*, Deut. i. 32; *ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ οὐκ ἐνεπιστεύσατε κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν* = יהוה ביהם לא יאמינו; 2 Chron. xx. 21, *ἀκούσατέ μου . . . ἐμπιστείσατε ἐν κυρίῳ θεῷ ὑμῶν καὶ ἐμπιστευθήσεσθε ἐμπιστεύσατε ἐν προφήτῃ αὐτοῦ καὶ εὐδοθήσεσθε* = יִשְׁמְעוּ or יִשְׁמְעוּ. Often in the Apocrypha with the dative, *ἐπὶ τινι* and *εἰς τινα*, but rarely in a religious sense, as in Ecclus. ii. 10; *ἐμπ. νόμῳ*, Ecclus. xxxvi. 3. The word is Alexandrine, according to Sturz, *de dial. mac. et alex.* p. 164. *Καταπιστεύειν*, Micah vii. 5 = יִשְׁמְעוּ. *Ἀπιστία* often occurs in a religious sense in Plutarch, e.g. *Coriol.* xxxviii. 4, *τῶν μὲν θείων τὰ πολλὰ καθ' Ἡράκλειτον ἀπιστίῃ διαφυγγάνει μὴ γινώσκεσθαι*; *Alex.* lxxv. 2, *οὕτως ἄρα δεινὸν μὲν ἀπιστία πρὸς τὰ θεῖα καὶ καταφρόνησις αὐτῶν, δεινὴ δ' αὖθις ἡ δεισιδαιμονία*; *De superst.* 2 (165 B).

Πείρα in O. T. Greek is used as = *πειρασμός* in the sense of temptation and trial, akin to the use of *πείρα* in a hostile sense = *an attempt against one*; Thuc. vii. 21. 5, *ἵεναι οὖν ἐκέλευεν ἐς τὴν πείραν τοῦ ναυτικοῦ καὶ μὴ ἀποκνεῖν*. Thus = *temptation*, Deut. xxxiii. 8, *ἐπείρασεν αὐτὸν ἐν πείρᾳ* = נִסָּה; = *attack*, Wisd. xviii. 20, *ἠψατο δὲ καὶ δικαίων πείρα θανάτου*; ver. 25, *ἦν γὰρ μόνη ἡ πείρα τῆς ὀργῆς ἱκανή*. The difficulty in Matt. vi. 13 disappears by observing the connection; *εἰσφέρειν εἰς τὸν πειρασμόν* is not = *πειράζειν τινα*, but is the opposite of *ρύεσθαι ἐκ πειρασμοῦ*, 2 Pet. ii. 9, and is akin to the *ἐὰν πειρασθῇναι* of 1 Cor. x. 13. The prayer is parallel with the admonition in Matt. xxvi. 41; cf. Luke xxii. 31 sqq. We shall not go wrong in taking this *εἰσφ.* *εἰς τ. π.* as mainly the antithesis of the forgiveness prayed for in the fifth petition, and thus as the antithesis to 1 Cor. x. 13, Rev. ii. 10, iii. 10, and therefore as meaning God's judicial giving up of a man to temptation; cf. especially Rev. iii. 10, *κἀγὼ σε τηρήσω ἐκ τῆς ὥρας τοῦ πειρασμοῦ τῆς μελλούσης ἔρχεσθαι ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκουμένης ὅλης πειράσαι τοὺς κατοικοῦντας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*. Considering the following contrast, *ἀλλὰ ῥύσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ* (see *πονηρός*), it cannot refer to *λυπηθῆναι εἰ δέον ἐστὶν ἐν ποικίλοις*

πειρασμοῖς, 1 Pet. i. 6, Jas. i. 2; but like *πειρασμός* in a hostile sense, the *εἰσφερ. εἰς τ. π.* must signify something hostile, where God is against us; cf. 2 Chron. xxxii. 31; Ps. xxii. 1, xxvii. 9, *et al.*, and He is this not in His testings, but when He gives man up to the power of sin. Thus the prayer has special weight as the prayer of the congregation. The conception of temptation as distinct from seduction is not known in the ex-biblical sphere. The representation seemingly most akin to it, viz. the divinity befooling men, does not at all answer to the thought unfolded in Rom. i. 24 sqq.

Πίπτω in biblical Greek appears, since Lachm., Tisch., in the Alex. form of the indicative *ἔπεσα, πέπτωκα*. In the LXX. = *פָּלַח*, *to fall*, a sense in which it almost uniformly appears. Morally or figuratively used, the idea is not to fall from a height, but to fall so as to endanger oneself. Thus in the combination *εἰς κακότητα, εἰς ἀνανδρίαν, ὀργήν*, or with the dative *δυσπραξίαις, αἰσχύνῃ, et al.*, having nothing in common with the German *fallen* in its ethical sense, but here = *to fall into, to fall into or incur disgrace, to fly into a passion*. In biblical Greek it occurs nowhere in a moral sense, not even in Prov. xxiv. 16, *ἐπτακὶς γὰρ πεσέεται δίκαιος καὶ ἀναστήσεται, οἱ δὲ ἀσεβεῖς ἀσθενήσουσιν ἐν κακοῖς*; cf. ver. 17, *ἐὰν πέσῃ ὁ ἐχθρὸς σου, μὴ ἐπιχαρῆς ἐπ' αὐτῷ*; Ps. xxxvii. 24, *ὅταν πέσῃ οὐ καταραχθήσεται, ὅτι κύριος ἀντιστηρίξει χεῖρα αὐτοῦ*; Ps. xxvii. 2, xx. 9. Heb. iv. 11 is to be explained accordingly, *ἵνα μὴ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ τις ὑποδείγματι πέσῃ τῆς ἀπειθείας*, where *ἐν* is not, as in *π. ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ, ἐν παγίδι*, Ps. xxxv. 8, cxli. 10, for the dat. (cf. *μαχαίρᾳ*, Isa. iii. 24), nor as the poetical *πίπτειν ἐν* for *εἰς*, e.g. *ἐν ὕπνῳ*, Pind. *Isthm.* iv. 39, *ἐν κλύδωνι καὶ φρενῶν ταράγματι*, Eur. *Herc. fur.* 1092, but as in Eph. iv. 16, Thuc. i. 77, *ἐν τοῖς ὁμοίοις νόμοις τὰς κρίσεις ποιεῖν*; see Kühner, § 431. 1. 3c. Thus also we must explain *τῷ αὐτῷ ὑποδείγματι τ. ἀ.* = "in the same manner as *this very example* of unbelief shows," for *τῷ αὐτῷ* does not mean *ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ ἀπ.*, because the unbelief is referred to not as to its kind, but as to its consequences, and in this it is the *ὑποδ.* Rev. ii. 5, *μνημόνευε οὖν πόθεν πέπτωκας καὶ μετανόησον*, is not to be explained thus, because the connection indicates that the fall spoken of is not a fall from a state of salvation; a special form of conduct is referred to, and *πίπτειν* is not used in its ethical sense, but, as the *πόθεν* shows, like *πίπτειν ἔκ τινος* = *to fall from or out of*, here from the *πρώτῃ ἀγάπῃ*, from a condition in which the Lord would not have anything *κατ' αὐτοῦ*, ver. 4. Compare Hupfeld on Ps. xx. 9.

Πληρώ, in the LXX. = *מָלַא*. On Eph. iii. 19, cf. John xviii. 23, *τετελειωμένοι εἰς ἓν*; Xen. *Cyrop.* ii. 1. 5, *Ἀρτακόμαν λέγουσι ἱππέας εἰς ὀκτακισχιλίους ἀγειν*. The *πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ θεοῦ* is the goal which the *πληροῦσθαι* has in view. The *πλήρωμα* here is hardly "the fulness of what God is," but a fulness called God's, because it springs from Him, He is the source of it, "the full measure of God's grace and gifts." The notion of an increase of the indwelling of God as spoken of 2 Cor. vi. 16, John xiv. 23, is beyond the range of biblical thought. The expression *πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου*, Gal. iv. 4, *τῶν καιρῶν*, Eph. i. 13, differs from *τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰώνων*, 1 Cor. x. 11 (see *πληροῦν* and

συντελεῖν conjoined, Tobit viii. 20), only in this, that the latter denotes a space of time, the former a point of time. Gal. iv. 4 in substance says the same thing as is expressed figuratively in Zech. xiv. 7, πρὸς ἐσπέραν ἔσται φῶς. As to Mark i. 15, πεπλήρωται ὁ καιρός, it does not denote a point of high development or the like, but the contrary, "the time is at end," the time, that is, either of waiting, or the world's time, according to the context; if the latter, it is like τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰώνων, and Christ's advent stands either in connection or in antithesis with the entrance of the divine κρίσις.

Ἀναπληροω, (a) to fill up, to fill out, in place of another, or of something missing; thus Gen. ii. 21, ἀναπλήρωσε σάρκα αὐτ' αὐτῆς, where, however, the accus. of that employed to fill up does not answer to profane usage. The object is the place or position. Thus 1 Cor. xiv. 16, ὁ ἀναπληρῶν τὸν τόπον τοῦ ἰδιώτου, where we must not render "he who fills the place," i.e. "he who is in possession of," i.e. the place in the assembly (Wendt), because in these modes of expression (τὴν ἔδραν, χώραν, et al.) it always signifies, not the assumption of a position, but the entrance of another into the position spoken of; thus Plato, *Tim.* 79 B, ἀναπλ. τὴν ἔδραν, i.e. the seat left. *Ibid.* 17 A, τὸ ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἀπόντος ἀναπληροῦν μέρος, to enter in place of the absent. Thus in all the places cited by Kypke, *Observ. Sacr.*, and since repeated. Hence τόπος must be taken as meaning *position* or *situation*, and ὁ ἀναπλ. τὸν τόπον τ. ἰδ. is one who had not before been an ἰδιώτης within the Christian community (see vv. 23, 24), but who holds the position, in relation to him who is speaking with tongues, which an ἰδιώτης has; for in ver. 16 the members of the church are spoken of as distinct from those referred to in vv. 23, 24. Elsner, *Observ. sacr.*, and following him Hofmann, as favouring this explanation of τόπος, rightly refer to Arrian, *Epict.* ii. 4. 5, φίλου οὐ δύνασαι τόπον ἔχειν, δούλου δύνασαι; The Hebrew phrase, וְיָחַד אֲנִי אִתְּכֶם, "to fill the place of the fathers," i.e. to be equal to them, to come up to them, see Buxtorf, s.v. אִתְּכֶם. (b) To make complete, e.g. τὴν ἀλήθειαν, Plut. *Cim.* ii. 4; Dem. *Epp.* i. 10, τὴν ἰδίαν ὀργήν. Thus in 1 Kings vii. 51, ἔργον; Ecclus. xxiv. 26, σύνεσιν; Gen. xv. 16, οὕτω γὰρ ἀναπεπλήρωνται αἱ ἁμαρτίαι (ἁμαρτίαι); cf. 1 Thess. i. 26 = to make the measure of sin quite full (by this shade of meaning to be distinguished from πληροῦν in the same connection). Mostly of time in biblical Greek, Ex. xxiii. 26, τὸν ἀριθμὸν τῶν ἡμερῶν σου ἀναπληρῶν ἀναπληρώσω = to accomplish; so everywhere that numbers are spoken of. On the other hand, αἱ ἡμέραι ἀναπληροῦνται = come to their end, Esth. ii. 12, i. 5; Gen. xxix. 28; Ex. vii. 25; Lev. xii. 6; Isa. lx. 20, ἀναπληρωθήσονται αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ πένθους σου. Not thus in the N. T.; see πληροῦν. But like πληροῦν, of the fulfilment of the law and the promise, and it would appear stronger than the simple verb, = quite to fulfil, to perfection, to the very end; so that πληροῦν emphasizes the act, ἀναπληροῦν the manner of it. Thus in Matt. xiii. 14, ἀναπληροῦνται αὐτοῖς ἡ προφητεία, the αὐτοῖς gains its due force. 1 Esdr. i. 54, εἰς ἀναπλήρωσιν ῥήματος κυρίου; Gal. vi. 2, καὶ οὕτως ἀναπληρώσετε τὸν νόμον τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

Ἀνταναπληρόω, to supply instead of; cf. Gen. ii. 21, ἀναπλήρωσε σάρκα ἀντ' αὐτῆς. Very rare in profane Greek; Dem. xiv. 17, of opposition of subjects, ἀνταναπληροῦντας πρὸς τὸν εὐπορώτατον ἀεὶ τοὺς ἀπορωτάτους. Thus ἀνταναπλήρωσις in Diog. Laert. x. 48 = "compensation on the other side." With reference to the object, Dio Cass. xlv. 48, ἵν' ὅσον καθ' ἕκαστον αὐτῶν ἐκ τοῦ νομιζομένου πρὸς τὸ τελειότατον καὶ τῆς τιμῆς καὶ τῆς ἐξουσίας ἐνέδει τοῦτο ἐκ τῆς παρὰ τῶν ἄλλων συντελείας ἀνταναπληρωθῇ, of one to whom all the offices of State, each of which had been in particular transferred or administered, were transferred together, so that no honour of any kind was lacking to him. Apollon. *Alex. de synt.* i. 19, iii. 255, 330 (cf. Tittmann, *de synon.* N. T. i. 230); i. 19, ἡ ἀντωνυμία (*pronomen*)—ἀνταναπληροῦσα καὶ τὴν θέσιν τοῦ ὀνόματος καὶ τὴν τάξιν τοῦ ῥήματος = to come in as supplementary to, so that the difference from ἀναπληροῦν is only that the substitution is specially expressed; see Gen. ii. 21. In biblical Greek only Col. i. 24, ὡς ἡμεῖς χαίρω ἐν τοῖς παθήμασιν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν καὶ ἀνταναπληρῶ τὰ ὑστερήματα τῶν θλίψεων τοῦ Χυ ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου ὑπὲρ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ. The idea cannot be that there was something lacking in Christ's sufferings which could not have happened to Him, and could only happen to one who occupied the special position of apostle to the heathen (Hofmann); nor can it mean that the sufferings of the apostle now supplied what was lacking in them before (Meyer), for which we should hardly have had ἀναπληροῦν or προσαναπλ., but most probably πληροῦν. As the sufferings of the apostle were for the sake or advantage of the body of Christ, the church, ἀνταναπληρῶ declares that the apostle with his sufferings supplies that which was lacking to the church in order to its full fellowship with Christ in suffering; for what the world, in its hatred of Christ and His church, inflicted, was concentrated upon him. It is a very strong expression to intimate that the apostle's suffering for the gospel's sake was an advantage to the church, 2 Cor. i. 5, 6; Eph. iii. 13; and it is in keeping with the fact that persecution came mainly upon the heads of the church. See πάθημα, and compare Calvin, Bengel, Thomasius, *in loc.*

Προσαναπληρόω, to supply in addition, to fill up by addition, Aristotle and later writers. In biblical Greek only in 2 Cor. xi. 9, τὸ ὑστέρημά μου προσαναπλήρωσαν οἱ ἀδελφοί; ix. 12, ἡ διακονία τῆς λειτουργίας ταύτης . . . προσαναπληροῦσα τὰ ὑστερήματα τῶν ἁγίων; as also Wisd. xiv. 4. It differs from ἀνταναπλ. in that it expresses not the supply, but the removal of a want, and from ἀναπληρ. in that it describes the manner in which the want is met, so that the element of supply falls into the background. Wisd. xiv. 4, ἵνα τὴν λείπουσαν ταῖς βασάνοις προσαναπληρώσωσιν κόλασιν, is similar to πληροῦν ἐξόδον, Luke ix. 31; Plut. *Cic.* xvii. 4, τὸ χρεῶν, to fulfil his destiny.

Ἐκπληρόω, to fill up, perfectly to fill, both (a) with reference to what is lacking, what has to be supplied, and (b) with reference to the whole = quite to fill; Herod., Xen., Plato. In Herod., Polyb., like πληροῦν likewise, of promises and pledges. Rare in biblical Greek, and only in the latter sense = πληροῦν, and this in 2 Macc. viii. 10, τὸν φόρον, to pay tribute; τὴν ἐπιβουλήν, 3 Macc. i. 2; ver. 22, τὸ τῆς προθέσεως. Acts

xiii. 33, ἐπάγγελίαν. — In the LXX. once, Ex. xxxii. 28, τὰς χεῖρας, to fill the hands; usually πληροῦν, answering to ἵδῃ of conferring the priest's office, etc.

Ἐκπλήρωσις, εως, ἡ, filling up, fulfilling, only in later Greek; often in Philo. In biblical Greek only in Acts xxi. 26, τῶν ἡμερῶν; 2 Macc. vi. 14, πρὸς ἐκπλήρωσιν ἁμαρτίων; see for both passages, πληροῦν, ἀναπληροῦν.

Συμπληρώω, to fill together with; both (a) to help to fill, and (b) to fill quite full, because much is filled in; perfectly to fulfil, Diod. Sic. i. 2, ἐξ ἀπάντων συμπληρομένης τῆς εὐδαιμονίας, cum ex omnibus beatitudo compleatur; frequently in profane Greek. In biblical Greek only in the latter sense; in O. T. Greek only συμπλήρωσις, 2 Chron. xxxvi. 21, ἐτῶν ἐβδομήκοντα. In like manner, 1 Esdr. i. 55, πάντα τὸν χρόνον τῆς ἐρημώσεως αὐτῆς εἰς συμπλήρωσιν ἐτῶν ἐβδ. = till the completion of seventy years, i.e. "for a space of 70 years," not "till 70 years have elapsed." Dan. ix. 2, εἰς συμπλήρωσιν ἐρημώσεως Ἱερ. ἐβδ. ἔτη—"70 years serve for the completion," not the termination, "of the ἐρήμ. Ἱερ., that it be accomplished." Thus the expression is distinguished from the simple verb or ἀναπληροῦν, and the language of Acts ii. 1 is explained, ἐν τῷ συμπληροῦσθαι τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς πεντεκοστῆς, i.e. "when the day was fully come," not as if it had come to an end; and accordingly Luke ix. 51, ἐν τῷ συμπληροῦσθαι τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς ἀναλήψεως αὐτοῦ = "when the days of his ἀναλ. were come;" ἀναλ. as in Test. XII. patr. Levi 18, and in patristic Greek, and as ἀναλαμβάνειν, Mark xvi. 19; Acts i. 2, 11, 22; 1 Tim. iii. 16; compare (Tob. iii. 6; 1 Macc. ii. 58; 2 Kings ii. 11) Ecclus. xlviii. 9, xlix. 14, of being taken up to God; the plural αἱ ἡμ., with reference to the time intervening between Christ's death and His ascension; cf. John viii. 21; Acts x. 40, 41. They are regarded not as a space, but as a point of time, whose arrival depended upon what was to take place before. Josephus uses the simple verb similarly, Ant. vi. 4. 1, ἐξεδέχετο τὸν καιρὸν γενέσθαι πληρωθέντος δ' αὐτοῦ καταβάς—ἐπορεύετο—which is only possible if a point of time is meant; but elsewhere πληροῦν signifies termination, Ant. iv. 4. 6, τεσσαράκοστον ἔτος πεπληρωκυῖαν ἀφ' οὗ τὴν Αἴγυπτον κατέλιπε; cf. Gal. iv. 4, πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου, not τοῦ καιροῦ. Further, in Luke viii. 23, συνεπληροῦντο, sc. τὰ πλοῖα ὕδατι.

Πνευματικῶς. Only in N. T. and patristic Greek, and, like the adj., in a religious sense = spiritually, in a manner determined or produced by the Holy Spirit, after the manner of the Holy Spirit, 1 Cor. ii. 14, ψυχικὸς δὲ ἄνθρ. . . τὰ τοῦ πνεύματος θεοῦ . . . οὐ δύναται γινῶναι, ὅτι πνευματικῶς ἀνακρίνεται; Rev. xi. 8, ἥτις (sc. ἡ πόλις ἡ μεγάλη) καλεῖται πνευματικῶς Σόδομα καὶ Αἴγυπτος.

Ποιμήν, ἐνος, ὁ, shepherd, according to Curtius (281) from the root pā = to protect; Sanskrit, pajús, guardian. In Homer and Hesiod an epithet of princes, π. λαῶν. In biblical Greek, (a) shepherd; ποιμήν, Gen. iv. 2, xiii. 7, 8, and often; Matt. ix. 36, xxv. 32; Mark vi. 34; Luke ii. 8, 15, 18, 20. Then (b) figuratively of chiefs who care

for the people; thus of Moses, who led the people through the Red Sea, Isa. lxiii. 11; Jer. iii. 15; Zech. xi. 5, 8; of generals, Jer. vi. 3. Nevertheless, the substantive is but seldom used of princes (cf. ποιμαίνειν, 2 Sam. v. 2, vii. 7); the plural often of the magistracy, as the guardians and champions of right in behalf of the people, men whose maladministration the prophets condemned, Jer. xxiii. 1 sqq.; Ezek. xxxiv. 2 sqq.; Zech. x. 3, *et al.* Jer. ii. 8, מִיָּדָהּ — מִיָּדָהּ הָרָחֵק מִיָּדָהּ — מִיָּדָהּ, οἱ ἱερεῖς καὶ οἱ ἀντεχόμενοι τοῦ νόμου καὶ οἱ ποιμένες καὶ οἱ προφῆται, see κρίνω, κριτής, in whose stead Jehovah in the Messianic times is regarded as the shepherd of His people, by whom righteousness and salvation are wrought (δικαιοσύνη καὶ σωτηρία, see δικαιοσύνη, δικαίω), Isa. xl. 11, Ex. xxxiv. 11, 12, or who will give His Servant, the Messiah, as a shepherd, Ezek. xxiv. 23, xxxvii. 24; Isa. xl. 11. Thus Ps. xxiii. is an expression of confidence that God will work righteousness and salvation for the downtrodden and oppressed, and the comparison includes all that is implied by δικαίω, δικαιοσύνη, in their soteriologic import. Accordingly, the N. T. comparisons, Matt. ix. 36 and parallels, and the parable of John x. 2 sqq., must be taken in their soteriologic or Messianic fulness; and in like manner, Heb. xiii. 20, ὁ δὲ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης ὁ ἀναγαγὼν ἐκ νεκρῶν τὸν ποιμένα τῶν προβάτων τὸν μέγαν ἐν αἵματι διαθήκης αἰωνίου; 1 Pet. ii. 25, ἦτε γὰρ ὡς πρόβατα πλανώμενοι, ἀλλ' ἐπεστράφητε νῦν ἐπὶ τὸν ποιμένα καὶ ἐπίσκοπον τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν, where ποιμήν and ἐπίσκ. differ in that the π. works salvation, the ἐπ. guards it; cf. Acts xx. 28; 1 Pet. v. 2. Akin to this, (c) in Eph. iv. 11, the designation of the ἐπίσκοποι or πρεσβύτεροι of the Christian community, or their ἡγούμενοι, as distinct from and in connection with their διδάσκαλοι, as ποιμένες. Καὶ αὐτὸς ἔδωκεν τοὺς μὲν ἀποστόλους τοὺς δὲ προφῆτας, τοὺς δὲ εὐαγγελιστάς, τοὺς δὲ ποιμένας καὶ διδασκάλους, for which combination compare 1 Tim. v. 17; 1 Pet. v. 2 sqq.; and for the distinction, 1 Cor. xii. 28, 29, κυβερνήσεις and διδάσκαλοι; Jer. ii. 8. For the rest, see ποιμαίνω, ἀρχιποίμην.

Ποιμαίνω, ποιμανῶ, ἐποίμανα, to tend; LXX. = נָגַד, which more rarely = βόσκω, Gen. xxix. 7, *et al.* (a) Of *shepherds*, Gen. xxx. 31, etc.; Luke xvii. 7; 1 Cor. ix. 7. (b) Of *princes, generals* = to direct, to rule; comparatively rare both in profane and biblical Greek, 2 Sam. v. 2, vii. 7; 1 Chron. xi. 2, xvii. 6; cf. Ps. xlix. 15, ὡς πρόβατα ἐν ἄλῃ ἔθεντο, θάνατος ποιμανεῖ αὐτούς, καὶ κατακυριεύσουσιν αὐτῶν οἱ εὐθεῖς τὸ πρῶν καὶ ἡ βοήθεια αὐτῶν παλαιωθήσεται. More seldom, of the representatives or members of the magistracy in general, as in Jer. vi. 3, xxii. 22, xxiii. 2 (see ποιμήν); but (c) often of God, as He who works righteousness and salvation for His people, who helps the downtrodden and oppressed, and provides Messianic deliverance, Ps. xxiii. 1, xxviii. 9, lxxx. 2 (lxxviii. 71); Isa. xl. 11; Ezek. xxxiv. 10, 23; Micah vii. 14. Cf. Zech. xi. 4, and the rendering of the LXX. Ps. xxxvii. 3. In connection herewith in the N. T. of the Messiah, Matt. ii. 6, ποιμανεῖ τὸν λαόν μου, from Micah v. 1-4, Rev. vii. 17, of His redemptive and preserving power, the reverse of which (as with

κρίνειν) is ποιμαίνειν ἐν ῥάβδῳ σιδηρᾷ, Rev. ii. 27, xii. 5, xix. 15, directed against the oppressors of the Church, or the ἔθνη. Akin to this is the use of ποιμαίνειν of the preserving and guardian care exercised by those who, in Christ's service and as His followers, are the ποιμένες of His people, to whom is committed the keeping of the flock in a state of salvation, Acts xx. 28, προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς καὶ παντὶ τῷ ποιμνίῳ, ἐν ᾧ ὑμᾶς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἔθετο ἐπισκόπους ποιμαίνειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ κυρίου κ.τ.λ.; 1 Pet. v. 2, ποιμάνετε τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν ποίμνιον τοῦ θεοῦ; John xxi. 16, ποίμαινε τὰ πρόβατά μου (see ἀρχιποίμην). Cf. Jer. iii. 15, xxiii. 4. Hence catachrestically in Jude 12, ἑαυτοὺς ποιμαίνοντες; cf. Jer. vi. 3; Ezek. xxxiv. 2, et al. — Cf. also βόσκω in a figurative sense, Isa. v. 17, xiv. 30, xlix. 9; Ezek. xxxiv. 2 ff.; John xxi. 16.

Ποίμνη, ἡ, (a) flock, LXX. = צֶמֶד; only in Gen. xxxii. 16. In the N. T. Luke ii. 8; 1 Cor. ix. 7. (b) Figuratively of God's people or Church, as the object of His saving activity, Matt. xxvi. 31, τὰ πρόβατα τῆς ποίμνης, where the passage quoted, Zech. xiii. 7, simply has τὰ πρόβατα; John x. 16, μία ποίμνη εἰς ποιμήν. It denotes the Church of God as enjoying the state and the possession of salvation. See Ποίμνιον, οὐ, τό, flock, LXX. = צֶמֶד. (a) The flock, especially τῶν προβάτων, Gen. xxix. 2, and often. (b) Figuratively of the people of Israel, Jer. xiii. 17, τὸ π. κυρίου; cf. Zech. x. 3, Ex. xxxiv. 1, not so much to denote them collectively (their multitude), but to describe them as the objects of God's saving care. In the O. T. almost only in the figurative words of Ps. lxxviii. 52; Isa. xl. 11; Jer. xiii. 20, xxxi. 10, 24; Ezek. xxxiv. 12. In the N. T. only of the Church of God, gathered by God's redeeming work and enjoying salvation; see ποιμήν and Luke xii. 32; Acts xx. 28, 29; 1 Pet. v. 2, 3.

Ἀρχιποίμην, ἱερός, ὁ, Chief Shepherd; only in the N. T., and here only in 1 Pet. v. 4, of Christ, as distinguished from the πρεσβυτέροις τοῦ ποιμνίου τοῦ θεοῦ, who are ποιμένες in Christ's service, His followers who have to see to the preservation of God's people in that state of salvation of which Christ is the author and finisher; see ποιμήν, ποιμαίνω.

Πονηρός. In the LXX. evil, as threatened by God in the way of punishment, is never rendered by τὸ πονηρόν, but by κακόν, κακά; and this is the only peculiarity in the use of κακός in the LXX. The N. T. πονηρόν answers to this O. T. κακόν. Sometimes πονηρός as an adj. is thus employed, e.g. ἔλκος, νόσος, most strikingly in Deut. vi. 22, ἔδωκε κύριος σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα μεγάλα καὶ πονηρὰ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ ἐν Φαραῶ; Isa. xxiii. 15, ἐπάξει κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἐφ' ὑμᾶς πάντα τὰ ῥήματα τὰ πονηρὰ; and it is clear, if we consider it, that in these places κακός would qualify the σημεῖα and ῥήματα in quite an unusual manner. Κακός describes the nature, and πονηρός the estimate; πονηρός qualifies according to the effect, κακός according to the nature or character. The Hebrew נָּ is seldom rendered by κακός, but the substantive נֶפֶשׁ is usually = τὰ κακά, ἡ κακία. Πονηρία rarely appears in biblical Greek of persons, Isa. xlvii. 10; Ps. lxxiii. 8,

cxli. 4, 7, 10; Deut. xxxi. 21; but usually as an attribute of acts or conduct (see *ἀμαρτία*), Dan. xi. 27, αἱ καρδίαι αὐτῶν εἰς πονηρίαν; Isa. lix. 7, εἰς πον. τρέχουσιν. Ps. xxviii. 4; Jer. xlii. 22, ἀπὸ προσώπου πονηρίας πραγμάτων ὑμῶν καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν βδελυγμάτων ὑμῶν. Hence the plural αἱ πον., Jer. vi. 29, xxxii. 32, xxxiii. 5; Isa. i. 16; Wisd. xix. 13 (elsewhere in the Apocrypha only the sing.).

Πρέσβυς. In biblical Greek (*a*) = old, only in Isa. xiii. 8, and the superlative *πρεσβύτατος*, 4 Macc. ix. 11. But (*b*) as a substantive, *an ambassador*, Num. xxi. 21, xxii. 5; Deut. ii. 26 = פְּרָשִׁי; Ps. lxviii. 32; Isa. xxi. 2, xxxvii. 6, lvii. 9, lxiii. 9; often in 1 Macc. The verb *πρεσβεύειν*, *to be an ambassador*, or to act as such, in Xen., Plato, Thuc., Dem., and others. In biblical Greek, 2 Cor. v. 20, Eph. vi. 20, of the apostle's work. Ἐπίσκοπος differs from *πρεσβύτερος* as the designation of the *charge* differs from that of the *rank*.

Συμπρεσβύτερος, ό, only in 1 Pet. v. 1 and in patristic Greek. In 1 Pet. v. 1, *πρεσβυτέρους οὖν τοὺς ἐν ὑμῖν παρακαλῶ ό συμπρεσβ.*, in order thus to remind them of the dignity of their office, that they might not forget its duties (vv. 2, 3). The word is intentionally chosen to lay stress upon the equality of position and dignity belonging to the apostle, together with them in the Christian community.

Πωρόω, from *πῶρος*, the name of a kind of stone (topaz, also of a kind of marble), and then figuratively of a swelling hardened as hard as bone, a bony excrescency or stone. Hence *πωρόω* = *to petrify, to turn to stone*; then *to cause a bony excrescence, to harden*. Hence the N. T. usage which applies *πωρόω* to the opposition of men to the divine testimony, syn. *σκληρύνεσθαι, σκληροκαρδία*. That it does not come from an adj., *πωρός, blind*, is clear from Mark vi. 52, ἦν γὰρ ἡ καρδία αὐτῶν πεπωρωμένη; cf. Matt. xiii. 15, ἐπαχύνθη ἡ κ. τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου; John xii. 40, ἐτύφλωσεν αὐτῶν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς καὶ ἐπώρωσεν αὐτῶν τὴν καρδίαν, from Isa. vi. 10 = פָּשַׁח, LXX. ἐπαχύνθη. Hence it is figuratively applied to τὰ νοήματα in 2 Cor. iii. 14, compare ver. 15, and also to persons, Rom. xi. 7, οἱ λοιποὶ ἐπώρωθησαν (passive, cf. ver. 8). It denotes the insensibility judicially ensuing upon repeated resistance of impressions produced by the divine testimony, the inability to receive new impressions which might lead on to salvation, and hence the total loss of any sensibility to the presence and the saving will of God; cf. Hesychius, *πώρωσις* = *ἀναισθησία*. In the LXX. it occurs once, Job xvii. 7, *πεπώρωνται γὰρ ἀπὸ ὀργῆς οἱ ὀφθαλμοί μου* = פָּשַׁח, where the Alex. reads *πεπήρωνται*. It is not impossible that the *πωρός, blind*, cited by Suidas and other lexicographers, but nowhere verified, was first coined in the strength of this passage. That *πεπώρωνται* here may designate the blinding or insensibility of the eyes, with a word borrowed from another pathological state, is all the more likely, as in John xii. 2 *τυφλοῦν* and *πωροῦν*, though with different objects, stand side by side.

Πώρωσις, εως, ἡ, **hardening**, Plut., Galen. In the N. T. figuratively of inner insensibility towards the divine revelation, Mark iii. 5, and Eph. iv. 18, π. τῆς καρδίας; Rom. xi. 25, π. ἀπὸ μέρους τῷ Ἰσραὴλ γέγονεν ἄχρις κ.τ.λ., of the judicial hardening of Israel during the καιροὶ ἐθνῶν. Cf. Theodoret on Eph. iv. 18, πωρ. τὴν ἐσχάτην ἀναληγησίαν ἐκάλεσε, in Ernesti, *Glossa Sacr.*, Suid. s.v., Harless *in loc.*

Ῥύεσθαι never has reference to any doing or behaviour of its object, but always to suffering or injury coming from without; and this is important for the interpretation of Matt. vi. 13. The τὸ πον. here clearly denotes simply sin and evil that is inflicted upon us. The petition is based upon the fact that the path of God's children runs through "much tribulation," Acts xiv. 22; 1 Thess. i. 6; 2 Thess. i. 6, 7; Rev. ii. 10, vii. 14; compare the θλίψις ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, John xvi. 33, and the position of Israel as God's servant in the world (Psalms and Isaiah), and the expression in 2 Tim. iv. 18; John xvii. 15. The final and concluding granting of the petition will bring the παρουσία; compare Heb. ix. 28; Rev. vii. 14. If the preceding petition be a petition for the preservation or guarding of faith, this is a petition of faith verifying or guarding itself; and it is obvious that the two petitions should be linked together as they are by καί.

Σάρξ, κός, ἡ, **flesh**. (I.) USAGE OF PROFANE GREEK. (a) As a substantive, of the human or animal body, and in combination with ὀστέα, ὀστούν, and αἷμα, Aristotle, *Hist. An.* iii. 2, ἀρχαὶ πάντων τούτων (κύστεως ὑμένος τριχῶν πτερῶν κ.τ.λ.) τό τε ὀστούν καὶ ἡ σάρξ; cf. Bonitz, *Ind. Arist.* s.v.; Eurip. *Med.* 1200, σάρκες δ' ἀπ' ὀστέων . . . ἀπέρρεον. In Homer, who only once uses it in the sing. to denote a piece of flesh, *Od.* xix. 450, and in the Tragedians, but also in Plato and Aristotle the plural is used to denote the mass, the singular to denote the substance (Passow), e.g. σάρκας βιβρώσκειν, Soph. *Trach.* 1054, and often. Aristotle, *Meteorol.* ii. 3, τῷ δ' ἰδρῶτι συνεκκρινομένης ἐκ τῶν σαρκῶν. Differing from κρέας, which denotes slaughtered flesh, flesh as food. As a substantive, of *the body*, it signifies also (b) *the body itself* according to its substance; thus in antithesis with νοῦς, Aeschylus, *Sept.* 622, γέροντα τὸν νοῦν σάρκα δ' ἠβώσαν φέρει, to which (c) we have the usage of Epicurus and his school often adopted by Plutarch in his use of σάρξ in a physiological sense, *the corporeity* in so far as it is the means, and by an easy turn of expression the subject, of sensational enjoyment or of bodily sensations; thus = *sense* or *sensation*, *corpus hominis vivi ejusque vita animalis*, Wyttenbach, *animadverss. in Plut. opp. Mor., de sanit. tu.* 126 C. Thus Plutarch cites Epicurus, *de tu. sanit.* 22 (35 C), πρὸς τὴν ὑμνουμένην σαρκὸς εὐστάθειαν, likewise often in the treatise *non posse suaviter vivi secundum Epicuri decreta*, e.g. c. 2 (1087 B), πᾶσα διὰ σαρκὸς ἐπιτερεπῆς κίνησις, ἐφ' ἥδονήν τινα καὶ χαρὰν ψυχῆς ἀναπεμπομένης; F, ἡδοναὶ . . . ἔξαψιν ἅμα καὶ σβέσιν ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ λαμβάνουσιν; 1088 F; 1089 D, E, τὸ μὲν ἡδόμενον τῆς σαρκὸς τῷ χαίροντι τῆς ψυχῆς ὑπερεῖδοντες; 1090 A, E, F, *al.*; 1096 C, αἱ τῆς σαρκὸς ἐπιθυμίαι, the desires directed to fleshly

indulgence; *ibid.* D, τὰ τοῦ σώματος πάθη; cf. Diog. Laert. x. 145, εἰ δὲ ἡ διάνοια τοῦ τῆς σαρκὸς τέλους καὶ πέρατος λαβοῦσα τὸν ἐπιλογισμόν, καὶ τοὺς ὑπὲρ τοῦ αἰωνίου φόβους ἐκλύσασα, τὸν παντελῆ βίον παρεσκεύασε. Plutarch himself uses the word in the same way. *De virt. et vit.* iii. (101 B), ταῖς μὲν γὰρ τῆς σαρκὸς ἡδοναῖς ἡ τοῦ σώματος εὐκрасία καὶ ὑγίεια χώραν καὶ γένεσιν δίδωσι· τῇ δὲ ψυχῇ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐγγενέσθαι γῆθος οὐδὲ χαρὰν βεβαίαν; *Consol. ad Apollon.* xiii. (107 F), τὸ γὰρ μὴ δεδουλωσθαι σαρκὶ καὶ τοῖς πάθεσι ταύτης διάγειν, ὑφ' ὧν κατασπώμενος ὁ νοῦς τῆς θνητῆς ἀναπύμπλαται φλυαρίας, εὐδαιμόν τι καὶ μακάριον; *Conv.* vii. sap. 16 (159 B), τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ μίasma τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν; *De sera num. vind.* xxii. (565 B); *De exil.* i. (599 C), μὴ τῆς σαρκὸς πυνθάνεσθαι τι πέπονθε, μηδὲ τῆς ψυχῆς εἰ διὰ τὸ σύμπτωμα τοῦτο χείρων γέγονε; *Convival. disp.* 5 prooem. (672 E), τὴν ψυχὴν ὥσπερ ἐκμαγεῖον ἡ κάτοπτρον εἰκόνας καὶ εἶδωλα τῶν ἐν σαρκὶ γιγνομένων αἰσθήσεων ἀναδεχομένην; *ibid.* vi. 2. 1 (688 D); *ibid.* viii. 9. 3 (734 A). Σάρξ seems not to have been used elsewhere in this sense.

(II.) USAGE OF THE LXX. AND APOCRYPHA. In the LXX. σάρξ with κρέας (or σῶμα, see under (b)) answers to the Hebrew רֶשֶׁת, and with this difference, that κρέας, which only occurs as a rendering of רֶשֶׁת, means *flesh serving for food*, either ordinary *meat*, Num. xi. 13, 18, 1 Kings xvii. 6, and often, or *the flesh of the sacrifice*, Lev. vii. 5 sqq.; Ps. l. 13; Isa. lxxv. 4, *et al.* Only once it denotes the substance of the body, Job x. 11, δέρμα δὲ καὶ κρέας με ἐνέδυσας, ὁστέοις δὲ καὶ νεύροις με ἔνειρας, where, however, it stands simply as one of the constituents of the body, therefore as mere matter; whereas in the combination δέρμα and σάρξ, *e.g.* Lev. xiii. 18, 24, 38, 39, ἐν τῷ δέρματι τῆς σαρκός; Lam. iii. 4, ἐπαλαίωσε σάρκα μου καὶ δέρμα μου, ὅστέα μου συνέτριψιν, it is otherwise distributed. Σάρξ never stands for the flesh of sacrifice; and where it appears as the object of φαγεῖν, Gen. xl. 19; Lev. xxvi. 29; Deut. xxviii. 55; 1 Sam. xvii. 44; 2 Kings ix. 36; Job xix. 22, xxxi. 31; Ps. xxvii. 2, lxxix. 2; Eccles. iv. 5; Isa. ix. 20, x. 18, xlix. 26; Jer. xix. 9; Ezek. xxxii. 5; Zech. xi. 9; Dan. vii. 5; this is always something unnatural, and serves to express a doom of judgment; it always in these combinations denotes the flesh of man, whereas κρέας is the flesh of animals. Κρέας stands in this way only once, Zech. xi. 16, τὰ κρέα τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν καταφάγεται, but in this connection as a figure which rendered the choice of the expression necessary.

As the conception expressed by σάρξ conformably with profane usage is narrower than that of the Hebrew רֶשֶׁת, its connection with the Hebrew widens it beyond profane usage. It signifies (a) the substance of the human or animal body. Distinct from and side by side with ὀστέα, ὀστούν, αἷμα, of the bodies of animals only, in Lev. iv. 11; Gen. xli. 2, 3, 4, 18, 19, ἐπὶ βοάς, ἐκλεκταί, λεπταὶ ταῖς σαρκί (cf. Zech. xi. 16); Ezek. xxiii. 20, ἦσαν ὡς ὄντων αἱ σάρκες αὐτῶν, רֶשֶׁת הַבָּשָׂר הַבָּשָׂר, where, however, σάρκες is syn. with αἰδοῖα; elsewhere always of men. The plural for the most part is employed in this sense, Gen. xl. 19; Num. xii. 12; Job ii. 5, vi. 12, xiii. 14, xiv. 22, xix. 20,

xxi. 6, xxxiii. 21, 25; Zech. xiv. 12; Dan. i. 15, and in most places where *σάρξ* is the object of *φαγεῖν*. The sing. in this sense only in Gen. ii. 21, ἀνεπλήρωσε σάρκα ἀντ' αὐτῆς; Ex. iv. 7, εἰς τὴν χροάν τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτῆς; Lev. xiii. 10, xviii. 24, 38, 39, 43; 2 Kings iv. 34, v. 10, 14; Lam. iii. 4. Thus also in the combination *σὰρξ καὶ ὀστέα*, e.g. Ps. cii. 6, ἐκολλήθη τὸ ὀστοῦν μου τῇ σαρκί μου; Job ii. 5, ἄψαι τῶν ὀστέων αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν σαρκῶν αὐτοῦ, and especially ὀστοῦν ἐκ τῶν ὀστέων τινὸς καὶ σὰρξ ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς τινος, Gen. ii. 23, xxix. 14, of kinship contracted, ὀστοῦν τινὸς καὶ σὰρξ τινος εἰμι, Judg. ix. 2; 2 Sam. xxix. 13; ὅστ' αὖ καὶ σάρκες τινός, where mention is made of several, 2 Sam. v. 1, xix. 12; 1 Chron. xi. 1; cf. 2 Sam. xix. 13, and still more briefly *σὰρξ τινος*; Gen. xxxvii. 27, ἀδελφὸς ἡμῶν καὶ σὰρξ ἡμῶν ἐστίν; cf. Neh. v. 5, νῦν ὡς σὰρξ ἀδελφῶν ἡμῶν σὰρξ ἡμῶν, ὡς υἱοὶ αὐτῶν υἱοὶ ἡμῶν, a mode of expression sounding so strange to a Greek ear, that the LXX. render Isa. lviii. 7, מִן הַבָּשָׂר מִן הַבָּשָׂר, by ἀπὸ τῶν οἰκείων τοῦ σπέρματός σου οὐχ ὑπερόψει; cf. Lev. xxv. 49, ἀπὸ τῶν οἰκείων τῶν σαρκῶν αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς αὐτοῦ λυτῶσαι αὐτόν; xviii. 6, ἀνθρ. πρὸς πάντα οἰκεῖα σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ οὐ προσελεύσεται κ.τ.λ. After this its substance (*b*) the body itself is thus named, Ex. xxxii. 32 (ἐλαιον ἄλειμμα χρίσεως ἁγίου) ἐπὶ σάρκα ἀνθρώπου οὐ χρισθήσεται. In 2 Kings vi. 30, Lev. xxi. 5, the plural, mention being made of several, ἐπὶ τὰς σάρκας αὐτῶν οὐ κατατεμουῖσιν ἐντομίδας. Thus in the combinations of *καρδία* or *ψυχή* with *σὰρξ*, Ps. xvi. 9, xxxviii. 8, lxiii. 2, lxxxiv. 3; Eccles. ii. 3, xi. 10; Ezek. xi. 19, xxxvi. 26, xlv. 7, 9 (cf. Ps. xxviii. 7 = בָּשָׂר), and without this contrast, Ps. xxxviii. 4, cix. 24 (but in ver. 22 *καρδία*), cxix. 120; Eccles. v. 5. Still this use of *σὰρξ*, infrequent as it is in profane Greek, is comparatively rare in the LXX., where for the most part בָּשָׂר is rendered by *σῶμα* (elsewhere for נֶפֶשׁ, הַבָּשָׂר, and occasionally for other words, mostly = *corpse*), Lev. vi. 10, xiv. 10, xv. 2, 3, 13, 16, 19, xvi. 4, 24, 26, 28, xvii. 16, xix. 28 (in the parallel passage Lev. xxi. 5, *σάρκες*), xxii. 7; 1 Kings xxi. 27 (parall. 2 Kings vi. 30, *σὰρξ*); Job xli. 15, σάρκες δὲ σώματος αὐτοῦ κεκόλληται = בָּשָׂר וְנֶפֶשׁ מִבָּשָׂר; Prov. v. 11, ἡνίκα ἂν κατατριβῶσιν σάρκες σώματος μου = תִּרְבֹּץ וְתִרְבֹּץ בְּבָשָׂר. The plural also, used of kinship in the combinations *σὰρξ καὶ ὀστέα τινός* or *σὰρξ τινος*, when mention is made of several, shows that *σὰρξ* is primarily equivalent to the substance of *flesh* in its concrete form; then the *body* is named after its substance, and the clearness of this reference to the substance, to the material of which it is made, appears in Ps. xxxviii. 4 as compared with ver. 8 and Ps. cix. 24, where the poetical description of the corporeal state adds also words regarding the *ὀστέα*, *γόνατα*, and so forth. Passing by the poetic usage, there remain only a few places in which *σὰρξ* signifies the corporeity. That in Gen. xvii. 13, *ἔσται ἡ διαθήκη μου ἐπὶ τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν*, the word does not mean *body*, is clear from ver. 17, *περιτέμνεσθαι τὴν σάρκα*. Vv. 24, 25, *περιτέμνετο τὴν σάρκα τῆς ἀκροβυστίας αὐτοῦ*; cf. ver. 11, Lev. xii. 3, where the word is used in a sexual sense, as in Ezek. xxiii. 20, and perhaps also Eccles. v. 5. Connected not with *σὰρξ* as = *body*, but with *σὰρξ* as = the substance of the body, is (*c*) the widening of the conception in relation to profane usage, wherein *σὰρξ* is = *living creatures as a whole*,

especially mankind, and as distinct from God or the Spirit of God. Primarily it is the predicate of the creature, Ps. lxxviii. 39; Isa. xxxi. 3 (Hebrew). The creature is flesh in its phenomenal form and the condition of its being, in the flesh it has its affinities, and among men flesh is the common bond of fellowship. Thus it is said of man and wife, Gen. ii. 24, *ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν*, and in Gen. vi. 3 it is said of man, *διὰ τοῦ εἶναι αὐτοὺς σάρκας* (the plural as above denoting kinship in the plurality of the subjects). Thus the word becomes a designation of the subject as in Ps. lvi. 5, Deut. v. 26, and living creatures as a whole are designated *πᾶσα σάρξ* or *πᾶσα σὰρξ ἐν ᾗ ἐστὶν πνεῦμα ζωῆς*, Gen. vi. 17, vii. 15; cf. *ψυχὴ ζωσα ἐν πάσῃ σαρκὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*, Gen. ix. 15, 16; π. σ. *κινουμένη ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*, Gen. vii. 21; Lev. xvii. 11, 14, *αἷμα πάσης σαρκὸς οὐ φάγεσθε, ὅτι ψυχὴ πάσης σαρκὸς αἷμα αὐτοῦ ἐστί*; Num. xviii. 15; Ps. cxxxvi. 26, and often. Mankind in particular as meant Gen. vi. 3, 12; Ps. lxv. 3, cxlv. 22; Isa. xl. 5, 6, lxvi. 16, 23, 24; Jer. xxv. 31; Joel iii. 1; Zech. ii. 13. This usage does not arise out of the antithesis of *ψυχὴ* or *νοῦς* and *σάρξ*, which governs the use of *σάρξ* in Epicurus and Plutarch, nor has it to do with the use of *σάρξ* as = corporeity as distinct from *καρδιά*, *ψυχὴ*, or *νοῦς* (see I. (b) and (c); II. (b)). The creature is thus named because *σάρξ* is the vessel or instrument of its being and is its exponent, and mainly in its antithesis or difference from God and God's Spirit, for *flesh* is not *spirit*, spirit is of God, and belongs to the creature only from God; cf. Num. xvi. 22, xxvii. 16, where the LXX. render *לֶחֶם לְבָנִים וְרוּחַ אֱלֹהִים* by *θεὸς τῶν πνευμάτων καὶ πάσης σαρκὸς*, and thus introduce quite a different contrast between *πνεῦμα* and *σάρξ*; Isa. xxxi. 3, Egypt is man and not God, his horses *וְהָיָה רֶכֶשׁוֹ לֶחֶם לְבָנִים*, LXX. *ἵππων σάρκας καὶ οὐκ ἐστὶν βοήθεια*—a proof that the LXX. did not understand the literal sense of the Hebrew, or have transformed it into the antithesis of spirit and matter which was familiar to them. God's Spirit either supports or destroys the creature which is flesh, Isa. xl. 7, cf. Job xii. 10, xxxiv. 14; Ps. civ. 29, 30. As flesh the creature thus distinguished is weak and frail, Ps. lvi. 5, *ἐν τῷ θεῷ ἠλπισα, οὐ φοβηθήσομαι τί ποιήσει μοι σάρξ*; Ps. lxxviii. 39, *ἐμνήσθη ὅτι σάρξ εἰσι, πνεῦμα πορευόμενον καὶ οὐκ ἐπιστρέφον* (πν. not in the sense *spirit*, but = *breath, wind*); Isa. xl. 6, *πᾶσα σὰρξ χόρτος καὶ πᾶσα δόξα ἀνθρώπου ὡς ἄνθος χόρτου* (cf. ver. 7, *ἐξηράνθη ὁ χόρτος καὶ τὸ ἄνθος ἐξέπεσε*, where the Vat. and Alex. omit the words, *ὅτι πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐπνευσεν εἰς αὐτό*). The contrast between *flesh* (i.e. the creature, and mankind in particular) and God is not only one between weakness and strength, Ps. lvi. 5; 2 Chron. xxxii. 8, *μετὰ αὐτοῦ βραχίονες σάρκινοι, μεθ' ἡμῶν δὲ κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν*; Jer. xvii. 5, *ἐπικατάρατος ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὃς τὴν ἐλπίδα ἔχει ἐπ' ἄνθρωπον καὶ στηρίσει σάρκα βραχίονος αὐτοῦ ἐπ' αὐτὸν καὶ ἀπὸ κυρίου ἀποστή ἡ καρδιά αὐτοῦ*, but is at the same time a moral contrast; Deut. v. 26, *τίς γὰρ σὰρξ ἦτις ἤκουσε φωνὴν θεοῦ ζῶντος . . . καὶ ζήσεται*; cf. Ex. xxxiii. 20; Isa. vi. 5, "for all flesh has perverted its way on earth," Gen. vi. 3, 12, 13, cf. with i. 31; and therefore God's judgment is upon all flesh, Isa. xl. 5–7, xlix. 26, lxvi. 16; Jer. xii. 12, xxv. 31, xlv. 5; Ezek. xx. 48, xxi. 4, 5; Zech. ii. 13. But the revelation of salvation is likewise intended for all

flesh, Isa. xl. 5 sqq., lxvi. 23, 24; Joel ii. 28; Zech. ii. 13, and is in fact to be an outpouring of the Spirit upon all, Joel ii. 28; cf. Isa. xlv. 3; Ezek. xxxvi. 26, 27.

This is the O. T. conception of σάρξ = נֶפֶשׁ, with which the Apocrypha may be included, except that the relation or contrast with God nowhere finds expression there, humiliation and frailty but seldom, Ecclus. xiv. 17, 18, xl. 8, strongest in Ecclus. xxviii. 5, αὐτὸς σὰρξ ὧν διατηρεῖ μῆνιν, τίς ἐξιλάσεται τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτοῦ. As the substance of the (human) body, Ecclus. xix. 12; Judith xiv. 10; cf. the plural, Wisd. xii. 5, xix. 21; Ecclus. xxxviii. 28; Judith xvi. 17; 2 Macc. ix. 9; 4 Macc. vi. 6, vii. 13, ix. 20, xv. 12, 17; Baruch ii. 3. Compare the expression σῶμα σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ, Ecclus. xxiii. 16. Corporeity, the body itself, is denoted by σαρκές, Ecclus. xxv. 25, xxxiv. 1; by σάρξ, Ecclus. xlv. 20, as in Gen. xvii. 13; cf. ἡ σ. τῆς ἀκροβ. αὐτοῦ, Judith xiv. 10. Πᾶσα σάρξ occurs just as in the O. T. in Ecclus. i. 8, xiii. 15, xvii. 4, xviii. 12, xxx. 29, 38; Judith ii. 3, x. 13, and often. Only σάρξ τινος, to denote affinity, does not occur. But occasionally we find a twofold widening of the expression, that, namely, of the Hebrew but post-biblical phrase נֶפֶשׁ רָצָה (see αἷμα), answering to σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα, Ecclus. xiv. 18, xvii. 18 (cf. 1 Macc. vii. 17, σάρκας ὁσίων σου καὶ αἵματα αὐτῶν ἐξέχεαν), and the expression τὰ τῆς σαρκὸς πάθη; 4 Macc. vii. 18, ὅσοι τῆς εὐσεβείας προνοοῦσιν ἐξ ὅλης καρδίας οὗτοι μόνοι δύνανται κρατεῖν τῶν τῆς σαρκὸς παθῶν, which still more strongly reminds us of the ἐπιθυμίαι τῆς σαρκός, τὰ τοῦ σώματος πάθη, as distinct from the ψυχὴ or νοῦς in Plutarch (or Epicurus), than of the expression moving on the O. T. lines in Ecclus. xxiii. 16, ἄνθρωπος πόρνος ἐν σώματι σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ οὐ μὴ παύσεται ἕως ἂν ἐκκαύσῃ πῦρ. Josephus has no part in the biblical use of σάρξ, nor does Philo adopt it. Philo treats of it, indeed, in the treatise *De Gigantibus*, i. 266. 32 sqq. in connection with Gen. vi. 3, Lev. xviii. 6, and says, αἷτιον τῆς ἀνεπιστημοσύνης ἡ σὰρξ καὶ ἡ πρὸς σάρκα οἰκείωσις. The souls burdened with the φόρτος τῶν σαρκῶν, ἂν μὲν βλέπειν εἰς τὰς οὐρανίους περιόδους ἀδυνατοῦσι, κάτω δὲ ἐλκυσθεῖσαι τὸν αὐχένα βιαίως δίκην τετραπόδων γῇ προσεῖρρίζωνται. But the expression is not in keeping with his system. In order the least to avail himself of biblical terms, what he has to say of σάρξ as corporeity named after its substance, he says of σῶμα, contempt of which he expresses by calling it τὸ συμφυᾶ νεκρὸν ἡμῶν, in contrast with τὸ κράτιστον τὸ ἐν ἡμῖν, ψυχὴ ἢ νοῦς. But he cannot attach any importance to the ethical or religious element in the biblical idea of σάρξ, because his distinction between αἴσθησις, arising from the union of the soul with the body, and νοῦς, leads him quite the other way, according to the intellectually aesthetic character of his system, which attaches main importance to these two sides of man's spiritual nature and their partition; compare this partition or division as to the essence of the soul in his treatise, *Deterius potiori insidiatur*, i. 206. 41 sqq. The starting-point and centre of his psychology lies in his calling man not σάρξ, but ψυχὴ, and his psychology is further ruled by the identifying ψυχὴ and νοῦς, an identification having its origin in Greek philosophy. Instead of the religio-ethical view and estimate of man, we have the intellectually

aesthetic. Cf. Carpzov, *sacr. exercitatt. in ep. ad Hebr. ex Philone Al.* p. 106; Dähne, *Alex.-Jüd. Rel.-Philos.* i. 288 sqq.; Siegfried, *Philo von Alex.* p. 235 sqq. The genuine appraising and development of the O. T. conception—to which the Philonic anthropology is directly opposed—is to be found in the N. T., and especially in Paul's writings. In post-biblical synagogal literature only *בשר* or *בשר* remain as representing the O. T. form of the conception, also *בשרא*, *בשרא*, as designating man with reference to his weakness and transitoriness, also *בשר ודם* in the same sense (see *αἷμα*); see Buxtorf under *בשר*; Levy, *Wörterb. über die Targumim s.v.*; an ethico-religious colouring cannot be traced.

(III.) THE NEW TESTAMENT CONCEPTION AND USAGE. It is at the outset to be noted that, excepting in 1 Cor. xv. 39 and Rev. xix. 18, *σάρξ* throughout the N. T. stands only for the human *σάρξ*.

1. In the non-Pauline writings, (a) as in profane and O. T. Greek, *σάρξ* designates *flesh* simply as substance, and indeed as the substance of the body, of which with the *ὀστέα* the body consists, Luke iv. 39, *πνεῦμα σάρκα* (so Lachm., Treg., Westc., Tisch. 7, but Tisch. 8 *σάρκας*) *καὶ ὀστέα οὐκ ἔχει*. The plural *σάρκες* elsewhere only in the combination *σάρκας τινὸς φαγεῖν*, Jas. v. 3; Rev. xvii. 16, xix. 18; cf. ver. 21, *πάντα τὰ ὄρνεα ἐχορτάσθησαν ἐκ τῶν σαρκῶν αὐτῶν*, to which what has already been said (under II.) of the like O. T. expression applies. As *σὰρξ καὶ ὀστέα* constitute the substance of the body,—which expression may be shortened into the simple *σάρξ* (see above II. (a)),—so *σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα* constitute the substantial basis, the bearer, of human life (cf. Lev. xvii. 14, *ψυχὴ πάσης σαρκὸς αἷμα αὐτοῦ ἐστίν*), Heb. ii. 14, *ἐπεὶ οὖν τὰ παιδία κεκοινωνήκεν αἵματος καὶ σαρκός, καὶ αὐτὸς παραπλησίως μετέσχευεν τῶν αὐτῶν*, and upon this rests the division in John vi. 53, 54, 55, 56 of *ἡ σὰρξ μου* (*sc. ἦν ἐγὼ δώσω ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς*, ver. 51) between *σάρξ* and *αἷμα*, the former regarded as *βρώσις*, the latter as *πόσις*, for everlasting life. (b) As the substance of the human corporeity or of the body, it denotes this in its substantiality or special nature (*σῶμα* as an organism); so in the O. T. citations in Acts ii. 26 (from Ps. xvi. 9); cf. ver. 31, *οὐδὲ ἡ σὰρξ αὐτοῦ εἶδε διαφθοράν*; ver. 30, Rec. *τὸ κατὰ σάρκα ἀναστήσειν τὸν Χν.*; Heb. x. 20, *διὰ τοῦ καταπετάσματος τοῦτ' ἐστὶν τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ*; cf. ver. 10, *σῶμα*. In ver. 20 it denotes the quality of the *σῶμα*, and in like manner 1 Pet. iv. 1, *πάσχειν σαρκί*; ver. 2, *τὸ ἐπίλοιπον ἐν σαρκὶ βιώσαι χρόνον*, and iii. 18, *οὐ σαρκὸς ἀπόθεσις ῥύπου, ἀλλὰ συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς ἐπερώτημα κ.τ.λ.*, for *σῶμα* and *συνειδήσις* would stand face to face with one another, if the sense of the language admitted it, only to distinguish the external from the internal, while *σάρξ* denotes the evil outside, over against the noble inward principle, designating the body (according to the substance of it) by a word which at the same time implies an estimate of its worth. The *σάρξ* is that in and through which man has his life, his earthly life, the life in and through which he belongs to mankind and dwells among them, 1 Pet. iv. 2; accordingly Heb. v. 7, *ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ*; xii. 9, *τοὺς τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν πατέρας* (over against *τῷ πατρὶ τῶν πνευμάτων*; cf. Num. xvi. 21, xxvii. 16); and hence the import of

Christ's words, John vi. 51, ὁ ἄρτος ὃν ἐγὼ δώσω ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς, ἡ σὰρξ μου ἐστίν. While παραδιδόναι τὸ πνεῦμα, John xix. 30, expresses the act of the surrender of life, and τιθέναι τὴν ψυχὴν, x. 17, the individual setting apart of the life to be surrendered, emphasizing the self-surrender of it, John vi. 51 treats of the quality of this earthly and humanly-corporeal life of Christ, which by His self-surrender was to become the bread of life and the instrument of begetting new life; cf. vv. 52, 53. It is the distinctive quality of the human body to be σὰρξ; to have life therein is the peculiarity of man, and accordingly it is said of the married in Gen. ii. 24, ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν; Matt. xix. 5; Mark x. 8a; cf. Matt. xix. 6; Mark x. 8b. As it is σὰρξ which Christ employed to carry out His work of redemption, seeing that He came as our representative, He is said ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθώς, 1 John iv. 2, cf. i. 1, 3, 7, ii. 2, iii. 8, iv. 9, 10, v. 6, for σὰρξ rendered His dying possible; cf. Heb. ii. 14, ἵνα διὰ τοῦ θανάτου καταργήσῃ κ.τ.λ. The present participle, 2 John 7, οἱ μὴ ὁμολογοῦντες Ἰν. Χρ. ἐρχόμενον ἐν σαρκί, refers to the doctrine, the perfect to the historical fact. Accordingly Christ is θανατωθεὶς μὲν σαρκί, 1 Pet. iii. 18; παθὼν σαρκί, 1 Pet. iv. 1. But as in σὰρξ the distinctive nature of man is embodied, σὰρξ serves (c) as a designation of man in this his peculiar nature, Matt. xix. 5, ἔσονται οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν; ver. 6, ὥστε οὐκέτι εἰσὶν δύο ἀλλὰ σὰρξ μία, Mark x. 8; and πᾶσα σὰρξ, Matt. xxiv. 22, Mark xii. 20, Luke iii. 6, John xvii. 2, Acts ii. 17, 1 Pet. i. 24, as in the O. T., denotes, not indeed all creatures, but mankind as a whole embodied in flesh. As Christ was incorporated or incorporated Himself therein, it can be said of Him ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο, John i. 14, only on account of His divine origin (οὐκ' ἐκ θελήματος σαρκός, John i. 13; cf. John iii. 6, τὸ γεγενημένον ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς σὰρξ ἐστίν), an origin which adopts the σὰρξ, but is so determined thereby that the surrender of Himself to death is the surrender of His flesh; see above. (d) As in the O. T., σὰρξ gives expression to the distinction between man and God, Matt. xvi. 17, σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα οὐκ ἐκάλυψέν σοι, ἀλλ' ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς; cf. John i. 14 with ver. 13; 1 Pet. iv. 6, ἵνα κριθῶσι μὲν κατὰ ἀνθρώπους σαρκί, ζῶσι δὲ κατὰ θεὸν πνεύματι,—a distinction which alone gives its full significance to the declaration of John i. 14 as compared with ver. 1, ὁ λόγος, ὃς ἦν θεὸς πρὸς τὸν θεόν, σὰρξ ἐγένετο, without thereby divesting him who in the σὰρξ and through it is υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου, John v. 27, and whose σὰρξ is the σὰρξ τοῦ υἱοῦ ἀνθρ., John vi. 53, of his nature, as distinguished from πᾶσα σὰρξ,—καὶ ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, δόξαν ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός κ.τ.λ. For though this contrast coincides with the contrast of flesh and spirit, yet Christ, because He speaks of His flesh as the instrument of His saving work, does not exclude from Himself that He has the power of the Spirit; while He emphatically says τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστιν τὸ ζωοποιοῦν, He declares—not ἡ σὰρξ μου οὐκ ὀφελεῖ οὐδέν, but—ἡ σὰρξ οὐκ ὀφελεῖ οὐδέν, John vi. 63, for it is not ἡ σὰρξ in general, but ἡ σὰρξ μου ἀληθής ἐστιν βρώσις, καὶ τὸ αἷμα μου ἀληθής ἐστι πόσις, vi. 55. Save in John i. 14, vi. 63, the O. T. antithesis between flesh and the Spirit of God is reduced to the psychological antithesis between the flesh and spirit of man (see πνεῦμα)

i.e. between flesh and the divine principle of life in man, his inward nature as determined thereby, Heb. xii. 9, 1 Pet. iv. 6, of which distinction or antithesis Christ is a participator, 1 Pet. iii. 18, *θανατωθεὶς μὲν σαρκὶ ζωοποιηθεὶς δὲ πνεύματι*; and this is an antithesis not only physiological, but to the extent indicated by His words, Matt. xxvi. 41, *γρηγορεῖτε καὶ προσεύχεσθε ἵνα μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς πειρασμόν· τὸ μὲν πνεῦμα πρόθυμον, ἡ δὲ σὰρξ ἀσθενής*, an expression which, if we compare vv. 38, 40, *γρηγορεῖτε μετ' ἐμοῦ*, refers also to Himself. What distinguishes His *σάρξ*, or Him in His *σάρξ*, from *πᾶσα σάρξ* really qualifies Him to be the Saviour, and shows that men need salvation, for they do not submit to God and His Spirit, but follow their own way, their own desires, which in their present corporeal state are turned away from God, or at least are not directed to Him, but solely to this life, a life which exists, is determined, and even designated by the *σάρξ*, 1 John ii. 16, *πᾶν τὸ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, ἡ ἐπιθυμία τῆς σαρκὸς καὶ ἡ ἐπιθυμία τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν καὶ ἡ ἀλαζονεία τοῦ βίου οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς, ἀλλὰ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου ἐστίν*; cf. ver. 17, *ἡ ἐπιθυμία τοῦ κόσμου . . . τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ*; 1 Pet. iv. 2, *εἰς τὸ μηκέτι ἀνθρώπων ἐπιθυμίαις ἀλλὰ θελήματι θεοῦ τὸν ἐπίλοιπον ἐν σαρκὶ βιώσαι χρόνον*; cf. ver. 1, *ὁ παθὼν σαρκὶ πέπανται ἁμαρτίας*. Hence the reproach *κατὰ τὴν σάρκα κρίνετε*, John viii. 15, *sc. οὐ κατὰ θεόν*. Sinful desires generally are not indeed meant by the *ἐπιθυμίαις σαρκός*, but, compare ver. 10, *τοὺς ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἐν ἐπιθυμίαις μiasμοῦ πορευομένους* (see *μiasμός*), the sins called *κατ' ἐξ.* sins of the flesh; cf. Jude 7, *ἐκπορνεύσασαι καὶ ἀπελθοῦσαι ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἐτέρας*. Ver. 8, *σάρκα μὲν μαιίνουσιν*, in keeping with the O. T. *רָצוֹן* in the sexual sense, Lev. xii. 3; Ex. xxiii. 20; Eccles. v. 5 (see above, II. (b)). But the use of the term in this particular sense is owing to the fact that in mankind as they are, sin and *σάρξ*, or a perverted relation to God and His life-power (*πνεῦμα*), are really bound together in one, and hence *ὀπίσω σαρκὸς πορεύεσθαι* is a *πορ. ἐν ἐπιθυμίαις μiasμοῦ*, and is as morally wrong as *κρίνειν κατὰ σάρκα*.

Rare as is the use of *σάρξ* in the synoptical Gospels and the Book of the Acts, the few places where it does occur present not only all the traits of the O. T. conception, *i.e.* *σάρξ* as denoting the substance of the corporeity, Luke xxiv. 39 (Acts ii. 26, 31), as a designation for man and humanity, Matt. xix. 5, 6; Mark x. 8; Matt. xxiv. 22; Mark xiii. 20; Luke iii. 8; Acts ii. 17; it also designates the difference between man and God (Matt. xvi. 17), and carries on the thought farther to denote the perverted relationship of man to the divine principle of life, and to the inward man as ruled thereby, Matt. xxvi. 41; Mark xiv. 38. The two last-named elements are not traceable in Luke's writings, where the word occurs very seldom.

The use which the Johannine and Petrine writings, with the Epistle of Jude and the Hebrews, make of the word is much richer. Not that new elements are to be added, but the representation as a whole is fuller. While the usage of the Epistle to the Hebrews is limited to *σάρξ* as denoting *corporeity*, it is not merely = *body*, but designates man's earthly being. Simply as the substance which with blood forms the basis and medium

of our existence as qualified thereby, it occurs in Heb. ii. 14; cf. xii. 9. In it Christ has been manifested, His earthly existence and His saving work were conditioned and moulded thereby, v. 7, x. 20. As the characteristic form of our existence, its preponderance made the O. T. δικαιώματα δικαιώματα σαρκός, "carnal ordinances," ix. 10 (cf. ἐντολή σαρκίνη, vii. 16, with διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου, ix. 14), and to it the efficacy of the O. T. ordinances through lack of the spirit were narrowed; ix. 13, τοὺς κεκοινωνημένους ἡγιάζει πρὸς τὴν τῆς σαρκὸς καθαρότητα (cf. Num. xix. 7), i.e. the operations and ordainments of the O. T. economy had as their immediate object and limit the corporeal manifestation of life which is qualified as σάρξ. This only was attained, that the σάρξ did not prevent fellowship and participation with the O. T. economy together with its promises and hopes; cf. Rom. viii. 3, 7, 14. Cf. *Apol. Cons.* A 254, *dicebantur in lege quaedam propitiatoria sacrificia propter significationem seu similitudinem, non quod mererentur remissionem peccatorum coram Deo, sed quia mererentur remissionem peccatorum secundum justitiam legis, ne illi pro quibus fiebant excluderentur ab ista politia.* The O. T. never expresses this so clearly as the Epistle to the Hebrews, but the conception of σάρξ with which that Epistle has to do is none other than that of the O. T., and rests upon the O. T. antithesis between flesh and spirit, Heb. ix. 14, xii. 9, developed as in Matt. xxvi. 41, Mark xiv. 38; and the πρὸς τὴν τῆς σαρκὸς καθαρότητα, which also imputes sin to the σάρξ, has its O. T. anticipation in the command of the רָצָה רָצָה, Lev. xiv. 10, xv. 13, 16, xvi. 4, and often.

In the Johannine writings it is primarily the contrast between the divine and human that is expressed in the designation of the latter by the σάρξ which qualifies it, and which is at the same time the O. T. contrast between the power of the spirit and the weakness of the flesh, John i. 14, vi. 63. This contrast, where it asserts itself or is realized conformably with the σάρξ, produces desire and conduct which as conformed to the σάρξ is sinful, John viii. 15; 1 John ii. 16. Yet this, apart from Gen. vi. 3, 12, is not an O. T. mode of expression; it goes farther than Matt. xxvi. 41, but like the πρὸς τὴν τῆς σαρκὸς καθαρότητα of the Hebrews, runs upon the same lines upon which the conception of רָצָה moves, and is akin to the striking expressions of the Petrine Epistles and the Epistle of Jude, both where σάρξ and sin appear together, 1 Pet. iv. 1, and where the special idea of sins of the flesh is named, 2 Pet. ii. 10, 18; Jude 7, 8, 23.

2. In the Pauline writings. Paul makes the most comprehensive use of this conception, and brings out all the elements it contains as they appear in the light of the Gospel and in the work of the Holy Spirit, and indeed to such a degree that the O. T. antithesis between רָצָה and רָצָה becomes a contrast between the N. T. πνεῦμα ἅγιον and σάρξ; and in this light σάρξ, as is also matter of experience, appears as σὰρξ ἁμαρτίας, while the antithesis of Matt. xxvi. 41 is differently expressed, and presents itself as an antithesis of νοῦς and σάρξ.

(a) Σάρξ primarily in Paul's writings designates the substance of the body, in combination with ὀστέα, Eph. v. 30, μέλη ἐσμὲν τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ

καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὁστέων αὐτοῦ (cf. Luke xxiv. 39). 1 Cor. xv. 39 stands alone, οὐ πᾶσα σὰρξ ἡ αὐτὴ σὰρξ, ἀλλή δὲ σὰρξ κτηνῶν κ.τ.λ. (the only Pauline passage where σὰρξ is used of the lower animals); cf. vv. 38, 40, σῶμα; 1 Cor. vi. 16, ὁ κολλώμενος τῇ πόρνῃ ἐν σῶμά ἐστιν, ἔσονται γὰρ οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν; Eph. v. 31, cf. ver. 28 (Matt. xix. 5, 6; Mark x. 8). In the combinations σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα, on the other hand, the quality or nature of σὰρξ is dwelt upon; see what follows. Rarely (*b*) the body itself is called σὰρξ, according to the substance which characterizes it; cf. Col. ii. 5, τῇ σαρκὶ ἄπειμι ἀλλὰ τῷ πνεύματι σὺν ὑμῖν εἰμί, with 1 Cor. v. 3, ἀπὸν τῷ σώματι, παρὼν δὲ τῷ πνεύματι. In Col. ii. 5 σὰρξ is chosen, as already in ver. 1, τὸ πρόσωπον μου ἐν σαρκί, because absence in body is more than outweighed and supplied by fellowship of spirit or "in spirit," which is far before all that is designated by σὰρξ; cf. also 2 Cor. vii. 5, οὐδεμίαν ἔσχηκεν ἄνεσιν ἢ σὰρξ ἡμῶν, with ii. 13, οὐκ ἔσχηκα ἄνεσιν τῷ πνεύματι μου; 1 Cor. vii. 28, θλιψὺν δὲ τῇ σαρκὶ ἔξουσιν; v. 5, εἰς ὄλεθρον τῆς σαρκὸς ἵνα τὸ πνεῦμα σωθῇ. Wherever σὰρξ denotes the body, it is corporeity after its kind which comes into consideration, which is viewed according to the substance of it, and this its nature is indicated partly by its contrast with the inward man, the πνεῦμα after its kind, or the καρδιά, Rom. ii. 28, ἡ ἐν τῷ φανερωῷ ἐν σαρκὶ περιτομή in antithesis with ver. 29, περιτομή καρδίας ἐν πνεύματι οὐ γράμματι; Eph. ii. 11, ἔθνη ἐν σαρκὶ οἱ λεγόμενοι ἀκροβυστία ὑπὸ τῆς λεγομένης περιτομῆς ἐν σαρκὶ χειροποιήτου; Col. ii. 13, ἀκροβ. τῆς σαρκὸς; Gal. vi. 13, ἵνα ἐν τῇ ὑμετέρᾳ σαρκὶ καυχῶνται; cf. Deut. x. 16, Ezek. xxxvi. 26, xlv. 7, 9, and ψυχὴ and σὰρξ, e.g. Ps. lxiii. 2, lxxxiv. 3, in the main as distinguished from God and His Spirit, expressing itself in its frailty, weakness, and need, 2 Cor. vii. 5, cf. with ver. 6, ἀλλ' ὁ παρακαλῶν τοὺς ταπεινοὺς παρεκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς ὁ θεός; 2 Cor. iv. 11, ἵνα ἡ ζωὴ τοῦ Ἰϋ φανερωθῇ ἐν τῇ θνητῇ σαρκὶ ἡμῶν; Phil. i. 22, τὸ ζῆν ἐν σαρκί; ver. 24, τὸ ἐπιμένειν τῇ σαρκί; cf. ver. 20, ὡς πάντοτε καὶ νῦν μεγαλυνθήσεται Χς ἐν τῷ σώματί μου, εἴτε διὰ ζωῆς, εἴτε διὰ θανάτου, and carrying with it a contrasted relation to God and His testimony when it asserts itself as σὰρξ; 1 Cor. x. 3, ἐν σαρκὶ γὰρ περιπατοῦντες οὐ κατὰ σάρκα στρατευόμεθα; Rom. xiii. 14, τῆς σαρκὸς πρόνοιαν μὴ ποιεῖσθε εἰς ἐπιθυμίαν. That this may not be obliterated or lost sight of, we might in all these cases translate σὰρξ not body, but body of flesh; but in most cases the rendering flesh not only suffices, but does full justice to the apostle's thought, inasmuch as he is treating not of the body as such, but of that which constitutes it after its kind; cf. Gal. vi. 13, θέλουσιν ὑμᾶς περιτέμνεσθαι ἵνα ἐν τῇ ὑμετέρᾳ σαρκὶ καυχῶνται, with ver. 12, ὅσοι θέλουσιν εὐπροσωπῆσαι ἐν σαρκί; also Rom. iv. 1-10, 11; 2 Cor. xi. 18, κατὰ σάρκα καυχᾶσθαι; Phil. iii. 3, 4, πεποιθέναι σαρκί, ἐν σαρκί; cf. ver. 5; Rom. iv. 1, τί ἐροῦμεν Ἀβραὰμ εὐρηκεῖν κατὰ σάρκα; cf. vv. 10, 11; Col. ii. 13, νεκροὶ ἐν τῇ ἀκροβυστίᾳ τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν. So much does the apostle dwell on the conception of σὰρξ, on that which σὰρξ represents and its phenomena, that the thing itself falls into the background, and (*c*) the O. T. designation of mankind as πᾶσα σὰρξ occurs very occasionally in his Epistles, Rom. iii. 20, οὐ

δικαιοθήσεται πᾶσα σὰρξ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ, without ἐν. α. in Gal. ii. 16; and only besides in 1 Cor. i. 29, ὅπως μὴ καυχῆσεται πᾶσα σὰρξ ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ. In this class we may include the combinations σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα to designate what man is in his nature as distinct from God and all other non-terrestrial beings, Gal. i. 16; 1 Cor. xv. 50; Eph. vi. 12.

But the σάρξ, as such, which we carry about with us, and which determines our being, is regarded by the apostle (*d*) as that which mediates and gives form to the natural continuity of humanity; Gen. ii. 23, 24; 1 Cor. vi. 16; Gal. iv. 23, ὁ μὲν ἐκ τῆς παιδίσκης κατὰ σάρκα γεγέννηται; ver. 29, ὁ κατὰ σάρκα γεννηθείς, in contrast with ὁ κατὰ πνεῦμα, where κατὰ σάρκα is equivalent to "according to the conditions of human nature present in the σάρξ;" Rom. viii. 9, τὰ τέκνα τῆς σαρκός, in contrast with τῆς ἐπαγγελίας; cf. iv. 19. (Hence σάρξ as the object of sensuality—not with Paul—Jude 2; 2 Pet. ii. 10, 18; cf. Ecclus. xxiii. 16, and under II. (*b*).) Hence also σάρξ used of kinship, Rom. xi. 14, εἴ πως παραζηλώσω μου τὴν σάρκα; cf. ix. 3, ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου τῶν συγγενῶν μου κατὰ σάρκα; ix. 5, ἐξ ὧν ὁ Χρὶς τὸ κακὰ σάρκα; i. 3, ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυὶδ κατὰ σάρκα; 1 Cor. x. 18, βλέπετε τὸν Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ σάρκα. Cf. in the O. T. Isa. lviii. 7; Judg. ix. 2; 2 Sam. v. 1, xix. 13; Gen. ii. 23. Σάρξ denotes the human species, humanity, not distinct from its corporeal manifestation, but in and through this, by which Christ τὸ κατὰ σάρκα, Rom. ix. 3, is a member of the people of Israel and of mankind, 1 Tim. iii. 16, ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί; Col. i. 22, ὑμᾶς ἀποκατήλλαξεν ἐν τῷ σώματι τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ (cf. Heb. x. 20, xii. 9; 1 John iv. 2), and this goes so far that in Rom. viii. 3 it is said, ὁ θεὸς τὸ ἑαυτοῦ υἱὸν πέμψας ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας (see ὁμοίωμα). To σάρξ thus belongs (*e*) all that distinguishes the natural man after his kind; cf. 1 Cor. iii. 4, ἄνθρωποι, parallel with ver. 3, σαρκικοὶ ἐστε καὶ κατ' ἄνθρωπον περιπατεῖτε; Rom. vi. 19, ἀνθρώπινον λέγω διὰ τὴν ἀσθενεῖαν τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν; and hence the natural idiosyncrasy of man, resting on a natural basis, springing therefrom, active and manifesting itself thereby, is designated κατὰ σάρκα; 1 Cor. i. 26, σοφοὶ κατὰ σάρκα, parallel with ver. 27, τοῦ κόσμου; compare vv. 20, 21, 25. Hence its contrast with καινὴ κτίσις, 2 Cor. v. 16, 17, and the parallelism with ὁ παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος, Rom. vi. 6, viii. 3 sqq., and also with ὁ ἔξω ἄνθρ., 2 Cor. iv. 11, 16; Col. i. 24. This kind or character belonging to man by way of nature, through the σάρξ, is always regarded from a religious point of view, and distinguishes man over against God, upon the basis of his existence realized by means of the flesh and in the flesh; and hence the O. T. contrast between God and man, between עֲלִי and עֲדָם, as it still sounds in Rom. i. 3, 4, τοῦ γενομένου ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυὶδ κατὰ σάρκα, τοῦ ὀρισθέντος υἱοῦ θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιοσύνης; cf. 1 Tim. iii. 16, ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκί, ἐδικαιώθη ἐν πν. (see δικαιόω, δικαιοσύνη) becomes the contrast between πνεῦμα and σάρξ, πνεῦμα being always the N. T. πν. ἅγιον, the Spirit of God's saving presence as He dwells in the members of the new covenant, Rom. viii. 3, οἱ μὴ κατὰ σάρκα περιπατοῦντες ἀλλὰ κατὰ πνεῦμα; Gal. iii. 3, ἐναρξάμενοι πνεύματι νῦν

σαρκὶ ἐπιτελείσθε; Gal. vi. 8, ὁ σπείρων εἰς τὴν σάρκα ἑαυτοῦ ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς θερίσει φθοράν, ὁ δὲ σπείρων εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος θερίσει ζωὴν αἰώνιον. This contrast is not to be confounded with that named under (c), between σάρξ and the inward man as designated πνεῦμα, i.e. with the contrast between σάρξ and the πνεῦμα of man apart from the indwelling of the Holy Spirit; it is a contrast between σάρξ and a new principle of life, as is clear from Rom. viii. 4-9, 12-15. Ver. 5, οἱ γὰρ κατὰ σάρκα ὄντες τὰ τῆς σαρκὸς φρονοῦσιν, οἱ δὲ κατὰ πνεῦμα τὰ τοῦ πν.; ver. 9, ὑμεῖς δὲ οὐκ ἐστὲ ἐν σαρκὶ ἀλλὰ ἐν πν. εἵπερ πνεῦμα θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν; ver. 10, Χρ̄ς ἐν ὑμῖν; ver. 11, διὰ τοῦ ἐνοικούντος αὐτοῦ πν. ἐν ὑμῖν; vv. 13, 14, 15, ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα υἰοθεσίας; Gal. v. 16, πνεύματι περιπατεῖτε καὶ ἐπιθυμίαν σαρκὸς οὐ μὴ τελέσητε; ver. 17, ἡ γὰρ σάρξ ἐπιθυμεῖ κατὰ τοῦ πν. κ.τ.λ.; ver. 18, εἰ δὲ πνεύματι ἄγεσθε; vv. 19, 22, τὰ ἔργα τῆς σαρκὸς — ὁ καρπὸς τοῦ πν. Cf. ver. 24, οἱ δὲ τοῦ Χρ̄ τὴν σάρκα ἐσταύρωσαν, with Rom. vi. 6, ὁ παλαιὸς ἡμῶν ἄνθρ. συνεσταυρώθη; Gal. v. 25. To this belongs also 2 Cor. vii. 1, μολυσμὸς σαρκὸς καὶ πν., defilement pertaining to man in his corporeal form, which injures the new divine principle within. This is an antithesis distinctively Pauline, and in accordance with it (f) is the view, traceable indeed in other N. T. writings, though not so comprehensively and fully dwelt upon and carried out, of the connection of σάρξ with sin, so represented that σάρξ, in express or implied contrast to this πνεῦμα, includes the sinful bias which overcomes man and belongs to him. It is σάρξ ἁμαρτίας, Rom. viii. 3, for it is determined by sin, and hands down both sin and its consequences with the life. The body is a σῶμα τῆς σαρκὸς in this sense, Col. ii. 11, cf. i. 22, whereby the members of the fleshly corporeity become the seat of the νόμος τῆς ἁμαρτίας, Rom. vii. 23; compare ver. 5, ὅτε γὰρ ἦμεν ἐν τῇ σαρκί, τὰ παθήματα τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἐνεργεῖτο ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν ἡμῶν. It is the seat of sin, Rom. vii. 20, ἡ οἰκοῦσα ἐν ἐμοί, — ver. 18, τουτέστιν ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου — ἁμαρτία, cf. viii. 13, whence it becomes clear, not indeed that the σάρξ is itself like πνεῦμα a principle, i.e. the principle of sin, but that it is only the seat and instrument of sin; yet as such, being, moreover, the bearer and the medium of life, it stands contrasted with the πνεῦμα, and acts in the form of a principle, as a power determining the person; cf. Rom. viii. 5, οἱ κατὰ σάρκα ὄντες, with ver. 8, οἱ ἐν σαρκὶ ὄντες; 2 Cor. x. 2, 3, ἐν σαρκὶ γὰρ περιπατοῦντες οὐ κατὰ σάρκα στρατευόμεθα. The apostle distinguishes between σάρξ and νοῦς, in which latter the spirit, as the universal and divine life principle, acts as in conscience, and he says, Rom. vii. 25, ἄρα οὖν αὐτὸς ἐγὼ τῷ μὲν νοῷ δουλεύω νόμῳ θεοῦ, τῇ δὲ σαρκὶ νόμῳ ἁμαρτίας, and cannot here employ πνεῦμα (as in Matt. xxvi. 41) on account of the other contrast between σάρξ and πνεῦμα, which he deals with and gives full weight to in chap. viii. But, on the other hand, the νοῦς as well as the σῶμα is influenced by the σάρξ, since the individual partakes of its nature as inborn with the flesh, so that the νοῦς with which we are said to serve God, Rom. vii. 25 (cf. σῶμα, 1 Cor. vi. 20; Rom. xii. 1, σάρξ is never thus used), becomes a νοῦς τῆς σαρκὸς; Col. ii. 18, φυσιοῦμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ νοὸς τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ; Eph. ii. 3, ποιῶντες τὰ θελήματα τῆς σαρκὸς καὶ

τῶν διανοιῶν, in explanation of the ἀναστρέφεσθαι ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις τῆς σαρκός, compare σῶμα τῆς σαρκός, Rom. vii. 23; cf. vv. 5, 20, vi. 13, and κατὰ σάρκα ζῆν, parallel with the πράξεις τοῦ σώματος, Rom. viii. 12, 13. Further, φρόνημα τῆς σαρκός, Rom. viii. 6, 7, ver. 5, τὰ τῆς σαρκός φρονεῖν, and ἐπιθυμία τῆς σαρκός, Gal. v. 16, 24; cf. ver. 17; Eph. ii. 3; Rom. xiii. 14; Col. ii. 23, ἐν ἀφειδίᾳ σώματος—πρὸς πλησμονὴν τῆς σαρκός; Gal. v. 13, εἰς ἀφορμὴν τῇ σαρκί. It depends upon what aspect of σάρξ is adopted; but that the idea is not in the first instance borrowed from its connection with sin, or needs to be specially expressed thus, is clear from such passages as Rom. viii. 3; 1 Cor. v. 5; 2 Cor. xii. 7, ἵνα μὴ ὑπεραίρωμαι ἐδόθη μοι σκόλοψ τῇ σαρκί. Cf. 1 Pet. iv. 1 sqq. Now while, on the one hand, the Pauline manner of speaking of σάρξ with such special emphasis seems akin with the way in which Plutarch (following Epicurus) speaks of it, and while this resemblance seems to be confirmed by the antithesis of σάρξ and νοῦς, Rom. vii. 25, we must not, on the other hand, overlook the fact that the ἐπιθυμίαι τῆς σαρκός in Plutarch are only a fragment of what Paul calls τὰ παθήματα τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν ἡμῶν, Rom. vii. 5, or τὰ ἔργα τῆς σαρκός, Gal. v. 19. The ἐπιθυμίαι τῆς σ. in Plutarch differ from the Pauline ἐπιθυμία σ., Gal. v. 16, just as the contrasted terms in each case differ, νοῦς in Plutarch, and πνεῦμα sc. ἅγιον in Paul. The σάρξ in Plutarch is sensuality; τὰ τοῦ σώματος πάθη, αἱ ἐπιθ. τῆς σ., τῇ σ. δεδουλωσθαι, signify only the sensational longing after enjoyment. The σάρξ with Paul is the material nature-basis of our life, in and through which sin in all its ramifications overcomes and possesses us. The Pauline view of σάρξ is fully rooted in the O. T. phraseology, and simply gives expression to the whole contents of the conception,—important as that conception is for the O. T. view of mankind,—on the ground of, and in connection with, man's personal experience alike of sin and of salvation. The usage adopted by Plutarch, which is also traceable in Latin writers, e.g. in Seneca, may serve as a point of connection whereto may be linked the announcements of the gospel, but the gospel view does not unfold itself from it, although the νοῦς of Plutarch may, in certain circumstances, be included under the νοῦς τῆς σαρκός, the θελήματα τῆς σαρκός καὶ τῶν διανοιῶν; and, under certain conditions, the contrast with the σάρξ expressed in Rom. vii. 25 may be traced in his statements. We must abide by the remark of Wittenbach on Plut. *Mor.* p. 126 C, *Epicurea consuetudo loquendi manavit ex colluvione vulgi; ecclesiasticus σαρκός usus latissime ille patens ex Hebraeo fonte fluxit.* Compare, *inter alia*, Holsten, *über die Bed. des Wortes σάρξ im Lehrbegriffe des Paulus*, 1855 (reprinted in his treatise, *zum Evangelium des Paulus u. Petrus*, 1868). Wendt, *die Begriffe Fleisch u. Geist im bibl. Sprachgebrauch*, 1878; and my article "*Fleisch*" in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* ed. 2.

Σαρκικός. Lachm., Tisch., Treg., Westc. read this in 1 Cor. iii. 3; 2 Cor. i. 12; and σόρκινος is indisputable in 2 Cor. iii. 3. In the LXX. we have only σάρκινος, whereas σαρκικός is attested by only few MSS. in 2 Chron. xxxii. 8, μετὰ αὐτοῦ

βραχίονες σάρκινοι, μεθ' ἡμῶν δὲ κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν. Cf. Add. Esth. iv. 7, θανμασθῆναι βασιλέα σάρκινον εἰς αἰῶνα. Ezek. xi. 19 and xxxvi. 26, καρδιά σαρκίνη over against λιθίνη.

Σέβω. Used of heathen *cultus*, Bel and the Dragon iv. 23; but in the biblical sense, Prayer of Azariah ix. 67, σέβ. τὸν θεόν; 2 Macc. i. 3, with the addition, καὶ ποιεῖν αὐτοῦ τὰ θελήματα καρδία μεγάλη καὶ ψυχῇ βουλομένη; 3 Macc. iii. 4, καὶ τῷ τούτου νόμῳ πολιτευόμενοι; Bel and the Dragon, ver. 5, οὐ σέβομαι εἰδῶλα χειροποίητα, ἀλλὰ τὸν ζῶντα θεόν. Cf. Josephus, *Ant.* xiv. 7. 2, πάντων τῶν κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην Ἰουδαίων καὶ σεβομένων τὸν θεόν. — In Acts xiii. 43, of proselytes, οἱ σεβόμενοι προσήλυτοι; xvii. 4, οἱ σεβ. Ἕλληνες; ver. 17, οἱ Ἰουδ. καὶ σεβόμενοι; xiii. 50, οἱ δὲ Ἰουδ. παρώτρυναν τὰς σεβομένας γυναῖκας. — Σεβάζομαι, of heathen *cultus*, Rom. i. 25; ἐσεβάσθησαν καὶ ἐλάτρευσαν τῇ κτίσει παρὰ τὸν κτίσαντα. — Σέβασμα, in biblical Greek only in a heathen sense, Wisd. xiv. 20, τὸν πρὸ ὀλίγου τιμηθέντα ἄνθρωπον νῦν σέβασμα ἐλογίσαντο; xv. 17; Bel 27. Like σέβας = *reverential homage*.

Ἀσεβής, ἐς, acc. ἀσεβήν, Tisch., Rom. iv. 5, but Treg, Westc. read ἀσεβῆ; cf. Sturz, *De dial. mac.* p. 127 sqq.; Buttmann, viii. 12. The Hebrew נָפִי is rendered oftenest by ἀσεβής, less frequently by ἁμαρτωλός, more seldom still by ἄνομος, and very occasionally by ἄδικος, παράνομος, ἔνοχος, πονηρός, σκληρός. In the Psalms ἁμαρτωλός prevails, especially where the sufferings of the righteous under the oppression of the wicked and sinners is treated of; ἀσεβής appears there only in Book I., but is not even there the prevailing word, it occurs only where the suffering of the righteous is not contrasted (i. 1, 4, 5, 6, ix. 6, x. 2, 15, xi. 5, xii. 9, xvii. 9, 13, xxvi. 5, xxxi. 18, xxxvi. 28, 35, 38); we elsewhere find ἁμαρτωλός = נָפִי, only in 2 Chron. xix. 2; Prov. xxiv. 19; Isa. xiv. 5; Ezek. xxxiii. 8, 11, 19 (elsewhere = נָפִי, נָפִי). Ἀσεβής occurs chiefly in Job, Proverbs, Eccles., where, accordingly, the main idea is not the behaviour of the ungodly towards others,—the oppression of the righteous,—but their wicked behaviour towards God and God's ways. It occurs in Gen., Exodus, Deut., Isaiah, Jeremiah, standing almost everywhere for נָפִי. Ἄνομος, which denotes neglect of God concretely as = despal of His law, in the usual rendering for נָפִי in Ezek. iii. 18, 19, xiii. 22, xviii. 20–27, xxi. 25, 29, xxxiii. 8, 12 (ἀσεβής only in xxxiii. 8, 9, 11, 14), and seldom elsewhere. Ἄδικος is employed only in a social sense. Thus in O. T. Greek ἀσεβής strictly designates the man who has God's judgment against him, because he stands in a wrong relation to God, and acts accordingly. Ἀσεβής prevails in the LXX., ἁμαρτωλός only in Eccles., where it is frequent, and where ἄνομος also is not very rare. In the N. T. ἀσεβής falls strikingly into the background (see ἄδικος), because the conduct to which it applies is there called ἀπιστία.—Ἀσέβεια is more frequently = נָפִי (with ἀδικία, ἄνομος, ἀνομία), Ps. lxxiii. 6; Jer. vi. 7; Ezek. xii. 9; Obadiah 10; Micah vi. 12; Hab. i. 3, ii. 8, 17; Zeph. i. 10; Mal. ii. 16. It is = נָפִי in Ezek. xvi. 57, xxiii. 27, 29, 35, 48 (also ἀνομία, and occasionally other words); but most

frequently = נַפְשׁ, for which also, but less frequently, we find ἁμαρτία and ἀνομία, rarely ἀδικία, and others. The plural is frequent in the LXX. Ps. v. 11, lxv. 4; Jer. v. 6; Lam. i. 6; Ezek. xviii. 28, 30, 31, xxi. 24, xxxvii. 23; Amos i. 3-13, ii. 1-6, iii. 14, v. 12; Micah i. 13, iii. 8; Isa. lix. 20; answering to the Hebrew נַפְשׁ. The singular = נַפְשׁ, only in 1 Sam. xxiv. 12; Prov. xxviii. 13; Micah i. 5, vi. 7, while נַפְשׁ and נַפְשׁ are usually rendered by the singular.—Ἀσεβέω is = נַפְשׁ, also in Hos. vii. 13, viii. 1; Amos iv. 4; = נַפְשׁ in Jer. xxii. 3; Zeph. iii. 5, εἰς τὸν νόμον. Also = נַפְשׁ, 2 Sam. xxii. 22; Job ix. 20, x. 7, 15, xxxiv. 10; Ps. xviii. 22; Eccles. vii. 18; Dan. ix. 5. Occasionally = נַפְשׁ, נַפְשׁ. That it is stronger than ἁμαρτάνειν appears from Lam. iii. 41; Dan. ix. 5. It usually signifies *an abandonment or denial of God's will and way*; see ἀπὸ θεοῦ ἀσεβεῖν, 2 Sam. xxii. 22; Ps. xviii. 22; ἔναντι κυρίου, Job xxxiv. 10; εἰς θεόν, Jer. ii. 8, iii. 13; Hos. vii. 13; κατὰ τοῦ νόμου μου, Hos. viii. 1; and only in this strong sense, in which it stands over against ἀγνοεῖν καὶ πλανᾶσθαι, and as stronger than παράβασις, is the expression justified in Wisd. xiv. 9.

Εὐσεβής. This word is frequent only in 4 Macc. i. 1, 7, 16, x. 15, xiii. 1, xv. 20, etc. The N. T. follows the disinclination of the LXX. to use it, employing it to describe Cornelius, εὐσεβὴς καὶ φοβούμενος τὸν θεόν. In Acts xxii. 12 it is not well attested, the εὐσεβής of the Rec. being, since Lachm., supplanted by εὐλαβής. Further in 2 Pet. ii. 9, οἶδεν κύριος εὐσεβεῖς ἐκ πειρασμῶν ῥύεσθαι, ἀδίκους δὲ κ.τ.λ., as in Isaiah. As to the adverb and substantive in the Pastoral Epistles, see εὐσέβεια, εὐσεβῶς. Εὐσεβῶς occurs in biblical Greek only in Tit. ii. 12, 2 Tim. iii. 12, and in 4 Macc., where εὐσέβεια, εὐσεβής, εὐσεβεῖν are favourite words, in keeping with the import and character of the book *De rationis imperio*, wherein Israelitish faith and fear of God seeks to express itself in the language of Greek philosophy and Greek life. There the adv. vii. 21, τίς πρὸς ὅλον τὸν τῆς φιλοσοφίας κανόνα εὐσεβῶς φιλοσοφῶν = pious, God-fearing. (Fritzsche cancels εὐσ.) Elsewhere only in 2 Tim. iii. 12, ζῆν εὐσεβῶς ἐν Χρ. Ἰν., and in a purely Greek combination, Tit. ii. 12, ἵνα ἀρνησάμενοι τὴν ἀσέβειαν καὶ τὰς κοσμικὰς ἐπιθυμίας, σωφρόνως καὶ δικαίως καὶ εὐσεβῶς ζήσωμεν ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰῶνι, in the sense of εὐσεβής, Xen. Mem. iv. 8. 11.—Ἀσέβεια denotes *the despoliation of God*, that turning away from Him which characterizes heathendom. As to its use in the Pastoral Epistles, see εὐσέβεια and καλός. Schmidt, *die Ethik der alten Griechen*, i. 307, says, "the Hippolytus of Euripides is in one place called *just* (1307-1309, cf. 656), because he declines to court Phaedra, but *pious* because he will not break the pledge he had given her." In Christianity the true εὐσέβεια becomes possible, as including fellowship with Christ, and through Christ with God.

Σθένος is = נַפְשׁ, Job xxiv. 14, iv. 10; 3 Macc. ii. 2.—Ἀσθενής is = ἥσυχ, Ezek. xvii. 14, βασιλεία α.; Num. xiii. 9; Job iv. 3 = נַפְשׁ; 1 Sam. ii. 9, κύριος ἀσθενῇ ποιήσει τὸν ἀντιδικόν σου = נַפְשׁ. Nowhere in the N. T. absolutely of moral weakness. Cf. Ps. vi. 2, ἐλέησον με κύριε ὅτι ἀσθενής εἰμι· ἰάσαι με κύριε, ὅτι ἐταράχθη τὰ ὀστέα

μου κ.τ.λ. = לִּחְיֵי . Cf. ἀσθενεῖν, Ps. ix. 4, ἀσθενήσουσι καὶ ἀπολούνται ἀπὸ προσώπου σου; Ps. cvii. 12, ἐταπεινώθη ἐν κόποις ἡ καρδία αὐτῶν, ἡσθένησαν καὶ οὐκ ἦν ὁ βοηθῶν. We might perhaps compare νεκρός. Cf. Wisd. xiii. 17, parallel with ἄψυχος, νεκρός. Ἀσθένεια rarely occurs in the LXX., Eccles. xii. 4 = לֵבִי ; Ps. xvi. 4 = לֵבִי ; also differently in Jer. vi. 21, xviii. 23; Job xxxvii. 7.—Ἀσθενέω is the usual word in the LXX. for לָחַץ ; but is also used for a number of other words, such as לָחַץ , לָחַץ , לָחַץ , לָחַץ , but isolatedly.

Σκάνδαλον, τό, with its derivatives, only in biblical and patristic Greek; and therefore perhaps the Alexandrine form for σκανδάληθρον, which signifies "the bent piece of wood in the trap on which the bait is placed, and which, when touched by the animal, springs out, causes the trap to close, and catches him, Pollux, vii. 114, x. 156; metaphorically σκανδάληθρ' ἰστάς ἐπ' ὧν, Aristoph. Ach. 687, one who sets a word-trap for another, in order to catch him as in a noose," Passow. That σκάνδαλον with its derivatives belongs only to biblical and ecclesiastical Greek is in keeping with the thought it expresses, which is not to be found beyond the sphere of revelation. It answers in the LXX. to the Hebrew שִׁבְלֵי (which also sometimes is = παγίς, which again elsewhere is = נֶבֶל , נֶבֶלָה), and differs from παγίς, which strictly answers to this word, in that παγίς always implies a reference simply to the injury lurking or hidden in the ambush, and not so much to the suffering; whereas σκάνδαλον involves a reference also to the conduct of the person who through this is said to be injured. We do not indeed always find this in σκάνδαλον, e.g. not in Ps. cxl. 6, cxli. 9, lxix. 23 = שִׁבְלֵי , where it is quite parallel with παγίς, nor in Ps. l. 20, where τιθένα σκάνδαλον is parallel with καταλαλεῖν. Ps. cxix. 165, Lev. xix. 14, 1 Sam. xxv. 31 = לִּשְׁבִּלֵי . But it always denotes an enticement or occasion, leading to conduct which brings with it the ruin of the person in question, Judg. ii. 3, ἔσονται ὑμῖν εἰς συνοχὰς καὶ οἱ θεοὶ αὐτῶν ἔσονται ὑμῖν εἰς σκάνδαλον; cf. ver. 2, οὐδὲ τοῖς θεοῖς αὐτῶν προσκυνήσετε; vii. 27, ἐποίησεν αὐτὸ Γεδεὼν εἰς Ἐφὼδ καὶ ἔστησεν αὐτὸ ἐν πόλει αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐξεπόρνευσεν πᾶς Ἰσρ. ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ ἐκεῖ καὶ ἐγένετο τῷ Γεδεὼν καὶ τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ εἰς σκῶλον, Alex. σκάνδαλον; 1 Sam. xviii. 21, δώσω αὐτήν αὐτῷ καὶ ἔσται αὐτῷ εἰς σκ. In the Apocrypha, mainly of injury or mischief lying in ambush or concealment, Judith v. 1, ἔθηκεν ἐν τοῖς πεδίοις σκάνδαλα; 1 Macc. v. 4, xxvii. 23, ἐν τοῖς λόγοις σου δώσει σκάνδαλον; more generally what injures any one, what one stumbles at, Ecclus. vii. 6; only once perhaps with a reference to the conduct called forth by the σκ. and leading on to ruin, Wisd. xiv. 11, διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἐν εἰδώλοις ἐθνῶν ἐπισκοπῇ ἔσται, ὅτι ἐν κτίσματι θεοῦ εἰς βδέλυγμα ἐγενήθησαν καὶ εἰς σκάνδαλα ψυχαῖς ἀνθρώπων καὶ εἰς παγίδα ποσὶν ἀφρόνων, cf. Judg. vii. 27; see also, however, Ps. cvi. 36. In the N. T., on the contrary, the conception of σκάνδαλον determines itself mainly with reference to the fact that it produces certain behaviour which leads to ruin, and rarely denotes merely a hidden unexpected cause of ruin. (a) The latter is the case in Rom. ix. 33, ἰδοὺ τίθημι ἐν Σιών λίθον προσκόμματος καὶ πέτραν σκανδάλου καὶ ὁ πιστεύων

ἐπ' αὐτῷ οὐ κατασυνθήσεται, and 1 Pet. ii. 8, from Isa. viii. 14, where in the LXX. $\text{לִישָׁרָהּ הָיָה} = \text{πέτρας πτόμα}$, parall. λίθου πρόσκομμα. So also Rom. xi. 9, from Ps. lxi. 23; cf. Lev. xix. 14, ἀπέναντι τυφλοῦ οὐ προσθήσεις σκάνδαλον; Psalter. Sol. iv. 27, ῥύσεται ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ παντός σκανδάλου παρανόμου, parall. ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπων δολίων καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν. But (b) in most cases the σκάνδαλον is something which gives occasion to conduct leading to ruin, the cause of a course of sin leading to ruin or to a fall, Rev. ii. 14, ὃς ἐδίδασκεν τῷ Βαλάκ βαλεῖν σκάνδαλον ἐνώπιον τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ, φαγεῖν εἰδωλόθута καὶ πορνεῦσαι; cf. Judg. vii. 27. So in 1 Cor. i. 23, ἡμεῖς δὲ κηρύσσομεν Χρ̄ν ἐσταυρωμένον Ἰουδαίοις μὲν σκάνδαλον, ἔθνεσιν δὲ μωρίαν (cf. βδελυγμός καὶ σκάνδαλον, 1 Sam. xxv. 31), and in like manner Gal. v. 11, τὸ σκάνδαλον τοῦ σταυροῦ. In this case the behaviour of one may become to another a πρόσκομμα ἢ σκάνδ., Rom. xiv. 13, and it is necessary σκοπεῖν τοὺς τὰς διχοστασίας καὶ τὰ σκάνδαλα παρὰ τὴν διδαχὴν . . . ποιούντας, for σκάνδαλα are things which lead others to turn away from God's salvation (or to fall, see σκανδαλίζω), and thus to come to ruin, Matt. xviii. 7; Luke xvii. 1; cf. Lev. iv. 3, $\text{וְעַל הַזֶּה הָיָה הַקִּרְבָּן הַזֶּה לְפָנֶיךָ דָּם, ἐὰν ἁμάρτη τοῦ τὸν λαὸν ἁμαρτεῖν}$. On account of this contrast, σκ. is (c) that at which one takes offence as an abomination, from the standing-point of him who knows it of himself (syn. βδελυγμός, 1 Sam. xxv. 31), as Christ says to Peter, Matt. xvi. 23, σκάνδαλον εἰ ἐμοῦ, ὅτι οὐ φρονεῖς τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀλλὰ τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων. But 1 John ii. 10, ὁ ἀγαπῶν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ φωτὶ μένει καὶ σκάνδαλον οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν αὐτῷ, is to be classed under (a); compare ver. 11, οὐκ οἶδεν ποῦ ὑπάγει ὅτι ἡ σκοτία ἐτύφλωσεν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ.

Σκαυδαλίζω, only in the Apocrypha, N. T., and patristic Greek; also Aquila Ps. lxiv. 9, Prov. iv. 12; cf. Isa. viii. 15, σκανδαλωθήσονται, not in the LXX.; = to commit that which leads to the fall and ruin of any one. (a) Without reference to the element of misleading = to throw any one unawares into ruin, passive = unawares to fall into ruin. Thus only in Ecclus ix. 5, παρθένον μὴ καταμάνθανε, μήποτε σκανδαλισθῆς ἐν τοῖς ἐπιτιμίοις αὐτῆς; xxiii. 8 parallel with καταλειφθῆναι. We may also refer here to Ecclus. xxxv. 13, ὁ ζητῶν νόμον ἐμπλησθήσεται αὐτοῦ καὶ ὁ ὑποκρινόμενος σκανδαλισθήσεται ἐν αὐτῷ. (b) On the other hand, in Psalter. Sol. xvi. 7, and always in the N. T., of occasion given for ungodly conduct, and ruin ensuing therefrom; Luther = to vex, *deteriorem facere et offendere*, so that the active is = to give offence, the passive = to take offence, though this translation is not suitable in all cases. Psalter. Sol. xvi. 7, ἐπικράτησόν μου, ὁ θεός, ἀπὸ ἁμαρτίας πονηρᾶς καὶ ἀπὸ πάσης γυναικὸς σκανδαλιζούσης ἄφρονα; cf. ver. 8, καὶ μὴ ἀπατησάτω με κάλλος γυναικὸς παρανομώσης. Thus the active, Matt. v. 29, 30; εἰ ὁ ὀφθαλμός, ἡ χεὶρ . . . σκανδαλίζει σε. In like manner, xviii. 8, 9; Mark ix. 43, 45, 47; 1 Cor. viii. 13, εἰ βρῶμα σκανδαλίζει τὸν ἀδελφόν μου,—ἵνα μὴ τὸν ἀδελφόν μου σκανδαλίσω, compare vv. 7–12. It denotes not *misleading*, but only the *giving occasion for ungodly conduct, and the mischief incurred thereby* (upon which the emphasis mainly lies), in Matt. xvii. 27, ἵνα μὴ σκανδαλίσωμεν αὐτούς; John vi. 1, τοῦτο

ὑμᾶς σκανδαλίζει. On the other hand = *craftily to entice or lead to ruin*, to effect that one shall adopt a course in which unperceived he will come to mischief and ruin (*i.e.* falls away and is ruined), in Matt. xviii. 6, ὃς δ' ἂν σκανδαλίῃ ἓνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων τῶν πιστευόντων εἰς ἐμέ; Mark ix. 42; cf. ver. 43 sqq.; Luke xvii. 2. The passive = *to be offended*, *i.e.* to be caught or affected by a σκάνδαλον, or to regard something as a σκάνδαλον (see σκάνδαλον (b)); Matt. xv. 12, οἱ Φαρισαῖοι ἀκούσαντες τὸν λόγον ἐσκανδαλίσθησαν, they regarded it as a σκάνδαλον; cf. ix. 3, οὗτος βλασφημεῖ; xxiv. 10, σκανδαλισθήσονται πολλοί; cf. xiii. 21, γενομένης θλίψεως διὰ τὸν λόγον εὐθὺς σκανδαλίζεται (Mark iv. 17), with Luke viii. 13, ἐν καιρῷ πειρασμοῦ ἀφίστανται. So also Matt. xxvi. 33, εἰ πάντες σκανδαλισθήσονται ἐν σοί, ἐγὼ οὐδέποτε σκανδαλισθήσομαι; Rom. xiv. 21, ἐν ᾧ ὁ ἀδελφός σου προσκόπτει, ἢ σκανδαλίζεται, ἢ ἀσθενεῖ; Treg., while Tisch., Westc. read simply προσκ.; 2 Cor. xi. 29, τίς ἀσθενεῖ—τίς σκανδαλίζεται; The combination σκανδ. ἐν τινι, Matt. xi. 6, xiii. 57, xxvi. 31, 33, Mark vi. 3, Luke vii. 23, like Ecclus. ix. 5, xxxv. 13, is not to be taken as instrumental, but denotes that wherein the σκάνδαλον is seen or discovered, or that which is taken as a σκάνδαλον; see σκάνδαλον (b).

Σ κ λ η ρ ό ς, ά, όν, arid, dry, hard, *e.g.* γῆ, ξυλόν, ἀήρ, ἄνεμος, etc. Of condition of body, *stiff, haggard*. Figuratively, *unbending, hard, unyielding, unpitiful*, etc. LXX. = נָפֶחַ (also = σκληροκάρδιος, σκληροπρόσωπος), only occasionally for other words, *e.g.* = נָפֶחַ, לָפֶחַ, וְנָפֶחַ, *et al.*, (a) literally, seldom in biblical Greek, Prov. xxvii. 16, Jas. iii. 4, ἄνεμος; Ps. xvii. 4, ὁδός; Wisd. xi. 14, λίθος. Otherwise (b) figuratively, ἔργα, *hard, difficult, not to be got through, tiresome* labour, Ex. i. 14, vi. 9; Deut. xxvi. 6; δουλεία, 1 Kings xii. 4; 2 Chron. x. 4; Isa. xiv. 3. To this belongs Acts xxvi. 14, σκληρόν σοι πρὸς κέντρα λακτίζειν. Ἀλγύδονες, 2 Macc. vi. 30; λαλεῖν, ἀποκρίνεσθαι, δεικνύναι σκληρά = *hard, rude, unfriendly, unpitiful*, Gen. xlii. 7, 30; 1 Kings xii. 13; Ps. lx. 5; λόγος, Jude 15; cf. χεῖρ, 1 Sam. v. 7; λιμός, Isa. viii. 21. Cf. 1 Kings xiv. 6, ἐγὼ εἰμι ἀπόστολος πρὸς σε σκληρός. Also John vi. 60, σκληρός ἐστὶν ὁ λόγος οὗτος· τίς δύναται αὐτοῦ ἀκούειν is not, after the analogy of σκληρὰ φράσις, to be understood as denoting figurative speech difficult to understand (cf. Dion. Hal. *de Thuc.* 30, σκληραγωγῶν τὴν λέξιν), but = *repellent, harsh*; cf. ver. 61, τοῦτο ὑμᾶς σκανδαλίζει; as also σκληρὰ λέγειν is used in Greek. Cf. also Isa. xxi. 2, φοβερόν τὸ ὄραμα καὶ σκληρόν ἀνηγγέλη μοι, which does not mean “hard to be understood.” In a psychological sense = *hard, unbending, unyielding, e.g.* ζῆλος, Song viii. 6; θυμός, Isa. xxviii. 2; τράχηλος, Deut. xxi. 27 (cf. σκληροτράχηλος, Ex. xxxiii. 3, 5, xxxiv. 9; Deut. ix. 6, 13; Bar. ii. 30, οὐ μὴ ἀκουσώσιν μου, ὅτι λαὸς σκληροτραχηλός ἐστίν; Ecclus. xvi. 11); σκληρός τὴν καρδίαν, Prov. xxviii. 14, opposed to εὐλάβεια; Ecclus. iii. 26, 27, καρδιά σκληρὰ βαρυνθήσεται πόνους καὶ ὁ ἁμαρτωλὸς προσθήσει ἁμαρτίαν ἐφ' ἁμαρτίαις (cf. σκληροκαρδία, σκληροκάρδιος, and Num. xvi. 26, ἀποσχίσθητε ἀπὸ τῶν σκληρῶν τῶν ἀνθρώπων τῶν σκληρῶν τούτων, = נָפֶחַ; cf. Ezek. ii. 4, υἱοὶ σκληροπρόσωποι καὶ στερεοκάρδιοι). Also = *hard-hearted*,

unpitiful, Isa. xix. 4; 1 Sam. xxv. 3; 2 Sam. iii. 39; Matt. xxv. 24. The connection always shows in which way the *σκληρότης* is meant, but the usage is not fixed in either way, as with the biblical *σκληρύνειν*.

Σκληρότης, τητος, ή, literally **hardness, harshness**; used figuratively of hard, rigid, unbending, or even wild and cruel disposition, but seldom thus in profane Greek, usually (Plato, Aristotle, Plutarch, *et al.*) of the state of body. In biblical Greek very seldom; (*a*) literally, Isa. iv. 6; (*b*) figuratively = **severe**, Isa. xxviii. 27, where the LXX. translate as abstract the concrete *ἡγή*; 2 Sam. xxii. 6, *σκληρότητες θανάτου* = *ἔρις*. Psychologically, only in Deut. ix. 27, *μὴ ἐπιβλέψῃς ἐπὶ τὴν σκληρότητα τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου καὶ τὰ ἁσεβήματα* = *ἔρις*; cf. *σκληρός*. Not in the Apocrypha; in the N. T. only in Rom. ii. 5, in the same sense as in Deut. ix. 27.

Σκληρύνω, only in later Greek (Hippocr., Galen) = **to make hard or stiff, to harden, to make obdurate**, and in a literal sense. Elsewhere only in biblical and patristic Greek; LXX. actively = *πῶρῃ*; passively = *πῶρ*; and sometimes also = *ῥῃ*, Kal and Piel, where *כִּל* is the object. Thus the word in biblical Greek becomes the *term. techn.* for **hardening of heart**, of disdain, inflexibleness, impenitence towards God's saving revelation, as *σκληρός* sometimes, and *σκληροκαρδία, σκληροκάριος, σκληροτράχηλος* are often used; see *σκληροκαρδία*. It is rarely used otherwise, as in Gen. xlix. 7, *ἐπικατάρατος ὁ θυμὸς αὐτῶν ὅτι ἀνθάδης, καὶ ἡ μῆνις αὐτῶν ὅτι ἐσκληρύνθη*, of reckless and bitter obstinacy. Cf. Judg. iv. 24, *χεὶρ σκληρυνομένη*; 2 Chron. x. 4, *τὸν ζυγόν*; 2 Kings ii. 10, *ἐσκληρύνῃς τοῦ αἰτήσασθαι*; 2 Sam. xix. 43, *ἐσκληρύνθη ὁ λόγος*, see *σκληρός*. Elsewhere always in an ethico-religious sense, (I.) the active = **to make hard, to harden**; (*a*) with man as subject, *σκληρύνειν τὸν τράχηλον*, Deut. x. 16; 2 Chron. xxx. 8, xxxvi. 13; Neh. ix. 16, 17, 29; Jer. vii. 25, xvii. 23, xix. 15; 1 Esdr. i. 46; *τὸν νῶτον*, 2 Kings xvii. 14; *τὰς καρδίας*, Ps. xciv. 8. In the N. T. Heb. iii. 8, 15, iv. 7, from Ps. xciv. 8. Here always = *πῶρῃ*. Cf. Ex. xiii. 15, *ἐσκληρυνε Φαραὼ ἀποστεῖλαι ἡμᾶς*. (*b*) With God as subject, of *judicial hardening* (opposed to *ἐλεεῖν*, Rom. ix. 18), which punishes sin by giving the person over to sin (cf. Rom. i. 21, 24, 26, 28, *παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς εἰς ἀδόκιμον νοῦν*), so that conversion becomes difficult and at length impossible in the case of the impenitent, who will not allow himself to be turned; or which hardens those who have hardened themselves. Ex. vii. 3, *σκληρυνῶ τὴν καρδίαν Φαραώ*; Deut. ii. 20, *τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ* = *πῶρῃ*. Elsewhere *τὴν καρδίαν*, Ex. iv. 21, ix. 13, x. 20, 27, xi. 10, xiv. 4, 8, 17; of God's hardening Pharaoh's heart = *ῥῃ* (cf. Josh. xi. 20, *κατισχεύειν τὴν καρδίαν*; Jer. v. 3, *στερεοῦν τὸ πρόσωπον*). Rom. ix. 18, *ἄρα οὖν ὃν θέλει ἐλεεῖ, ὃν δὲ θέλει σκληρύνει*, with reference to the hardening of Pharaoh. (II.) Passively = **to become hardened**; in the preterites = *to be hard* (cf. 2 Sam. xix. 43, *ἐσκληρύνθη ὁ λόγος ἀνδρὸς Ἰούδα ὑπὲρ τὸν λόγον ἀνδρὸς Ἰσραὴλ*) = *πῶρ* only in the passages not to be classed here, 2 Sam. xix. 43; Judg. iv. 24; Gen. xlix. 7. But = *ῥῃ*, *ἐσκληρύνθη ἡ*

καρδία Φ., Ex. vii. 22, viii. 18, ix. 36. So in the N. T. Heb. iii. 13, ἵνα μὴ σκληρυνθῇ τις ἐξ ὑμῶν ἀπ' αὐτῆς τῆς ἀμαρτίας; Acts xix. 9, ὡς δὲ τινες ἐσκληρύνοντο καὶ ἠπειθύνον = "but as some were hardened," where, therefore, a modified meaning is unnecessary. In the sense *to have become hardened*, the aorist occurs only Ecclus. xxx. 12, θλάσων τὰς πλευρὰς αὐτοῦ ὡς ἔστι νήπιος, μὴ ποτε σκληρυνθεὶς ἀπειθήσῃ σοι.

Σκοπός, οὐ, ὁ, from the root σκεπ-, σκέπτομαι, σκοπέω, σκοπή, σκοπία, *per metathesis* connected with spähen (to spy); cf. Curtius, p. 168. (I.) *Spyer, scout, watcher, looker out*, Homer, Soph., Xen., Plut.; in the LXX. as a rule = שָׂרֵץ, 1 Sam. xiv. 16; 2 Sam. xviii. 24 sqq.; Jer. vi. 17; Ezek. iii. 17, *et al.* (II.) That after which one spies, *goal*, Homer, Soph., Plato, Aristotle, Plutarch; in the LXX. Job xvi. 13, κατέστησέ με ὥσπερ σκοπόν. Lam. iii. 12 = שָׂרֵץ. Wisd. v. 22. In the N. T. only in Phil. iii. 14, κατὰ σκοπὸν διώκω ἐπὶ τὸ βραβεῖον.

Σκοπέω, only present and imperfect, σκέπτομαι supplying its place, which in these tenses is not used; = *to look towards a goal, to give heed, literally to spy*; with the accusative, Rom. xvi. 17; 2 Cor. iv. 18; Phil. ii. 4, iii. 17; 2 Macc. iv. 5; followed by μή, Luke xi. 35; Gal. vi. 1.—Add. Esth. 6, 7. Not in the LXX.

Ἐπισκέπτομαι, in profane Greek usually in the derived tenses only, with the pres. and imperf. of ἐπισκοπέω (the present ἐπισκέπτομαι once in Hippocrates). In biblical Greek, on the other hand, the present, Ex. xxxii. 33; Ruth i. 8; 1 Sam. xi. 8, xv. 4, xx. 6; Job xxxv. 15; Ps. viii. 5, xxvii. 4; Jer. xiii. 21; Ecclus. ii. 14, vii. 22, 35, xvii. 27; Jas. i. 27; Heb. ii. 6 (from Ps. viii. 5). While in profane Greek it is strictly deponent, and has an aorist passive only in the simple form, and very seldom there, O. T. Greek has two aorists passive with a passive meaning, in which also the perfect participle occurs; thus ἐπεσκέφθην, Jer. iii. 16; 1 Esdr. ii. 18; ἐπεσκέπην, Num. i. 19, iv. 39, 43, 50; Judg. xx. 15, 17, xxi. 3, 9; 1 Sam. xx. 18, 25, 27; 2 Sam. ii. 30; 1 Chron. xxvi. 31; Neh. vii. 1, xii. 42; 1 Esdr. vi. 20. The corresponding future, ἐπισκεπήσομαι, 1 Sam. xx. 18; and the perf. participle ἐπεσκεμμένος, in a passive sense, Num. iv. 47, 49, xxvi. 64; whereas the indic. ἐπέσκειται, Num. xvi. 5, *et al.*, in an active sense; cf. Krüger, xxxix. 14. 2, 3. It signifies *to look at something, to examine closely, to inspect, to observe,—to inquire, to consider*. But the usage has little affinity with that of profane Greek; it corresponds rather both in its applications and its meanings to the Hebrew בָּקַר, for which it is the usual word, except where this is used of judicial visitation and of appointing an oversight; in the former case, ἐπισκ. alternates with the more frequent ἐκδικεῖν, and in the latter (with few exceptions) with καθιστάναι. Further, ἐπισκ. sometimes answers to בָּקַר, שָׁרַץ; once for שָׁרַץ, with παρακαλεῖν, Job ii. 11. It signifies accordingly (a) *to seek, to inquire, τί, περί τινος*, as in profane Greek. Thus = בָּקַר, שָׁרַץ, 2 Esdr. iv. 15, 19, vi. 1; Iev. xiii. 36, xxvii. 31, *et al.*; synon. with ἐκζητεῖν, Ezek. xxxiv. 11, ἐκζητήσω τὰ

πρόβατά μου καὶ ἐπισκέψομαι αὐτά, ὥσπερ ζητεῖ ὁ ποιμὴν τὸ ποιμνίον αὐτοῦ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὅταν ᾗ γνόφος καὶ νεφέλη ἐν μέσῳ προβάτων διακεχωρισμένων. With this we may connect Acts vi. 3, ἐπισκέψασθε ἄνδρας οὓς καταστήσομεν ἐπὶ τῆς χρείας ταύτης = *to seek out, to select, to choose*, that he may take the oversight of something, an application of the word which accords with קפ = *καθιστάναι*, and with which we may compare Num. xxvii. 16, where קפ in this sense is rendered by ἐπισκ., ἐπισκεψάσθω κύριος ὁ θεὸς τῶν πνευμάτων καὶ πάσης σαρκὸς ἄνθρωπον ἐπὶ τῆς συναγωγῆς ταύτης. Further = קפ, *to seek what one misses*, also = *to miss*, 1 Sam. xx. 18; 2 Kings x. 19. (b) *To inspect, to muster* = קפ, of the numbering of the people, Num. i. 3, and often; 1 Sam. iii. 15; 2 Sam. ii. 30, *et al.* Synon. δοκιμάζειν, Ps. xvii. 3. (c) *To seek out one*, Jer. iii. 16; Zech. xi. 6; *to visit*, to inquire friendly, lovingly after one, 1 Sam. xvii. 18, τοὺς ἀδελφούς σου ἐπισκέψῃ εἰς εἰρήνην καὶ ὅσα ἂν χρήσωσιν γνώσῃ, εἰς τὴν εἰρήνην. Judg. xv. 1; Ex. iii. 16; Jer. xxiii. 2. Thus in the N. T. Matt. xxv. 36, 43; Acts vii. 23, xv. 36; Jas. i. 27. Compare Plutarch, *De san. tu.* xiii. (129 C), τὸ τοὺς φίλους ἐπισκεπτόμενον ἀσθενούντας. Also in Dem., Xen., *et al.* Akin to this is the special use of the word as a *term. techn.* = קפ of the visitation of divine grace bringing salvation, τοῦ ἀγαθῶσαι αὐτούς, Jer. xxxii. 41 (here = עש). Thus first, with further qualification (cf. 1 Sam. xvii. 18; Judg. xv. 1), Ps. cvi. 4, μνησθητι ἡμῶν κύριε ἐν τῇ εὐδοκίᾳ τοῦ λαοῦ σου, ἐπισκεψαι ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ σωτηρίῳ σου; and then without addition, Gen. xxi. 1, l. 24, 25; Ex. iv. 31, ἐχάρη ὅτι ἐπεσκέψατο ὁ θεὸς τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσρ. καὶ ὅτι εἶδεν αὐτῶν τὴν θλίψιν; xiii. 19; Ruth i. 6; 1 Sam. ii. 21; Ps. viii. 5, lxv. 10, lxxx. 15; Jer. xv. 15, xxix. 10; Zeph. ii. 7; Zech. x. 3. This divine ἐπισκέπτεσθαι always terminates a condition of want or poverty. Thus in the N. T. Luke i. 68, 78, vii. 16; Acts xv. 14; Heb. ii. 6, from Ps. viii. 5. In this case, always with the accus. of the person. On the contrary (d) it stands, likewise like קפ, according to the connection, of judicial visitation; but in this case never with the accus. of the person, but exactly like קפ, with the accus. of the thing which is punished, or, like עש-קפ or עש = ἐπὶ τινα, of the person whom the visitation concerns. Thus ἐπισκ. τὰς ἀνομίας, Ps. lxxxix. 33; cf. Lam. iv. 22; Jer. xiv. 10; Ezek. xxiii. 21; also ἐπὶ τινι, on account of something, Jer. v. 9, 29. Then ἐπισκ. ἐπὶ τινα, *sc.* τὰς ἀνομίας, ἀμαρτίας, Jer. ix. 24, xi. 22, xxx. 20, xxxvi. 31, xliv. 13, xlix. 7; Hos. iv. 15; Zech. x. 3. Compare ἐπισκέψομαι ἐφ' ὑμᾶς εἰς πονηρά, Jer. xliv. 29, like εἰς εἰρήνην under (c). How intentional and fixed is this distinction between the ἐπισκ. τινά, bringing salvation, and the judicial ἐπὶ τινα, appears from Zech. x. 3, where both combinations occur side by side in their different significations.

Ἐπισκοπή, ἡ, belonging, it would seem, only to biblical and patristic Greek; only in Lucian, *Dial. Deorum*, 20. 6, is it known in profane Greek, and here as = *visit*. Elsewhere there occurs in profane Greek the form (used also in the LXX.) ἐπίσκεψις, *inspection, investigation, visit*. — Oftener in the LXX. and the Apocrypha, LXX. = קפ, קפך, קפך, and this I. (a) קפ, inspection, mustering, numbering (see ἐπισκέπτομαι)

actively, Ex. xxx. 12; passive, the numbered or mustered people, the chosen, the mustered, Num. vii. 2, xiv. 29, xxvi. 43. (b) Overseeing, $\overline{\text{רָב}}$, of the office of overseer, Num. iv. 16; Ps. cix. 8. Thus in the N. T. Acts i. 20, from Ps. cix. 8, of the apostleship of Judas (compare the office of the *πρεσβύτεροι* and *κριταί*, and Matt. xix. 28, for the import of this designation, and thus indirectly for the designation of the *πρεσβύτεροι* as *ἐπίσκοποι*). In 1 Tim. iii. 1 of the office of an *ἐπίσκοπος* or *πρεσβύτερος*. Then (II.) = visitation, in the twofold sense *ἐπισκέπτομαι* *τινα* and *ἐπὶ* *τινα*, the substantive in both cases with the genitive of the personal object. (a) Of the divine visitation of grace in redeeming love, Gen. i. 24, 25; Ex. iii. 16, xiii. 19 = $\overline{\text{רָב}}$; Wisd. ii. 20, iii. 7, 13, iv. 15, *χάρις καὶ ἔλεος ἐν τοῖς ἐκλεκτοῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐπισκοπὴ ἐν τοῖς ὁσίοις αὐτοῦ*; Ecclus. xviii. 20, xxxiv. 6; 1 Esdr. vi. 5; cf. 3 Macc. v. 42. Thus in the N. T. Luke xix. 44; compare vii. 15, i. 68. So also 1 Pet. ii. 12. For the connection of this signification with I. (b) cf. Job x. 12, *ἡ δὲ ἐπισκοπὴ σου ἐφύλαξέ μου τὸ πνεῦμα*. (b) Of judicial visitation, Isa. x. 3; Jer. viii. 12, x. 15 = $\overline{\text{רָב}}$, Jer. vi. 15 = $\overline{\text{רָב}}$; Lev. xix. 20 = $\overline{\text{רָב}}$; Ecclus. xvi. 16, xxiii. 24; Wisd. xiv. 11, xix. 15. Thus (as also *ἐπισκέπτομαι*) nowhere in the N. T., not even in 1 Pet. ii. 12; cf. v. 6, if we are to read there *ἐν καιρῷ ἐπισκοπῆς*, and not simply *ἐν καιρῷ*. The *ἡμέρα ἐπισκοπῆς*, 1 Pet. ii. 12, is like *καιρὸς ἐπισκοπῆς*, Wisd. ii. 20, iii. 7, in a good sense, denoting the time when God brings help. *Ἐπισκοπέω* in profane Greek occurs only as the present and imperf. to *ἐπισκέπτομαι*, and signifies *to look after one, to visit the sick*. It occurs only occasionally in the LXX., e.g. Esth. ii. 11 = $\overline{\text{רָב}}$, Prov. xix. 23 = $\overline{\text{רָב}}$, and Deut. xi. 12 = $\overline{\text{רָב}}$, in the sense *to exercise oversight*.

Σκότος, οὐς, τό, in profane Greek originally *ου, ό*, thus always in Homer, for the most part in the Tragedians, *τὸ σκ.* in Xen. with *ό σκ.* sometimes, oftener in Plato, prevailing in Aristotle, but nowhere is the masc. so entirely excluded as in biblical Greek, where it appears only in Heb. xii. 18 as a various reading, not instead of the neuter but instead of *ζόφος* = darkness, LXX. = $\overline{\text{רָב}}$, and the other derivatives of $\overline{\text{רָב}}$, (a) literally, Matt. xxvii. 45; Mark xv. 33; Luke xxiii. 44; Acts ii. 20, xiii. 11; Gen. i. 2, 4, etc. In the N. T. mainly (b) figuratively, answering to the O. T. use of $\overline{\text{רָב}}$ to denote mischief, corruption, death, in antithesis with light, as the condition of life and wellbeing; see *φῶς*; compare the parallel expressions *σκιὰ θανάτου*, Job iii. 5; Ps. cvii. 10, 14; *ὀλίσθημα*, Ps. xxxv. 6; *τὸ πικρόν*, Isa. v. 20; compare *σκ. σκληρόν*, Isa. v. 30 (cf. Rev. xvi. 10, *ἐγένετο ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ ἐσκοτωμένη*,—*σκοτοῦν* not being thus used in profane Greek, until in Byzantine Greek it is = *to kill*). Thus Job xvii. 19, xix. 8; Ps. xviii. 21, lxxxviii. 13, cxii. 4; Isa. ix. 2, xxix. 18, xlii. 7, lviii. 10, *et al.*; Micah vii. 8, *μὴ ἐπύχαιρέ μοι ἡ ἐχθρά μου, ὅτι πέπτωκα, καὶ ἀναστήσομαι διότι ἐὰν καθίσω ἐν τῷ σκότει, κύριος φωτιεῖ με*. So in the N. T. Matt. iv. 16 from Isa. ix. 1; Luke i. 79; 1 Pet. ii. 9, *τοῦ ἐκ σκότους ὑμᾶς κατέσαντος εἰς τὸ θαυμαστὸν αὐτοῦ φῶς*. In this contrast with salvation *σκότος* denotes *damnation*, Jude 13, 2 Pet. ii. 17, as in the expression *τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον*, *outer darkness*, the farthest removed from light, Matt. viii. 12,

xxii. 13, xxv. 30. This is akin to the use of *σκότος* in the *Iliad* as = *death* (in the Tragedians of the under-world also); Matt. vi. 23, *εἰ οὖν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἐν σοὶ σκότος ἐστίν, τὸ σκότος πόσον*, may also be compared with Luke xi. 35, as belonging to this head, because only by this rendering, darkness = *harm, corruption, ruin*, does the expression attain its full import. In like manner 2 Cor. iv. 6; Acts xxvi. 18; cf. John iii. 19. To this is added (*c*) an extension of the usage in the N. T. not traceable in the O. T., but in keeping with the truth that sin and misery all linked together (compare *heillos* = *wicked*), and connected with the circumstance that darkness conceals (Ps. cxxxix. 11, 12), and that sin has to shun the light, which makes it manifest; cf. John iii. 19. In this moral sense the word is not used in the O. T. In the N. T. mainly in Paul's writings. This connection of *σκότος* with sin, misery, or mischief, is clear in 2 Cor. vi. 14 as compared with iv. 6; Eph. v. 11, cf. with ver. 8; and the idea of darkness as *concealing* appears in 1 Thess. iv. 4, 5; 1 Cor. iv. 5, *φωτίσει τὰ κρυπτὰ τοῦ σκότους, καὶ φανερώσει τὰς βουλὰς τῶν καρδιῶν*. Both ideas are combined in John iii. 19. So likewise Rom. xiii. 12; 1 John i. 6. With this is connected the expression *ἡ ἐξουσία τοῦ σκότους*, Luke xxii. 53; Eph. vi. 12, *κοσμοκράτορες τοῦ σκότους τούτου*; and, on the other hand, in Col. i. 13, *ἐρύσατο ἡμᾶς ἐκ τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ σκότους, καὶ μετέστησεν εἰς τὴν βασ. κ.τ.λ.* Here there is no need to refer to another meaning, as for instance that named under (*b*). But Rom. ii. 19 does point to this meaning (*b*), *πέποιθὺς σε σεαυτὸν ὀδηγὸν εἶναι τυφλῶν, φῶς τῶν ἐν σκότει, παιδευτὴν ἀφρόνων*, inasmuch as *ἐν σκότει εἶναι* as the consequence of *τυφλὸς εἶναι* is simply a state of bewilderment and helplessness; cf. Eccles. ii. 14.

Σκοτία, *as, ἡ, darkness*; in profane Greek very late and seldom, designated as unused by Thom. Mag., and by Möris as not Attic; see Moeris, ed. Pierson, p. 354 sq. In biblical Greek, in the LXX. only in Micah iii. 6 = $\pi\psi\eta$; Job xxviii. 2 = 𐤓𐤕𐤔 . Elsewhere only in the N. T., and excepting Matt. x. 27, Luke xii. 3, only in John's Gospel and 1 John, where *σκότος* occurs only exceptionably, viz. John iii. 19; 1 John i. 6. (*a*) Literally, Matt. x. 27; Luke xii. 3; John vi. 17, xx. 1. (*b*) Figuratively, like *σκότος*, and with the prevailing associated idea of unhappiness or ruin, cf. John xii. 35, *περιπατεῖτε ὡς τὸ φῶς ἔχετε, ἵνα μὴ σκοτία ὑμᾶς καταλάβῃ*; ver. 46, *ἐγὼ φῶς εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἐλήλυθα, ἵνα πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ μὴ μείνῃ*; viii. 12, *ἐγὼ εἰμι τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου· ὁ ἀκολουθῶν ἐμοὶ οὐ μὴ περιπατήσῃ ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ, ἀλλ' ἔξει τὸ φῶς τῆς ζωῆς*; cf. 1 John ii. 8, 9. But as light is not only the emblem of happiness but also is itself *beneficent*, darkness in like manner works unhappiness, John xii. 35, *ὁ περιπατῶν ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ, οὐκ οἶδεν ποῦ ὑπάγει*; cf. 1 John ii. 11, *ὅτι ἡ σκοτία ἐτύφλωσεν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ*, with ver. 10. Thus *σκοτία* is not a figurative term for sin, but for the consequences of sin; *ἐν σκοτίᾳ εἶναι, μένειν* is the effect of sin, and in turn the cause of sin; 1 John ii. 9, *ὁ λέγων ἐν τῷ φωτὶ εἶναι καὶ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ μισῶν ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ ἐστὶν ἕως ἄρτι*. Thus the Johannine *σκοτία* has more in common with O. T. phraseology

than has the Pauline σκότος. By observing this, the Johannine expressions first attain their full weight, especially John i. 5, τὸ φῶς ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ φαίνει, καὶ ἡ σκοτία αὐτὸ οὐ κατέλαβεν; cf. ii. 8; and John iii. 19, αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ κρίσις, ὅτι τὸ φῶς ἐλήλυθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον καὶ ἠγάπησαν οἱ ἄνθρωποι μᾶλλον τὸ σκότος ἢ τὸ φῶς, which is in itself almost inconceivable and unnatural. The idea is qualified by the contrast with φῶς. God as light is the fountain of blessed life, and of the corresponding activity of life, the latter being the necessary consequence of the former; and thus we see the full soteriologic import of the proposition in 1 John i. 5, ὅτι ὁ θεὸς φῶς ἐστίν, καὶ σκοτία ἐν αὐτῷ οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδεμία; this is designated the sum and substance of the announcement taught by Christ and reproduced by the apostles; it could hardly be thus designated if σκοτία were here meant in an ethical sense.

Σοφός, ἡ, ὄν, according to Curtius 512, connected with σαφής, with the Latin *sapere*, Old High German *saf*, *sap*, so that the primary meaning is *to taste or relish*; not in Homer or Hesiod, though Homer has in some places the substantive σοφία. = *wise*, primarily of pre-eminent knowledge and skill in anything, expressing itself as experience, be it handiwork or art; hence = *clever, experienced, informed, skilled, full of understanding*. Thus the noun in Homer, σοφία τέκτονος, *Il.* xv. 412; σοφὸς κυβερνήτης, Pindar, *Nem.* vii. 25. Then also of familiarity with and experience of all the details and circumstances of daily life, *clever, shrewd, perceptive*; and lastly, especially in Attic Greek, of *deeper insight* into the foundations and connection of things and their laws, which philosophy partly strives after and partly possesses, = *wise*; see Lexica. In biblical Greek, in the LXX. = עָבֵר, which only occasionally is = συνετός (עָבֵר, עָבֵר), φρόνιμος (עָבֵר, עָבֵר); and this (a) of persons gifted with skill or dexterity in any art, Ex. xxviii. 3, xxxv. 9, 25, ταῖς χερσὶ νήθειν, *et al.*; 1 Chron. xxii. 16, τεχνῖται καὶ οἰκοδόμοι λίθων καὶ τέκτονες ξύλων καὶ πᾶς σοφὸς ἐν παντὶ ἔργῳ; 2 Chron. ii. 7, 13, 14, mostly in this case σ. τῇ διανοίᾳ, Ex. xxviii. 3, xxxv. 25, xxxvi. 1, *et al.*; τῇ καρδίᾳ, Ex. xxxv. 9, spoken of as conferred by God, Ex. xxviii. 3, λάλησον πᾶσι τοῖς σοφοῖς τῇ διανοίᾳ ὅς ἐνέπλησα πνεύματος σοφίας καὶ αἰσθήσεως; xxxvi. 1, πᾶς σοφὸς τῇ διανοίᾳ, ᾧ ἐδόθη σοφία καὶ ἐπιστήμη ἐν αὐτοῖς συνιέναι ποιεῖν κ.τ.λ. Then (b) of *especially intelligent experience and cleverness for the discharge of official and public affairs*, Deut. i. 13, δότε ἑαυτοῖς ἄνδρας σοφοὺς καὶ ἐπιστήμονας καὶ συνετοὺς εἰς τὰς φύλας ἡμῶν, καὶ καταστήσω ἐφ' ὑμῶν ἡγουμένους ὑμῶν; ver. 15; cf. xvi. 19; 2 Sam. xiii. 3; 1 Kings ii. 9; Isa. xix. 11, 12. (c) *Of pre-eminent knowledge and discernment of all things*, 2 Sam. xiv. 20, ὁ κύριός μου σοφὸς καθὼς σοφία ἀγγέλου τοῦ γινῶναι πάντα τὰ ἐν τῇ γῇ; 2 Chron. ii. 12, ἔδωκε τῷ Δαβὶδ υἱὸν σοφὸν καὶ ἐπιστάμενον ἐπιστήμην καὶ σύνεσιν, especially of knowledge of hidden things, Gen. xli. 8; Jer. ix. 16; compare Dan. ii. 12 sqq., iv. 3, 15, v. 7, 8, 16. And here begins the special application given to the conception in Holy Scripture. First of all, this wisdom, as it is manifested and valued in the world, worldly wisdom, has no stability or consistency

before God, Job v. 13, ὁ καταλαμβάνων σοφούς ἐν τῇ φρονήσει, βουλὴν δὲ πολυπλόκων ἐξέστησεν; Ps. xlix. 11; Jer. viii. 8, 9, ix. 22; Isa. xxix. 14. For (d) true wisdom is discernment and knowledge concerning God's righteousness and law, Deut. iv. 6, xxxii. 6; Prov. x. 9; he who is truly wise is therefore δίκαιος, Eccles. ix. 1, of whom all the declarations of Proverbs and Ecclesiastes hold good; cf. Ps. cvii. 43. (In the Psalms only here and xlix. 11.) See σοφία. A distinction must accordingly be made between σοφοῖς in the worldly sense and σοφοῖς in this higher sense, though the latter wisdom is not to be confined to its relation to God's law, but, like this, pervades all the relations of life, private as well as public; cf. Prov. xiv. 1, xxix. 8, 9.

In the Apocrypha, where the word occurs chiefly in Ecclus., less frequently in Wisdom and 1 Esdr., but in all much more seldom than the substantive, it is always—perhaps excepting 1 Esdr. iv. 42, where it = *clever*, and iii. 5, 9, v. 6, where it = *intelligent, shrewd, discerning*—used in this latter ethico-religious sense, parallel with δίκαιος, Wisd. iv. 17, with φοβούμενος τὸν θεόν, Ecclus. x. 24, cf. ver. 23, xviii. 26, xxxvi. 2, etc.; it denotes the man who through God's guidance and gifts, and an acute observation, has gained an understanding of nature and history, of what is and what ought to be, of God's works and ways, and conducts himself and his walk accordingly; compare the description in Wisd. vii. 15 sqq. Ver. 21, ὅσα τέ ἐστὶν κρυπτὰ καὶ ἐμφανῆ ἔγνω, ἡ γὰρ πάντων τεχνίτης ἐδίδαξέ με σοφία. Therefore the wise or righteous man stands alone, misunderstood, and persecuted in his generation, Wisd. iv. 7 sqq., but πλῆθος σοφῶν σωτηρία κόσμου, Wisd. vi. 25. As to 4 Macc. vii. 23, μόνος γὰρ ὁ σοφὸς καὶ ἀνδρείος ἐστὶ τῶν παθῶν κύριος; see σοφία. As predicated of the world-creating and world-governing God, it occurs but once, Ecclus. i. 6, εἷς ἐστὶ σοφός, φοβερὸς σφόδρα.

The usage of the N. T. stands in a peculiar relation to this. As the religio-ethical conception of σοφός is foreign to it,—excepting Matt. xxiii. 34, Jas. iii. 13, and a few other places, and as, on the other hand, σοφός is used almost always in a bad sense only, it might seem as if the O. T. σοφός, just in this sense, had gradually overruled the usage,—a circumstance all the more to be wondered at because the religious deepening of the concept in the writings of Wisdom is recognised and adopted in Matt. xxiii. 34, Jas. iii. 13. It can hardly have been by a mere chance that σοφός in this good sense is so rare, but occurs continually in the bad sense. The explanation must be sought in another direction. When we consider the import which חָכָם and חִכְמָה attained in the theological school of Israel, and how it thence so powerfully influenced the religious life and thought of the people, as is evident from the books of Ecclesiasticus and Wisdom; if we consider, further, the shallowness and artificiality to which the idea and the thing itself gradually fell in comparison with its high import in the book of Proverbs; and if, finally, we take the fourth book of Maccabees, the acknowledged treatise *de rationis imperio*, in which this idea of wisdom appears in its fullest revival as quickened by the Greek conception of the φιλόσοφος, see σοφία,—it becomes evident that it is the O. T. idea of חָכָם in its degenerate form, degenerated more and more in the course of history,

which the N. T. regards in *sensu malo*, and pronounces its verdict upon. The juxtaposition of σοφός and γραμματεὺς, 1 Cor. i. 20, specially confirms this view; and so does the word of the Lord in its relation to the most learned and religious rulers of the people, Matt. xi. 25, Luke x. 21, and the condemnation of the σοφία τῶν ἀρχόντων τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, οἱ τὸν κύριον τῆς δόξης ἐσταύρωσαν. The O. T. idea of *חָכְמָה* holds good in its purity still in the N. T., see σοφία, but in its historical aspect, as embodied in its representatives, the *חָכְמָה*, it had become so completely one with the human or worldly wisdom, alien to God, the φιλοσοφία καὶ κενὴ ἀπάτη κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν ἀνθρώπων, κατὰ τὰ στοχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου, Col. ii. 8, that it fell under the judgment pronounced by the O. T. itself upon the wisdom to be rejected; and Paul, in 1 Cor. i. 19 (quoted from Isa. xxix. 14) and iii. 19, 20 (from Job v. 13 and Ps. xciv. 11), appeals to this O. T. judgment.—Σοφός occurs (a) as an epithet of the workman skilled in art and competent, 1 Cor. iii. 10, ὡς σοφὸς ἀρχιτέκτων. Of knowledge and ability for official concerns, 1 Cor. vi. 5, οὐκ ἐν ὑμῖν οὐδεὶς σοφὸς ὃς δυνήσεται διακρίναι ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ; (b) in keeping with the deepening of the conception peculiar to the O. T., Rom. xvi. 19, θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς σοφοὺς εἶναι εἰς τὸ ἀγαθόν, ἀκεραίους δὲ εἰς τὸ κακόν, a mode of expression which must have touched a chord of sympathy even in Greeks. In like manner Eph. v. 15, βλέπετε οὖν ἀκριβῶς πῶς περιπατεῖτε, μὴ ὡς ἄσοφοι ἀλλ' ὡς σοφοί, ἐξαγοραζόμενοι κ.τ.λ., where the religious element becomes prominent; cf. ver. 17, μὴ γίνετε ἄφρονες (frequently contrasted with σοφός in Prov. and Eccles.), ἀλλὰ συνιέτε τί τὸ θέλημα κυρίου; and still more clearly in Jas. iii. 13, τίς σοφὸς καὶ ἐπιστήμων ἐν ὑμῖν; δειξάτω ἐκ τῆς καλῆς ἀναστροφῆς τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ ἐν πραύτητι σοφίας; cf. vv. 15, 17, ἡ ἄνωθεν σοφία (cf. Isa. xi. 2; Wisd. i. 4, *et al.*); 1 Cor. iii. 18, εἴ τις δοκεῖ σοφὸς εἶναι ἐν ὑμῖν ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ, μωρὸς γενέσθω, ἵνα γένηται σοφός. But the O. T. conception is expressly recognised and adopted in Matt. xxiii. 34, ἀποστέλλω πρὸς ὑμᾶς προφῆτας καὶ σοφοὺς καὶ γραμματεῖς; cf. xiii. 52.—It occurs as an epithet of God, Rom. xvi. 27, μόνος σοφὸς θεός, as also Rec. and Bengel read in 1 Tim. i. 17; Jude 25. Cf. 1 Cor. i. 25, τὸ μωρὸν τοῦ θεοῦ σοφώτερον τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐστίν. (c) In a bad sense, of the wisdom arising from and peculiar to the world as such, and expressing the wrong relation of the world to God, into which even the wise of Israel had lapsed, corresponding with the idea of the κόσμος within Israel, and what was connected therewith (see κόσμος, ἐκλεκτός); thus mainly with reference to the wise men of Israel, Matt. xi. 25, ἔκρυψας ταῦτα ἀπὸ σοφῶν καὶ συνετῶν, καὶ ἀπεκάλυψας ταῦτα νηπίοις; Luke x. 21. Cf. 1 Cor. i. 20, ποῦ σοφός; ποῦ γραμματεὺς; ποῦ συνζητητὴς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου; where the wise within Israel and outside are included in the same condemnation as σοφοὶ κατὰ σάρκα, 1 Cor. i. 26; cf. vv. 25, 27, iii. 18, i. 19, iii. 20; Rom. i. 22, φάσκοντες εἶναι σοφοὶ ἐμωράνθησαν; cf. ver. 28, παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς εἰς ἀδόκιμον νοῦν.—The word stands without condemnatory judgment simply for a σοφός in the profane sense in Rom. i. 14, Ἑλλήσιν τε καὶ βαρβάρους, σοφοῖς τε καὶ ἀνοήτοις ὀφειλέτης εἰμί.

Σοφία, ἡ, wisdom, is used primarily, like the adjective, of any excellence or cleverness in hand labour and arts (Homer, Pindar, and occasionally in Xenophon and Plato), and then specially for understanding and capability in art, poetry and music, sculpture and painting; in particular, Xen. *Anab.* i. 2. 8, 'Ἐνταῦθα λέγεται Ἀπόλλων ἐκδεῖραι Μαρσύαν, νικήσας ἐρίζοντά οἱ περὶ σοφίας; cf. *Mem.* i. 4. 2, 3, where Homer, Sophocles, Polycleitus, Zeuxis are cited as men who were admired ἐπὶ σοφίᾳ. Next it denotes experience and cleverness in all matters of private and public life, Plato, *Legg.* iii. 677 C, εἴ τι τέχνης ἦν ἐχόμενον σπουδαίας εὐρημένον ἢ πολιτικῆς ἢ καὶ σοφίας τινὸς ἐτέρας; and finally, that deeper insight into the foundations and connections of things, the significance and objects of life, which as such it shares with σωφροσύνη, and give its possessor a position and control over things, and over the affections connected with them; cf. Xen. *Mem.* iv. 6. 7, iii. 9. 4, iv. 5. 6; Plut. *de justo*, 375 C; Aristotle, *Metaph.* i. 1, τὴν ὀνομαζομένην σοφίαν περὶ τὰ πρῶτα αἰτία καὶ τὰς ἀρχὰς ὑπολαμβάνουσι πάντες; *ibid.* 9, ὅλως δὲ ζητούσης τῆς σοφίας περὶ τῶν φανερῶν τὸ αἷτιον, but in this last sense usually φιλοσοφία, so that σοφία is more practical and moral, and φιλοσοφία more intellectual in its reference; Plato, *Menex.* 247 A, πᾶσα ἐπιστήμη χωριζομένη δικαιοσύνης καὶ τῆς ἄλλης ἀρετῆς πανουργία οὐ σοφία φαίνεται. In later Greek the word becomes rarer and rarer, while in the same period in O. T. and Hellenistic Greek it assumes a prominent place.

In the LXX., with a few exceptions, in which φρόνησις, σύνεσις, ἐπιστήμη (never γνώσις) are employed instead, it corresponds to the Hebrew חָכְמָה. This word stands, like the adj. חָכֵם, σοφός, (a) of excelling, capability and cleverness in skilled work, 1 Chron. xxviii. 21, πᾶς πρόθυμος ἐν σοφίᾳ κατὰ πᾶσαν κέχνην, is attributed to divine bestowment, to the Spirit of God, Ex. xxxi. 3, xxxv. 29; in order to strengthen the idea it is conjoined with αἰσθησις, Ex. xxviii. 3; σύνεσις, xxxv. 33; ἐπιστήμη, xxxvi. 1. But more frequently it denotes (b) a degree of talent, knowledge, and experience far above the ordinary standard of mental capability and development, which puts its possessor in a position to give an account of everything, 1 Kings iv. 33, and to discern and make known what is hidden, 2 Sam. xiv. 20, ὁ κύριός μου σοφὸς καθὼς σοφία ἀγγέλου τοῦ γινῶναι πάντα τὰ ἐν τῇ γῇ; Dan. ii. 30, v. 12, 15, to maintain justice and uphold the right, 1 Kings x. 19, and this by virtue of the divine gift, 1 Kings iv. 29, 2 Chron. i. 10 sqq. Above all wisdom is (c) the understanding of God's righteousness and will as the foundation and support of all things, which gives to a people pre-eminence above other peoples, and carries on to a good issue whatever pertains to it, Prov. xxviii. 26, ὃς πέποιθε θρασεῖα καρδία ὁ τοιοῦτος ἄφρων, ὃς δὲ πορεύεται σοφία σωθήσεται, and in this sense it is said in Job xxviii. 28, ἰδοὺ ἡ θεοσέβειά ἐστιν σοφία, τὸ δὲ ἀπέχεσθαι, ἀπὸ κακῶν ἐστὶν ἐπιστήμη; Ps. cxi. 10, ἀρχὴ σοφίας φόβος κυρίου κ.τ.λ.; Prov. ix. 10, xvi. 4; Ps. xxxvii. 30, στόμα δικαίου μελετήσῃ σοφίαν καὶ ἡ γλῶσσα αὐτοῦ λαλήσῃ κρίσιν; cf. Ps. xlix. 4. This religious wisdom in its deepest sense, with which παιδεία in its biblical import (see παιδεύω) is connected, and which, therefore, is at war with sin within us and without, and defends its possessor, does not exclude from its influence the other

spheres of conscience and of will, but brings them, as also the entire life and conduct, under its religious and moral discipline, having a right to claim both mastery and leadership. We find the word in conjunction (see (a)) with *φρόνησις*, *σύνεσις*, *ἐπιστήμη*, e.g. Prov. iv. 7, viii. 1, x. 24, Isa. xxxiii. 6, being nearest akin to *ἐπιστήμη*, which denotes a self-understanding concerning anything, while *σοφία* is the attribute of him who possesses *ἐπιστήμη* in its widest range. It differs from *φρόνησις* as wisdom from a perceptive cleverness, while *σύνεσις* denotes clear apprehension and calculating reflection. We find *σοφία* combined with *γνώσις*, especially in Eccles., e.g. i. 16, 17, 18, ii. 21, ix. 10, *et al.*; also Prov. xxx. 3; by *γνώσις*, the possessor of *γνώσις* is designated by the thing itself, the subject by the object, but *σοφία* is itself active and productive; *γνώσις* is a bearing or relation to certain objects, or a possession obtained, determining conduct; *σοφία* is an attribute producing this bearing, and able to devise its own objects. *Σοφία* ranks above *ἐπιστήμη*, *γνώσις*, *σύνεσις*, *φρόνησις*, for it is never without these; it produces them all, but is never produced by them, Prov. x. 25, ἡ σοφία ἀνδρὶ τίκτει φρόνησιν; Eccles. i. 18, ἐν πλήθει σοφίας πλήθος γνώσεως. Wisdom owns what she possesses, not as her own, but as God's gift, and she is the fruit and effect of ἔλεγχος and παιδεία, as she in turn employs these, Prov. ii. 6, 10, iii. 13, xxix. 15, xxx. 3. Thus *σοφία* belongs (d) primarily to God Himself, from whom it comes, and as such it is the wisdom of God existing independently of men, yet distinct from God, Prov. viii. 21 sqq.; Job xxviii. 24 sqq.; that attribute of God which realizes itself in His conscious and purposeful creation and government of the world, appointing limit, or standard, and goal, Prov. iii. 19, 20, viii. 21 sqq., Job xxviii. 24, both in the execution of His will and in the moulding of history and of destiny, Jer. x. 11, li. 15; it is that upon which the rule of right on earth is based, and in which it is recognised and known; in a word, a moral power pervading and effecting all, Prov. viii. 1 sqq. Inasmuch as Wisdom rules and makes herself felt in nature and in man, and reveals herself in their laws, it is natural that she is hardly to be distinguished from God, but comes to be regarded as something objective and living, possessing an existence of her own distinct from the world and God, Job xxviii. 24 sqq.; Prov. viii. 21 sqq. Wisdom is accordingly the formative principle of God's creative and governing power, and at the same time the formative power, proceeding from God, of man's corresponding conduct towards God and the world, filling the heart with the fear of God and with confidence in Him, preserving it from want of discipline and self-confidence, Prov. xxviii. 26, Eccles. xii. 1 sqq., and knowing the way to life from sin and judgment, Ps. li. 8.—Contrasted with this there is another kind of wisdom, human and not of God, going hand in hand with pride, self-confidence, and self-glorification, condemned by God's judgment, and put to shame before Him, Isa. xxix. 14; Jer. ix. 22 (see *σοφός*).

With the wisdom that is religious and moral, and having its origin with God, may be reckoned that described in the Apocrypha, especially in Eccles., Wisdom, and Baruch. In the Book of Wisdom, God's wisdom is represented as asserting itself in the history

recorded in Holy Writ, in bringing to righteousness those perverted by sin; and while God's wisdom, it is at the same time theirs who know, understand, and submit themselves to God's ways and God's government; see especially Wisd. x. In Ecclesiasticus human wisdom is represented as life prudence, sound practical judgment growing out of the fear of God, while God's wisdom is represented as part of His omniscience going hand in hand therewith,—as the *μεγαλεία τῆς σοφίας αὐτοῦ* without further qualification prove He needs neither advice nor counsel. He alone knows how to act and rule, Ecclus. xlii. 17 sqq. In both books, however, there is already traceable a weakening of the conception, since the seeming extension of the biblical thought to the wisdom that affirms itself in the history of redemption in Wisd. x. not only confounds it with the divine *πρόνοια* (which see), but represents it in the form of the Stoic "world-soul" (Wisd. vii. 22 sqq.), while the Son of Sirach at last comes to represent human wisdom as the most empty, selfishly-directed discretion. The august ethico-religious force of Proverbs and Ecclesiastes is weakened into an agreeable self-gratifying reflection, until at length in 4 Maccabees a definition or description appears, which savours more of the Greek or Stoic idea of *φιλοσοφία* than of the Scripture *σοφία*; save that in the exposition we find "Stoic morality and the strictness of the Mosaic law blended together;" *σοφία ἐστὶ γνῶσις θεῶν καὶ ἀνθρωπίνων πραγμάτων καὶ τούτων αἰτίων*, i. 14; cf. Cic. *de off.* ii. 43, "*princeps omnium virtutum est illa sapientia quam σοφίαν Graeci vocant. Prudentiam enim quam Graeci φρόνησιν dicunt, aliam quandam intelligimus, quae est rerum expetendarum fugiendarumque scientia; illa autem sapientia quam principem dixi rerum est divinarum atque humanarum scientia.*" Cf. Grimm, *Comment.* p. 288. The main stress is laid upon the intellectual side, upon which the apathy of the wise man rests. Philo, on the contrary, after his manner, carries out the thought of God's creative and world-governing wisdom, yet in keeping with the estimate presented in his Logos doctrine, see *λόγος*. As to the biblical idea, there remains only the name; the historical manifestation and embodiment of divine wisdom is dissipated into allegories, and the living realization of wisdom as shared by man becomes an apathetic aestheticism; cf. Siegfried, *Philo of Alex.* p. 215 sqq.

The N. T., on the contrary, restores the true O. T. conception, and though not taken on exactly the same range, it is apprehended and realized in its central idea. (a) God's wisdom appears, not indeed as in the O. T. as the ordering and guiding principle of creation and providence, whence springs Israel's law and right, but as a sharpening and concentrating of the O. T. range of thought, manifested in God's redeeming work as embodied in the distinctively N. T. revelation, and in God's dealings with His people and His Church; so that no fault, no objection can be taken against the final aim itself, nor against the manner of its attainment. Nearest akin to the O. T. modes of expression are Rev. vii. 12, *ἡ εὐλογία καὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ ἡ σοφία καὶ ἡ εὐχαριστία καὶ ἡ τιμὴ καὶ ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἡ ἰσχὺς τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν*; v. 12, *ἄξιός ἐστιν τὸ ἄρνιον . . . λαβεῖν τὴν δύναμιν καὶ πλοῦτον καὶ σοφίαν κ.τ.λ.*, akin to which is Rom. xi. 33 with reference to the argument of chaps. ix.-xi., *ὦ βάθος πλούτου καὶ σοφίας καὶ γνώσεως θεοῦ*. From this the

transference is easy to the other Pauline texts representing God's wisdom in His saving purposes accomplished in Christ, and carried into effect in His Church, 1 Cor. ii. 7, λαλοῦμεν θεοῦ σοφίαν ἐν μυστηρίῳ τὴν ἀποκεκρυμένην, ἣν προώρισεν ὁ θεός κ.τ.λ.; i. 21, ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐκ ἔγνω ὁ κόσμος τὸν θεόν; Eph. iii. 10, ἵνα γνωρισθῇ νῦν . . . διὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἡ πολυποίκιλος σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ κατὰ πρόθεσιν κ.τ.λ. This also explains the designation of Christ in 1 Cor. i. 24 as θεοῦ δύναμις καὶ θεοῦ σοφία. In a manner reminding us of Prov. viii. 21 sqq. this historical and self-accomplishing wisdom is mentioned in Matt. xi. 19, ἐδικαιώθη ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς (where Tisch., Treg., Westc. read ἔργων; Treg., however, puts the undisputed τέκνων, in the parallel text in Luke vii. 35, in the margin); see δικαίω. This personification of wisdom comes out most strongly in Luke xi. 49, διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἡ σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ εἶπεν ἀποστελῶ εἰς αὐτοὺς προφῆτας καὶ ἀποστόλους . . . ἵνα ἐκζητηθῇ κ.τ.λ., for which Matt. xxiii. 34, διὰ τοῦτο ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω πρὸς ὑμᾶς προφῆτας καὶ σοφοὺς καὶ γραμματεῖς, where Christ is the subject. In Luke it is not a quotation, but a declaration of the divine purpose, expressed as in Ps. cx. 1, εἶπεν ὁ κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου; cf. Hofmann *in loc.* This concentration of divine wisdom upon its historical and redeeming realization answers to the N. T. declarations (b) concerning human wisdom, so far as this is taken in the sense of the O. T. deepening of the conception, Luke xi. 31, σ. Σολομῶνος; Acts vii. 22, σ. Αἰγυπτίων. Then Rev. xiii. 18, ὧδε ἡ σ. ἐστίν; xvii. 9, ὧδε ὁ νοῦς ὁ ἔχων σοφίαν, of the power to discern and make known hidden things, as in 2 Sam. xiv. 20, Dan. ii. 30, etc. But in the O. T. religious sense to denote the understanding of God's will and ways, and the ability to witness thereof, it occurs in Matt. xiii. 54, πόθεν τούτῳ ἡ σοφία αὕτη; compare the preceding ἐδίδασκεν; Mark vi. 2, τίς ἡ σοφία ἡ δοθεῖσα τούτῳ; in Luke ii. 40, 52, cf. ver. 47, the wisdom of the boy Jesus is represented as the basis of His σύνεσις and ἀποκρίσεις. How distinctly capability of independent action, of speaking and witnessing, is expressed by the word, is clear from Luke xxi. 15, δώσω ὑμῖν στόμα καὶ σοφίαν; Acts vi. 10, οὐκ ἴσχυον ἀντιστῆναι τῇ σοφίᾳ καὶ τῷ πνεύματι ᾧ ἐλάλει; vi. 3, vii. 10; Col. i. 28, νοουθετοῦντες πάντα ἄνθρωπον διδάσκοντες π. ἀ. ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ; iii. 16. Its application to the redeeming counsel and will of God appears specially in Eph. i. 8, 9; Col. i. 9, ii. 3, ἐν ᾧ εἰσὶν πάντες οἱ θησανροὶ τῆς σοφίας καὶ γνώσεως ἀπόκρυφοι; cf. ver. 8; 1 Cor. i. 20, Χριστὸς ἐγενήθη ἡμῖν σοφία ἀπὸ θεοῦ; 1 Pet. iii. 15, κατὰ τὴν δοθεῖσαν αὐτῷ σοφίαν ἔγραψεν ὑμῖν; and we may perhaps distinguish the λόγος σοφίας and λόγος γνώσεως in 1 Cor. xii. 8 by saying that the latter stands related to the former as the ἐρμηνεία γλωσσῶν is to the γένη γλωσσῶν, ver. 10, so that λόγος σοφίας denotes a perception or discernment of God's counsel and will beyond previous and general understanding of it, which the λόγος γνώσεως clearly expounds and applies. The practical import of the word as denoting what is necessary in order to maintain the Christian's position appears in Col. iv. 5, ἐν σοφίᾳ περιπατεῖτε πρὸς τοὺς ἔξω, τὸν καιρὸν ἐξαγοραζόμενοι, see σοφός; and the conception as answering to the O. T. *חָכְמָה*, but with a N. T. definiteness, appears in Jas. i. 5, iii. 13, 15, 17. This wisdom is

a special gift springing from God's saving work, the gift of the Holy Spirit, whether its reference be to extraordinary manifestations or to general Christian discernment and power, Mark vi. 2; Acts vi. 3; 1 Cor. xii. 8; Eph. i. 8, 17; Col. i. 9; Jas. i. 5, iii. 15, 17, ἡ ἄνωθεν σοφία; and with this reference it stands in contrast (c) to σοφία ἐπίγειος ψυχική, Jas. iii. 15; σαρκική, 2 Cor. i. 12; ἀνθρώπων, 1 Cor. ii. 5; ἀνθρωπίνη, ii. 13; τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, 1 Cor. ii. 6; τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, i. 20, iii. 19; cf. 1 Cor. i. 17, 19, 21, ii. 1, 4; Col. iii. 16. As to the relation of σοφία to the synonyms φρόνησις, σύνεσις, γνώσις, Eph. i. 8, Col. i. 9, ii. 3, see above.—Cf. Oehler, *Die Grundzüge der alttest. Weisheit*, Tübingen 1854; also his *Theol. des A. T.* § 235 sqq.; Schulz, *alttest. Theol.* pp. 346 sqq., 512 sqq., 815 sqq.; Delitzsch, *On Proverbs*, Introd. § 4; Siegfried, *Philo von Alex.* pp. 23, 215 sqq.

Σταυρός, οὐ, ὁ, from the root στα in ἵστημι, Latin *instaurare, restaurare*, Curtius 212. (I.) Pale, palisade, Hesychius, σταυροί οἱ καταπεπηγότες σκόλοpes, χάρακες, καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐστώτα ξύλα, Homer, Herod., Thuc., Xen. (II.) Stake for execution, an instrument of torture for the punishment of the ἀνασκολοπιζειν, Herod. iv. 202, for putting special malefactors cruelly to death; cf. Hom. *Il.* xviii. 176; in the form (III.) of a four-armed cross (2 Sam. xxi. 5–9?) which the Romans borrowed from the Carthaginians; see Zöckler, *Das Kreuz Christi*, p. 70. "The punishment of the cross was the most fearful and the highest (*summa supplicia, supremum, crudelissimum teterrimumque*, Cic. *Verr.* v. 64), and was originally employed only in the case of slaves, so that crucifixion and *servile supplicium* were synonymous (Cic. *pro Clu.* 66; Phil. i. 2; Liv. 22, 23; Plaut. *Mil.* ii. 4. 19; Tacitus, *Hist.* iv. 3. 11; *Ann.* iii. 50, etc.), yet also in the case of freemen, but only the humbler and dwellers in the provinces; *cives* were not to be crucified. The offences which were thus punished were highway robbery and piracy, assassination, lying and false witness, insurrection, and high treason," Pauly, *Realencykl.* art. "Cruz." It was not abolished till the time of Constantine, who put an end to it out of regard to Christianity. The comparison which Plutarch draws from it shows what the sensation was, *De sera num. vind.* 9 (554 A), τῷ μὲν σώματι τῶν κολαζομένων ἕκαστος κακούργων ἰκφέρει τὸν αὐτοῦ σταυρόν ἢ δὲ κακία τῶν κολαστηρίων ἐφ' ἑαυτὴν ἕκαστὸν ἐξ αὐτῆς τεκταίνεται, δεινὴ τις οὐσα βίου δημιουργὸς οἰκτροῦ καὶ σὺν αἰσχύνη φόβους τε πολλοὺς καὶ πάθη χαλεπὰ καὶ μεταμελείας καὶ ταραχαῖς ἀπαύστους ἔχοντος. Thus crucifixion was at one and the same time an execution, a pillory, and an instrument of torture. As to the circumstances and mode of crucifixion, see Zöckler, *l.c.*, Beilage, vii. p. 433 sqq. In biblical Greek the word occurs only in the N. T. (σταυρόω, Esth. vii. 10 = ἡλ. Add. Esth. vi. 15), and this (a) of the punishment of death pronounced upon Christ by the Roman authorities, Matt. xxvii. 40, 42; Mark xv. 30, 32; Luke xxiii. 26; John xix. 25, 31; Phil. ii. 8; Heb. xii. 2, ὑπέμεινε σταυρὸν αἰσχύνης καταφρονήσας; cf. Gal. v. 11, τὸ σκάνδαλον τοῦ σταυροῦ. As to the bearing of the cross to the place of execution (see Plutarch quoted above; Artemidor. *Oneirocrit.* ii. 56, ὁ μέλλων σταυρῷ προσηλοῦσθαι

πρότερον αὐτὸν βαστάζει), Matt. xxvii. 32, Mark xv. 21, Luke xxiii. 26, John xix. 17, the affixing of the accusation, John xix. 19 and parallels, cf. Zöckler, p. 434. Connected with the bearing of the cross on the part of the condemned we have (b) the expression, Matt. x. 38, ὃς οὐ λαμβάνει τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀκολουθεῖ ὀπίσω μου; xvi. 24, εἴ τις θέλει ὀπίσω μου ἔλθειν, ἀπαρνησάσθω ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἀράτω τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀκολουθεῖτω μοι; Mark viii. 34, x. 21; Luke ix. 23, xiv. 27, ὅστις οὐ βαστάζει τὸν σταυρὸν ἑαυτοῦ καὶ ἔρχεται ὀπίσω μου, οὐ δύναται εἶναί μου μαθητής. The comparison would be understood as borrowed from the well-known custom even apart from Christ's crucifixion (against Meyer and others). But by the reference to Himself, and to the impending end of His life, Christ takes from the comparison all implication of actual guilt; there remains only the reference to the *sufferings* in store for the disciples from the world, sufferings by which the world separated them from itself, and thus a reference only to reproach, ignominy, and death; cf. Heb. xiii. 13, τοίνυν ἐξερχώμεθα πρὸς αὐτὴν ἔξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς τὸν ὀνειδισμὸν αὐτοῦ φέροντες. Accordingly σταυρός is in this sense used of suffering for Christ's sake (cf. Herm. Past. Vis. iii. 2. 1, εἵνεκεν τοῦ ὀνόματος), as also Chrysostom explains, whereas Theophylact refers it to the τῶν τῆς σαρκὸς θελημάτων τὴν νέκρωσιν; cf. Ignatius, *ad Trall.* xi. 2, a thought which is not supported by Gal. v. 24 (see σταυρώω) or Rom. vi. 6 (see συνσταυρώω). (c) With the death of Christ upon the cross is connected in substance a considerable part of the Pauline phraseology; thus the word of apostolic announcement is called ὁ λόγος ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ, 1 Cor. i. 18; cf. Eph. ii. 16, ἀποκαταλλάξῃ τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους . . . τῷ θεῷ διὰ τοῦ σταυροῦ, i.e. through the death of ignominy and shame suffered by Christ; Col. i. 20, εἰρηνοποιήσας διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ σταυροῦ αὐτοῦ; ii. 14, ἐξαλείψας τὸ καθ' ἡμῶν χειρόγραφον . . . καὶ αὐτὸ ἦρκεν ἐκ τοῦ μέσου προσηλώσας αὐτὸ τῷ σταυρῷ, according to which His death was both the judgment and the execution of the sentence upon our sins (cf. Gal. iii. 13 under κατάρα), and thus all depends upon it, ἵνα μὴ κενωθῇ ὁ σταυρὸς τοῦ Χριστοῦ. While the cross of Christ is on the one hand the memorial of the relation between Him and the world, on the other hand it is that upon which our redemption and salvation depend; and thus the apostle makes the twofold declaration, Gal. vi. 14, ἐμοὶ δὲ μὴ γένοιτο κανχᾶσθαι εἰ μὴ ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δι' οὗ ἐμοὶ κόσμος ἐσταύρωται καὶ γὰρ κόσμος. Thus antagonism to the cross of Christ is antagonism to redemption, to redemption accomplished by the deepest humiliation, not by the display of power and glory (Phil. ii. 5-8), Phil. iii. 11, ἐχθροὺς τοῦ σταυροῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ; Gal. vi. 14, ἵνα τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ Χριστοῦ μὴ διώκονται; v. 11, ἄρα κατήγγηται τὸ σκάνδαλον τοῦ σταυροῦ. This Pauline way of speaking of Christ's death differs from the Johannine and Petrine writings and the Epistle to the Hebrews, which predicate of the blood or sacrifice of Christ (as Paul himself does elsewhere) what is here predicated of the cross, for here it is not the idea of sacrifice as such which is emphasized,—for this we have αἷμα τοῦ σταυροῦ, Col. i. 20,—but what Christ experienced from the world has, as the full measure of His rejection, become in a marvellous manner the means of redemption; and this peculiarity of His death—which

also was a sacrifice—must needs be made prominent.—Cf. Zöckler, *Das Kreuz Christi*, 1875; article "Crux" in Pauly's *Realencykl.* ii. 768; Winer, *Realwörterbuch*, article "Kreuzigung."

Σταυρόω, (I.) to make or drive in stakes or palisades; then to furnish with palisades, to strengthen therewith, Thuc. Diod. σταύρωμα, intrenchment, Xen., Thuc., Plut., Diod. (II.) Of the punishment of crucifixion = to crucify, synon. σκολοπίζειν, both, however, rare in profane Greek, usually ἀνασταυροῦν, syn. ἀνασκολοπίζειν; cf. Xen. *Anab.* iii. 1. 17, ὃς καὶ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ καὶ τεθνηκότος ἀποτεμῶν τὴν κεφαλὴν καὶ τὴν χεῖρα ἀνεσταύρωσεν. In Herod. ἀνασκολοπίζειν is more frequent; even later, e.g. in Polyb., the latter still occurs side by side with ἀναστ., but the use of ἀναστ. grows and prevails in Polyb., perhaps connected with the introduction of the cross from the Carthaginians, which occurred about this time. In Plato, *Gorg.* 473 C, it may still, if we keep in view the meaning in Xen., be = to empale; but that Polyb. had no longer in mind the form of empalement is clear from viii. 23. 6. In i. 11. 15, i. 24. 6, i. 79. 4, it is described as a Punic punishment of death; in v. 54. 6 as a Syrian. The simple verb, Esth. vii. 10; Add. Esth. vi. 15 = ἤη, to hang.

The preference for the verb in its simple form in N. T. Greek is in keeping with the circumstance that the N. T. writers dwell rather upon the fact of the punishment thus inflicted, than upon the manner of its infliction by lifting up or suspending (ἀναστ.). (Artemidor. uses only the simple verb, *Oneirocrit.* i. 76, ii. 73.) It stands in the N. T. (a) of the crucifixion of Christ, Matt. xx. 19, xxiii. 34, xxvi. 2, xxvii. 22, 23, 26, 31, 35, 38, xxviii. 5; Mark xv. 13, 14, 15, 20, 24, 25, 27, xvi. 6; Luke xxiii. 21, 23, 33, xxiv. 7, 20; John xix. 6, 10, 15, 16, 18, 20, 23, 41; Acts ii. 36, iv. 10; Rev. xi. 8; 1 Cor. ii. 8; 2 Cor. xiii. 4. The amazing contradiction between this most dishonourable of punishments and Him on whom it was inflicted, is expressed in 1 Cor. ii. 8, τὸν κύριον τῆς δόξης ἐσταύρωσαν. Hence Χριστὸς ἐσταυρωμένος is the characteristic expression for the sum and substance of the apostolic preaching, 1 Cor. i. 23, ii. 2, Gal. iii. 1 (cf. Matt. xx. 19, xxviii. 5; Mark xvi. 6), made significant by the fact which is further true of Him, ἐσταυρώθη ἐξ ἀσθενείας, ἀλλὰ ζῆ ἐκ δυνάμεως θεοῦ, 2 Cor. xiii. 4, and further, again, because He was crucified ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν; cf. 2 Cor. i. 13, μὴ Παῦλος ἐσταυρώθη ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν; This leads on (b) to the figurative use of the word, Gal. v. 24, οἱ δὲ τοῦ Χυ. Ἰν. τὴν σάρκα ἐσταύρωσαν σὺν τοῖς παθήμασιν καὶ ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις, which is not to be understood of sanctification, of the progressive conflict against sinful lusts, but of what has taken place and is accomplished in and through fellowship with the Crucified One, here expressed as the act of oneself, but in Rom. vi. 6 as an experience (explained under παλαιός); for σάρξ, as a determining power in the case of those who are τοῦ Χριστοῦ, is a thing of the past; cf. ver. 25, εἰ ζῶμεν πνεύματι. In like manner he who belongs to Christ experiences, in fellowship with Him, what Christ experienced from the world, ἐσταύρωται τῷ κόσμῳ, Gal. vi. 14; and this relation to the Crucified in

turn brings with it the fulfilment in the case of the world of what the world had done to Christ, δι' οὗ ἐμοὶ κόσμος ἐσταύρωται.

Ἀνασταυρόω, to crucify, literally to bring to the cross, to lift up upon the cross, but never = to crucify again, see σταυρόω; and thus in Heb. vi. 6 of the sin of apostasy, ἀνασταυροῦντας ἑαυτοῖς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ παραδειγματίζοντες; cf. Heb. x. 29, ὁ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ καταπατήσας καὶ τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης κοινὸν ἡγησάμενος, which means that the persons referred to will not have Christ to be anything more to them than did they who crucified Him; cf. 1 Cor. xi. 27, ἔνοχος τοῦ σώματος καὶ τοῦ αἵματος κυρίου. Certainly ἀνα in many compounds signifies both *up* and *back*, e.g. ἀνασκευάζειν, ἀναπλεῖν, et al.; but the usage of ἀναστ. is too fixed, and the classical colouring of the Greek of the Epistle to the Hebrews leads to the opinion that the compound verb is chosen simply instead of the simple, which is unused in profane Greek; the connection, moreover, especially the παραδειγματίζειν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, not only forbids the rendering to crucify again, but obliges us to adopt the signification to crucify.

Συνσταυρόω, to crucify with, not in profane Greek; (a) of the crucifixion of several; John xix. 32, τινά τινι, as also Lachm., Tisch., Treg., Westc. read in Matt. xxvii. 44, instead of σὺν τινι, while in Mark xv. 32 they read σὺν instead of the dative of the Rec. (b) Figuratively, Rom. vi. 6, ὁ παλαιὸς ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος συνεσταυρώθη; see παλαιός. Experiencing this, the relation of subjection to the law is at an end, Gal. ii. 19, 20, διὰ νόμου νόμφ ἀπέθανον ἵνα θεῷ ζήσω· Χριστῷ συνεσταύρωμαι; cf. iii. 13.

Στέλλω. In the LXX. 2 Macc. v. 1; Wisd. xiv. 1. In Mal. ii. 5 = נָחַל, Niphal. Also Ἀποστέλλω with ἐξαποστέλλω is the usual word for נָחַל, but נָחַל = ἐκτείνειν.—Ἀπόστολος often occurs in Dem. as a name for the fleet, e.g. iii. 5, xviii. 107. In the LXX. only once = נָחַל, 1 Kings xiv. 6. (a) Generally, one sent, 2 Cor. viii. 23, ἀπόστολοι ἐκκλησιῶν; Phil. ii. 25, ὑμῶν ἀπόστολος. (b) As a term. techn. to denote the apostles. This perhaps is connected with the use of נָחַל in post-biblical Hebrew to designate the priests and rulers of the synagogue, describing them as delegates of the churches or of God; see Levy, *Chald. Wörterb. über die Targ.* under נָחַל, who quotes Kiddush 23b, "The priests are in the sacrifices to be regarded as sent by God; they cannot be regarded as sent by us, for we of ourselves dare not offer any sacrifice;" and herewith cf. Berachoth v. 5, כְּמוֹת אֶדָם לִשְׁלֹחַ, "he who is commissioned by any one is as he who commissions himself." Elsewhere נָחַל, the overseer of the synagogue, the president of the Sanhedrim, is the person "delegated," i.e. by the community. If Ἀπόστολος thus includes נָחַל, there is in the term an abrogation of O. T. institutions; cf. Matt. xix. 28.—Ἀποστολή is (a) active, a sending forth, letting go, liberating, Eccles. viii. 8; (b) passive, a thing sent, present; (c) the office of apostle, Acts. i. 25.

Στοιχείον, τό, from στοιχος, row, στοιχέω, to put or go in a row = one of a series, κατὰ στοιχείον, in (alphabetical) succession, Curtius 195. In usage it signifies (a) a letter

of the alphabet, not as a written sign but as one of a series, a constituent part, or one of the primary elements or beginnings of syllables and words. Plat. *Crat.* 434 A, τὰ στοιχεῖα ἐξ ὧν τὰ πρῶτα ὀνόματά τις ξυνθήσει; Deff. 414 E, στοιχεῖα φωνῆς φωνὴ ἀσύνθετος; Cornut. *theol. graec. epit.* 22, πλεονάζοντος τοῦ στοιχείου; Aristot. *et al.*, τὰ στοιχεῖα, the alphabet, Xen. *Mem.* ii. 1. 1, σκοπῶμεν ἀρξάμενοι ἀπὸ τῆς τροφῆς ὥσπερ ἀπὸ τῶν στοιχείων . . . Δοκεῖ γοῦν μοι ἡ τροφή ἀρχὴ εἶναι· οὐδὲ γὰρ ζῷη γ' ἂν τις εἰ μὴ τρέφοιτο. (b) Since Plato it signifies the first principles, elements, of which the world and all in the world consist; Plat. *Theaet.* 201 E, τὰ πρῶτα οἷον περὶ στοιχεῖα ἐξ ὧν ἡμεῖς τε ξυγκείμεθα καὶ τᾶλλα; since Aristotle to be distinguished from the synonymous ἀρχαί as the *causae materiales* of the *formales*; cf. Bonitz, *ind. Arist.* s.v., hence ἀρχαί τε καὶ στοιχεῖα often conjoined; Plut. *de plac. phil.* i. 2 (875 C), στοιχεῖα μὲν καλοῦμεν γῆν, ὕδωρ, ἀέρα, πῦρ. But earth and water are derived from the ὕλη ἄμορφος καὶ ἀειδής, i.e. their ἀρχή, for ἀρχὰς δὲ λέγομεν ὅτι οὐκ ἔχει τι πρότερον ἐξ οὗ γεννᾶται. Hence τὰ στοιχεῖα in the common language is = *that of which the world consists*; Cornut. 26, τὸν Ἀτλαντα . . . ἔχειν κίονας μακράς, τὰς τῶν στοιχείων δυνάμεις, καθ' ἃς τὰ μὲν ἀνωφερῆ ἐστὶ, τὰ δὲ κατωφερῆ. In O. T. Greek only thus, and in the LXX. only Wisd. vii. 17, εἰδέναι σύστασιν κόσμου καὶ ἐνέργειαν στοιχείων; 4 Macc. xii. 13, τοὺς ὁμοιοπαθεῖς καὶ ἐκ τῶν αὐτῶν γεγονότας στοιχείων; xix. 18, δι' ἑαυτῶν γὰρ τὰ στοιχεῖα μεθαρμοζόμενα. Often in Philo and Josephus. In 2 Pet. iii. 10, 12, οὐρανοί and στοιχεῖα are twice named as distinct things; and στοιχεῖα here are not the stars, as in later Greek οὐράνια στοιχεῖα (Justin M. *Apol.* ii. 5; Theophil. *ad Autol.* i. 4. 9), and as the stars are perhaps thus designated by στοιχεῖα alone, but very seldom; στοιχεῖα here denotes the earth, this part of creation; cf. ver. 13, where καινοὺς οὐρανοὺς καὶ καινὴν γῆν are employed instead of οὐρ. καὶ στοιχεῖα, because this latter would be inappropriate to the concluding words ἐν οἷς δικ. κατοικεῖ. Cf. Just. M. *dial. c. Tryph.* 285 C, ἡ ὅτι πρὸς ἑαυτὸν ἔλεγεν ὁ θς Ποιήσωμεν . . . ἡ ὅτι πρὸς τὰ στοιχεῖα, τοιτέστι τὴν γῆν καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ὁμοίως ἐξ ὧν νοοῦμεν τὸν ἄνθρωπον γεγονέναι. —Later (c) στοιχεῖα is also employed to designate the first principles, the fundamental elements of knowledge, etc.; rarely in Attic Greek, and usually with the genitive, e.g. Cornut. 14, στοιχείου παιδείας ἐστὶ τὸ ἀφορᾶν πρὸς τὸ θεῖον κ.τ.λ.; Plut. *de puer. educ.* 16 (12 C), δύο γὰρ ταῦτα ὥσπερ ἐν στοιχείᾳ τῆς ἀρετῆς εἰσὶν, ἐλπίς τε τιμῆς καὶ φόβος τιμωρίας. Cf. Diog. L. x. 37, ποιήσασθαι δεῖ καὶ τοιαύτην τινὰ ἐπιτομὴν καὶ στοιχειώσιν τῶν ὅλων δόξων. *Ibid.* 44 = “instruction in first or elementary principles;” cf. Galen in Wetstein on Gal. iv. 3, μηδὲ τὰ στοιχεῖα τῆς Ἱπποκράτους τέχνης ἐπιστάμενος. Without the genitive, Plut. *Marcell.* xvii. 5, ὑποθέσεις . . . καθαρωτέροις στοιχείοις γραφόμεναι. In this sense Heb. v. 12, διδάσκειν τίνα τὰ στοιχεῖα τῆς ἀρχῆς τῶν λογίων τοῦ θεοῦ, where τῆς ἀρχ. strengthens the conception = “the first elements of all;” compare the contrast διδάσκαλος and νήπιος, vv. 12, 13. In this sense as peculiar to later Greek it must be taken also, as the ὅτε ἡμεν νήπιοι shows, in Gal. iv. 3, and in ver. 9 also; likewise in Col. ii. 8, 20; Gal. iv. 3,

οὕτως . . . sc. ὡς ὁ κληρονόμος ἐφ' ὅσον χρόνον νήπιός ἐστιν, ὑπὸ ἐπιτρόποις ἐστὶν . . . καὶ ἡμεῖς ὅτε ἦμεν νήπιοι, ὑπὸ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου ἤμεθα δεδουλωμένοι. Cf. iii. 24, ὁ νόμος παιδαγωγὸς ἡμῶν γέγονεν; iv. 4, τοὺς ὑπὸ νόμον. That the point of the comparison does not lie simply in δεδουλωμένοι, but that the σ. τ. κ. answers to the ἐπιτρόποις κ.τ.λ., and therefore denotes the law, is confirmed by ver. 9, πῶς ἐπιστρέφετε πάλιν ἐπὶ τὰ ἀσθενῆ καὶ πτῶχα στοιχεῖα οἷς πάλιν ἄνωθεν δουλεῦσαι θέλετε; cf. ver. 10, ἡμέρας παρατηρεῖσθε καὶ μῆνας καὶ καιροὺς καὶ ἐνιαυτούς. Had the apostle meant that, because the law had to do with days, months, etc., there was a servitude to the elements of which the world consists, he would not have used δεδουλωμένοι, but probably οἷς πάλιν δουλεύειν θέλ., for this expression would have denoted idolatry. If this be taken as answering to the former heathenism of the readers (ver. 8), the apostle would be placing the law of Israel—for it is of the time of this law, and of the past of the Israel of God (vi. 16), that he is certainly speaking in ver. 3—on a par with heathenism, and the question would remain, in what way could he designate servitude to the law as servitude to the material elements of which the world consists? These elements are not days, sabbaths, feasts, etc. There is no warrant for appeal to the earliest exegesis, for they by σ. τ. κ. understood, not so much the elements, but primarily the stars, etc., according to which days, etc. are regulated, see Suicer, *Thes. s.v.*, and only secondarily water and fire. It is evident that τοῦ κόσμου is not in keeping with this view; and how little such an explanation suits Col. ii. 9, 20, is clear from ver. 17, where of these στοιχεῖα it is said, ἃ ἐστὶν σκιὰ τῶν μελλόντων, τὸ δὲ σῶμα Χριστοῦ. Theophylact, moreover, recognises another explanation, τινὲς δὲ τὸν στοιχειώδη καὶ εἰσαγωγικὸν νόμον ἐνόησαν, and this is the true one. In relation to what the πλήρωμα τοῦ χρόνου accomplished, Gal. iv. 4, viz. the νῦν δὲ γνόντες θεόν, μᾶλλον δὲ γνωσθέντες ὑπὸ θεοῦ, the times past provided in the law, intended for the childhood and minority of the heir, only στοιχεῖα, elements. Regarded as a person, the law was παιδαγωγός and ἐπίτροπος, in its contents it presented only στοιχεῖα (cf. Heb. vii. 19, οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐτελείωσεν ὁ νόμος), and these are only πτῶχα καὶ ἀσθενῆ στοιχεῖα, ver. 9 (cf. Heb. vii. 18, διὰ τὸ αὐτῆς ἀσθενὲς καὶ ἀνωφελές); for they give no idea of the whole, they contain nothing of the possessions in store for the heir, but merely a σκιὰ τῶν μελλόντων, τὸ δὲ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, Col. ii. 16, and face to face with the full salvation they may, nay must, be designated merely στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου. This genitive is not indeed *gen. part.* as in σ.τ. παιδείας, τέχνης, but the *gen. poss.* or *qualitatis*. The law is characterized according to that which it presents, as κόσμος to βασιλεία τ. θ. (1 Cor. xv. 50), to τὰ ἐπουράνια (cf. iv. 21 sqq.), to Χριστός (Col. ii. 20), to the sphere of life of those who belong εἰς Χριστόν (Gal. iii. 24), who are raised with Him to a new life, and through Him have entered upon the free possession of the inheritance. The στοιχεῖα which the law presents possess, as its purposes also show, the features of the κόσμος, because they have to do with life cosmically conditioned and formed. Cf. Col. ii. 20, εἰ ἀπεθάνετε σὺν Χριστῷ ἀπὸ τῶν στοιχείων τοῦ κόσμου

(cf. Gal. vi. 14, δι' οὗ ἐμοὶ κόσμος ἐσταύρωται καὶ γὰρ κόσμῳ), τί ὡς ζῶντες ἐν κόσμῳ δογματίζεσθε; The law constitutes and gives elementary nurture and instruction to those who have at present no other sphere of life save the κόσμος, and therefore these στοιχεῖα are such, belonging as they do to the sphere of the κόσμος, and partaking of its nature; hence Col. ii. 8, κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν ἀνθρώπων, κατὰ τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου καὶ οὐ κατὰ Χριστόν, where στοιχ. τ. κ. characterizes as to its contents what παράδοσις ἀνθρ. designates as to its origin (not identical here with the νόμος παιδαγωγός). The στοιχεῖα are the elements which bear in them the nature or character of the world, and not of Christ. For the earlier literature, see Wolff, *Curae philol.* on Gal. iv. 3; for the later, Meyer = Sieffert on Gal. iv. 3, and Grimm, *Clavis*, s.v. Compare also Delitzsch, "Horae Hebr. et Talm." in the *Zeitschr. für die gesammte Luther. Theol.* 1878, p. 404 sqq., who explains στ. τ. κ. as "having to do with things of the outward visible world," and refers to τὸ ἅγιον κοσμικόν, Heb. ix. 1.

Στρέφω. Lachm., Tisch., Treg., Westc. read στραφῶσιν for ἐπιστραφῶσιν in John xii. 40. Cf. 1 Kings xviii. 37, ἔστρεψας τὴν καρδίαν τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου ὀπίσω; cf. Acts vii. 39. But the difficulty remains that the direction is not stated. We must compare the absolute στρέφεσθαι = *to turn oneself from the course prescribed*, as in Ps. lxxviii. 9, ἐστράφησαν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ πολέμου, the main point being not the whither but the whence, the change or turning. In the LXX. = הפך (also = ἀνα-, ἀπο-, ἐκ-, ἐπι-, κατα-, μεταστρέφω, μεταβάλλω). The word denoting moral and religious change is שׁוּב; see ἀποστρέφειν, ἐπιστρέφειν.

Ἀποστρέφω, aor. ἀπέστρεψα; perf. ἀπέστροφα; aorist middle and passive, ἀπεστράφην; future, ἀποστραφήσομαι, Num. xxv. 4, xxxii. 15; 2 Sam. xi. 15, *et al.*; while the future middle ἀποστρέψομαι does not appear in biblical Greek. Primarily transitive = *to turn away from, to cause any person or thing to turn*; then intransitive, *to turn oneself, to turn round*. Passive, *to turn oneself from or away*, hence, for example, *to shun any one*; then also = *to flee, to fall away from*, according to the situation indicated, but never absolutely, of moral conversion or improvement. Homer, Herod., Xen., Soph., Plutarch. That the passive is to be taken as a middle passive, and not as a middle, is clear not only from the future ἀποστραφήσομαι peculiar to biblical Greek, and the aorist found in Greek usage throughout ἀπεστράφην, but also from the other compound καταστρέφω, whose middle has a middle sense = *I resign myself to*, while the passive is = *I am made subservient to*, see (c). The word is as rare in N. T. Greek as it is frequent in the O. T., where it is = סׁוּר Hiphil, סׁוּר Hiphil, שׁוּב Hiphil, מׁר, סׁבב Kal and Hiph., פׁנּה, *et al.*; but especially = שׁוּב Kal and Hiphil, which more frequently is = ἐπιστρέφω; also = ἀναστρέφω, ἐπαναστρέφω, ὑποστρέφω, and often is rendered by other synonyms. (I.) Transitive, (a) *to turn away from* = הִסִּיר, e.g. μαλακίαν ἀπό τινος, Ex. xxiii. 25; Job xxxiii. 17, ἀνθρώπον ἀπὸ ἀδικίας. Prov. iv. 27, τὸν πόδα ἀπὸ ὁδοῦ κακῆς. = הִסִּיר, always in the combination τὸ πρόσωπον ἀπό τινος, or merely τὸ

πρόσωπον, Ex. iii. 6, Deut. xxxi. 17, 18, xxxii. 20, and especially in the Psalms (sometimes in this combination also = סָׁׁר , 2 Chron. xxx. 9; סָׁׁר , Ezek. vii. 22; Isa. xxxviii. 2, *et al.*; שָׁׁב , 1 Kings ii. 16, *et al.*). $\text{יָׁׁרַע$ and $\text{עָׁׁלַע$, τὸν ὀφθαλμόν, Ps. cxix. 37; Prov. xxviii. 27; Isa. i. 15. Thus in the N. T., τὴν ἀκοήν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀληθείας, 2 Tim. iv. 4; cf. Jer. xlv. 5; Rom. xi. 26, ἀποστρέφει ἀσεβείας ἀπὸ Ἰακώβ (from Isa. lix. 20); cf. Ezek. xxiii. 48.—Luke xxiii. 14, ὡς ἀποστρέφοντα τὸν λαόν = *to alienate*; cf. 2 Chron. xviii. 31; Jer. xli. 10, in another situation. (b) To turn round, to cause one to turn round, therefore = to bring or lead back = שָׁׁב , Gen. xxiv. 5, 6, 8; Deut. xxviii. 68; 1 Sam. vi. 21; Jer. xxx. 3, *et al.* Thus in the N. T. Matt. xxvii. 3, τὰ τριάκοντα ἀργύρια (Tisch., Treg., Westc., ἔστρεψεν); xxvi. 52, ἀπόστρεψον τὴν υἰαδικίαν σου εἰς τὸν τόπον αὐτῆς. Further = שָׁׁב , to make to cease, Gen. xxiv. 5, 6, 8; Deut. xxviii. 68; 1 Sam. vi. 21; Jer. xxx. 3, *et al.* $\text{תָׁׁשַׁבַּע$, Ezek. vii. 24, xii. 23, xvi. 40, xxiii. 27, 48, xxxiv. 10; Hos. ii. 11. (c) Passive = to be turned; hence = to remove, to avert oneself; then = to be turned round, to turn round or back. That this is to be taken as the medial passive, and not as the middle, is clear from *e.g.* Ps. xxxv. 4, ἀποστραφείησαν εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω καὶ καταισχυρυνθείησαν οἱ λογιζόμενοί μοι κακά; xl. 15, lxx. 3, cxxix. 5, with Isa. xlii. 17, αὐτοὶ δὲ ἀπεστράφησαν εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω (here everywhere = סָׁׁר). The connection shows whether it is used in a passive or in a reflexive sense; in the former, *e.g.*, 1 Sam. xxx. 22; Gen. xliii. 12, *et al.*; in the latter, Josh. xxii. 16, 18, 29, ἀποστραφῆναι ἀπὸ κυρίου = סָׁׁר ; syn. ἀποστήναι. Jer. xxv. 15, ἀποστράφητε ἕκαστος ἀπὸ τῆς ὁδοῦ αὐτοῦ. Ps. xviii. 38 and often = שָׁׁב . 1 Kings x. 14 = פָׁׁנָה . In the N. T. only ἀποστρέφεσθαι τινα, to turn oneself from one; in the LXX. almost always ἀπό or ἐκ with the Acc. Isa. xv. 6, σὺ ἀπεστράφης με, λέγει κύριος, ὀπίσω πορεύσῃ = פָׁׁנָה . Hos. viii. 3 = פָׁׁנָה , in classical Greek only sometimes with the Acc. Ar. Pax, 666, αὐτὸς ἀποστραφήσεται αὐτὸν ὁ πατήρ. Eur. Suppl. 171. Xen. Cyr. v. 5. 36, ἣ καὶ φιλήσω σε; καὶ οὐκ ἀποστρέψῃ με ὥσπερ ἄρτι. Later often, *e.g.* Polyb. ix. 39. 6, τὴν Αἰτωλῶν φιλίαν, to give up, to refer back. In Plut. ἀποστρέφεσθαι τι, to abhor something. Matt. v. 42, τὸν θέλοντα ἀπὸ σου δανίσασθαι μὴ ἀποστραφῆς. Philo, quod det. pot. insid. i. 209. 23, ὁ δὲ ἄτε ἀγαθὸς ὢν καὶ ἔλεως τοὺς ἰκέτας οὐκ ἀποστρέφεται. Heb. xii. 25, οἱ τὸν ἀπ' οὐρανῶν ἀποστρεφόμενοι. 2 Tim. i. 15, iv. 4; Tit. i. 14. (II.) Intransitive, to turn oneself from, to turn back or round, *e.g.* ἀπὸ τῆς ἀνομίας, ἐκ τῶν ἀνομιῶν, ἐκ τῆς δικαιοσύνης, Ezek. iii. 19, 20, and often; even side by side with the transitive ἀ, *e.g.* Ezek. xviii. 8, 17, τὴν χεῖρα ἀποστρέφειν ἀπὸ ἀδικίας; cf. with vv. 21, 23 = שָׁׁב . So in the N. T. Acts iii. 26, ἐν τῷ ἀποστρέφειν ἕκαστον ἀπὸ τῶν πονηριῶν ὑμῶν.—Absolutely, in a moral and religious sense = to turn oneself, syn. with μετανοεῖν, ἐπιστρέφειν, it does not occur except in Isa. xxx. 15, ὅταν ἀποστραφεῖς στενάξῃς, τότε σωθήσῃ; in some MSS. Jer. iii. 12, ἀποστρέφεσθαι πρὸς τὸν κύριον, but Vat. and Alex. read ἐπιστρ. As synon. with μετανοεῖν, but not in the religious sense, it stands by itself, 1 Sam. xv. 29, οὐκ ἀποστρέψει οὐδὲ μετανοήσει κύριος.—Ἐπιστρέφειν occurs in the passive as = to be

turned; cf. the act. trans. 2 Chron. xix. 4, ἐπέστρεψεν αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ κύριον θεὸν τῶν πατέρων αὐτῶν, in 1 Pet. ii. 25, ἦτε ὡς πρόβατα πλανώμενοι, ἀλλ' ἐπεστράφητε νῦν ἐπὶ τὸν ποιμένα κ.τ.λ.; cf. Lam. v. 21 (Isa. xlix. 6; Ezek. xxxiv. 4, 16). Usually, however, reflective, see Hos. xiv. 2, 3, Joel ii. 12, yet mostly in the active.

Σώζω = נצח Niphal and Hiphil, מלך Piel, Niphal, and Hiphil, and especially נשׂא. The frequent use of σωτήρ in the Pastoral Epistles must be traced back to the usage of the O. T., where the word is always joined with the genitive of the object; and its rare employment in the other N. T. writings with reference to God is owing to its employment in profane Greek as a name for Zeus.—Σωτήρ in the LXX. is, as a rule = נשׂא, נשׂא, נשׂא, = מלך, 2 Sam. xv. 14; Dan. xi. 42.—Σωτήριος in the LXX. is the *term. techn.* for the מלך, the thank-offerings; and analogously in profane Greek.

Σῶμα is in the LXX. = שׂר, see σάρξ; also = נ, נ, 1 Sam. xxxi. 10, 12; נ, נ, Dan. x. 6; Deut. xxi. 23; Josh. viii. 29; 1 Kings xiii. 22 sqq. נ, Dan. iii. 28, 29, iv. 30, v. 23, vii. 11.

Ταπεινός is in the LXX. chiefly = נ (usually = πτωχός, also πένης, ἀσθενής), Ps. xviii. 28, lxxxii. 3; Isa. xiv. 32, xxxii. 7, xlix. 13, liv. 11, lxvi. 2; Jer. xxii. 16; Amos ii. 7; Prov. iii. 34.—Ταπεινός is used in the LXX. specially of the humbling of the sinner by divine chastisement, 1 Kings viii. 35; 2 Chron. vi. 26; Ps. cxix. 67, 71, 75, 107; Isa. ii. 11, 17, iii. 16; Hos. v. 5. Compare also Job xxii. 23; Ps. li. 19; Isa. lviii. 3, 5, 10. Also = נ, נ, Hiphil and Niphal; occasionally = נ, Piel, נ, *et al.*—Ταπεινώσις occurs actively in Aristotle, *Rhet. Alex.* 4, τῶν μὲν ἐνδόξων ταπεινώσις, τῶν δὲ ἀδόξων αὐξήσις. It nowhere occurs in biblical Greek of disposition; cf. Prov. xxvi. 19, κρείσσων πραῦθυμος μετὰ ταπεινώσεως ἢ ὃς διαιρεῖται σκύλα μετὰ ὑβριστῶν. In the LXX. = נ, Gen. xvi. 11, xxix. 31, xxxi. 42, xli. 52; Deut. xxvi. 7; 1 Sam. i. 11; 2 Sam. xvi. 12; 2 Kings xiv. 26; Neh. ix. 9; Ps. ix. 14, xxii. 22, xxv. 18, *et al.*, always denoting a condition evoking the pity of God.

Τέλος is in the LXX. Eccles. vii. 3, Isa. ix. 7, τῆς εἰρήνης οὐκ ἔστιν τέλος = נ. Prayer of Azarias 10, μὴ παραδῶς ἡμᾶς εἰς τέλος διὰ τὸ ὄνομά σου. Εἰς τέλος is specially used in the LXX. as = נ, and occasionally otherwise; always = *to the end*. Job xiv. 20, xx. 7, xxiii. 7; Ps. ix. 7, 19, x. 11, xliv. 25, and often. (Τέλος, on the whole, occurs seldom in the LXX., save in adverbial combinations.) Eccles. xii. 13, τέλος λόγου θεὸν φοβοῦ = נ. In the sense, *tax* = נ, נ, Num. xxxi. 28 sqq.; Lev. xxvii. 23.—Τελέω, cf. Isa. lv. 11, ἕως ἂν τελεσθῇ ὅσα ἂν ᾔθελῃσα. Thus synon. with πληροῦν, of the fulfilment of prophecy.—Τέλειος, see Ex. xii. 5, of offerings. Cf. 1 Cor. ii. 6 with 1 Chron. xxv. 8, ἔβαλον κλήρους κατὰ τὸν μικρὸν καὶ κατὰ τὸν μέγαν, τελείων καὶ μανθανόντων, נ, נ. Sometimes = נ; always in the combination καρδιά τελεία, 1 Kings viii. 62, xi. 4, xv. 3, 14; 1 Chron. xxviii. 9 (see πλήρης, 2 Kings xx. 3; 1 Chron. xxix. 9; 2 Chron. xv. 17, xvi. 9, xix. 9, xxv. 2);

also = עֲשֶׂה, which is usually rendered ἄνωμος. — Τελείως, Judith xi. 6; 2 Macc. xii. 42; 3 Macc. iii. 26, vii. 22. — Τελειότης, Prov. xi. 3 = נְהִי. — Τελειόω is in 1 Kings vii. 21, xiv. 10 = עָשָׂה. In John xix. 28 the verb denotes the final or concluding accomplishment of prophecy with reference to Christ's sufferings as a whole, ἵνα τελειωθῇ ἡ γραφή, as distinct from ἵνα πληρωθῇ. What had occurred was not τελείον until this was done. — Τελείωσις is usually in the LXX. (like τελειοῦν τὰς χεῖρας = עָשָׂה; elsewhere πληροῦν) = עֲשֶׂה, of the sacrifice upon admission to the priest's office, Ex. xxix. 22 sqq.; Lev. vii. 37, viii. 21 sqq. — Τελειωτής, in Heb. xii. 2, signifies "who brings faith to its goal;" cf. Polyb. ii. 40. 2, ἥς ἀρχηγὸν μὲν καὶ καθ' ἡγεμόνα τῆς ὁλῆς ἐπιβολῆς Ἄρατον νομιστέον . . . ἀγωνιστὴν δὲ καὶ τελεσιουργὸν τῆς πράξεως κ.τ.λ. — Συντελέω is in the LXX. the usual word for מָלַךְ; occasionally = נָשָׂא, עָשָׂה, עָלָה, et al. — Συντέλεια in the LXX. is often = מָלַךְ; occasionally also נָשָׂא, עָשָׂה, et al. Cf. Eccles. xi. 27, ἐν συντελείᾳ ἀνθρώπου ἀποκάλυψις ἔργων αὐτοῦ; cf. ver. 28, πρὸ τελευτῆς; xxi. 11, συντέλεια τοῦ φόβου κυρίου σοφία; xxxiii. 24, xxxix. 28, ἐν καιρῷ συντελείας; not, therefore, anywhere in an historico-redemptive sense.

Τέμνω, τεμῶ, ἔτεμον, τέμνηκα, ἐτμήθην, to cut, in biblical Greek only in the LXX. and Apocrypha, and seldom there = נָחַץ, of pruning the vine, Lev. xxv. 3, 4; Isa. v. 5; = נָחַץ, 2 Kings vi. 4; Dan. ii. 45 = נָחַץ, Ex. xxxix. 3. Elsewhere Wisd. v. 12; 4 Macc. ix. 17, x. 19.

Κατατομή, ἡ, a cutting away, or asunder, only in later Greek and actively. In biblical Greek only in Phil. iii. 2, passively, βλέπετε τὴν κατατομήν; cf. ver. 3, ἡμεῖς γὰρ ἔσμεν ἡ περιτομή οἱ πνεύματι θεοῦ λατρεύοντες, to denote the Jewish false teachers, οἱ ἐν σαρκὶ πεποιθότες, since their περιτομή by their opposition amounted to a κατατομή, i.e. not "to a mere cutting which had been inflicted on the body" (Hofmann, Meyer; cf. κατατέμνειν, Lev. xxi. 5, 1 Kings xviii. 28, where κατατ. also signifies to cut asunder or off, as in Isa. xv. 2), but to a cutting off which excluded from the Church of God; cf. Deut. xxiii. 1, οὐκ εἰσελεύσεται θλαδίας οὐδὲ ἀποκεκομμένος εἰς ἐκκλησίαν κυρίου; see ἀποκόπτω. Further compare Isa. lvi. 3.

Περιτέμνω, to cut round, to cut off, to circumcise, LXX. = מָלַךְ, interchanged with περικαθαρίζειν, Deut. xxx. 6; cf. Lev. xix. 23, and so exclusively and κατ' ἐξ. for circumcision, that when מָלַךְ is used with another object, as = to cut off, as in Job xiv. 2, Ps. xc. 6, cxviii. 10, 11, 12, another rendering is chosen (ἐκπίπτω, ἀποπίπτω, ἀμύνομαι), though profane usage would have allowed the rendering περιτ., especially in Ps. cxviii. 10, 11, 12. Only once does περιτ. stand with another object than ἀκροβυστία or σάρκα, ἀρσενικόν, υἱόν, etc., namely in Ezek. xvi. 4, τὸν δμφαλον = מָלַךְ, which in Ex. iv. 25 is used of circumcision κατ' ἐξ. In Jer. iv. 4 it answers to מָלַךְ Hiphil, but still in the sense of circumcision, περιτμήθητε (מָלַךְ) τῷ θεῷ ὑμῶν καὶ περιτέμνεσθε (מָלַךְ for περιελέσθαι) τὴν σκληροκαρδίαν ὑμῶν. Everywhere else = מָלַךְ, Gen. xvii. 10,

11, 12, 14, 23, 24–27, xxi. 4, xxxiv. 15, 17, 22, 24; Ex. xii. 44, 48; Lev. xii. 3; Deut. x. 16; Josh. v. 2, 3, 4, 7, 8; Jer. iv. 4, ix. 24. Thus in Herod. the middle = *to circumcise oneself*; ii. 36. 2, τὰ αἰδοῖα ὅλλοι μὲν ἔωσι ὡς ἐγένοντο, πλὴν ὅσοι ἀπὸ τούτων ἔμαθον, Αἰγύπτιοι δὲ περιτάμνονται; *ibid.* 104. 1, μόνον πάντων ἀνθρώπων Κόλχοι καὶ Αἰγύπτιοι καὶ Αἰθίοπες περιτάμνονται ἀπ' ἀρχῆς τὰ αἰδοῖα. In like manner the middle, Diod. Sic. iii. 32; Josephus, *c. Ap.* i. 22. 5, ii. 13. 4, 5, 6; *Ant.* i. 10. 5. The active, *Ant.* i. 12. 2, the passive there also. The middle in Philo. In the LXX. the active, Gen. xvii. 23, 27; Ex. iv. 25, xii. 44, 48; Lev. xii. 3; Josh. v. 2, 3, 4, 7. In the Apocrypha, 1 Macc. i. 60, 61; 2 Macc. vi. 11; 4 Macc. iv. 25. The passive, Gen. xvii. 10, 12, 13, 14, 26, xxxiv. 15; Josh. v. 8; Jer. ix. 24; Ezek. xvi. 4. The middle with aorist middle, Gen. xvii. 24, 25, xxxiv. 17, 22; Deut. x. 16; with passive aorist or future, Gen. xvii. 11; Jer. iv. 4; Judith xiv. 10. In the N. T. the active, Luke i. 59, ii. 21; John vii. 22; Acts vii. 8, xv. 5, xvi. 3, xxi. 21. In Paul's writings only the passive or middle, 1 Cor. vii. 18; Gal. ii. 3, v. 2, 3, vi. 12, 13; Col. ii. 11; cf. Acts xv. 1, 24.—Cf. Winer, *Realwörterb.* i. 156 sqq.; Riehm, *Handwörterb.* 168 sqq.; von Orelli in Herzog's *Encyklop.* 2nd ed. ii. 343; Oehler, *Theol. des A. T.* § 87 sqq. In the N. T. it is used mostly in its historico-redemptive meaning with reference to the covenant people (Judith xiv. 10, περιτέμετο τὴν σάρκα τῆς ἀκροβυστίας αὐτοῦ καὶ προσετέθη πρὸς τὸν οἶκον Ἰσραὴλ; cf. Joseph. *Vit.* 23, τούτους περιτέμνεσθαι τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἀναγκαζόντων, εἰ θέλουσιν εἶναι παρ' αὐτοῖς), to denote their obligation under the law (cf. Acts xv. 1; Gal. v. 2, 3; see ὀφειλέτης), and in keeping with their symbolism, Col. ii. 11; compare Philo, *De sacrificantibus*, ii. 258, 5 sqq.; *De migr. Abr.* i. 450, 41 sqq.

Περιτομή, ἡ, circumcision, very seldom in profane Greek, = *the cutting round*; in biblical Greek, except in Jer. xi. 16, of the circumcision, so called κατ' ἐξ., of the ἀκροβυστία, and in the LXX. only in Ex. iv. 26 = *hew*; Gen. xvii. 12 = *hew*, infin. Niphal; in Jer. xi. 16 (a mistaking of the Hebrew *hāzāh*, noise) it stands for the hewing down of a tree. Not in the Apocrypha; rarely in Josephus, *Ant.* i. 10. 5; the plural, *ibid.* i. 12. 2, μετὰ τούτων ἡμέρας ἔθος ἔχουσιν οἱ Ἰουδ. ποιῆσθαι τὰς περιτομὰς. Oftener, on the other hand, in Philo (cf. his treatise, *De circumcisione*, i. 210–212), and in the N. T., where, excepting John vii. 22, 23, Acts vii. 8, x. 45, xi. 2, it occurs only in the Pauline writings, and this (a) actively, circumcision as an institution, John vii. 22; Gal. v. 11, εἰ περιτομὴν ἔτι κηρύσσω; Col. ii. 11; Acts vii. 8, ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ διαθήκην περιτομῆς; see διαθήκη. But usually (b) passively, John vii. 23, περιτομὴν λαμβάνειν; Rom. iv. 11, σημεῖον ἔλαβεν περιτομῆς; Rom. iv. 10, where περιτομή stands formally on a par with ἀκροβυστία, ἐν περιτομῇ εἶναι, to be in a state of circumcision, over against ἐν ἀκροβυστίᾳ εἶναι; cf. Rom. ii. 25, 26, where π. in like manner is = *the being circumcised*, *circumcision*; ver. 27, κρινεῖ ἡ ἐκ φύσεως ἀκροβυστία τὸν νόμον τελοῦσα σὲ τὸν διὰ γράμματος καὶ περιτομῆς παραβάτην νόμου, where διὰ, as in iv. 11, is = *to be a* παραβάτης while possessing the qualification established by the stipulation of the law

and circumcision. Rom. iii. 1; 1 Cor. vii. 19; Gal. v. 6, vi. 15; Phil. iii. 5. Connected with this, (c) π. is used as a name for Israel according to this its condition as circumcised, Eph. ii. 11, ὑμεῖς τὰ ἔθνη ἐν σαρκί, οἱ λεγόμενοι ἀκροβυστία ὑπὸ τῆς λεγομένης περιτομῆς ἐν σαρκὶ χειροποιήτου. Thus Rom. iii. 30, iv. 9, 12, xv. 8; Gal. ii. 7, 8, 9; Phil. iii. 9, ἡμεῖς γὰρ ἐσμεν ἡ περιτομή; Col. iii. 11. Hence οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς, they who have their origin thus, who belong thereto, not to be explained like οἱ ἐκ νόμου, Rom. iv. 14, 16, οἱ ἐξ ἐριθείας, Rom. ii. 8, but as simply local; cf. Col. iv. 11, οἱ ὄντες ἐκ π.; Acts x. 45, οἱ ἐκ π. πιστοί. Thus Acts xi. 2; Rom. iv. 12; Gal. ii. 12; Titus i. 10.—For circumcision in its symbolical meaning, see Rom. ii. 28, 29, π. καρδίας ἐν πνεύματι; cf. Col. ii. 11, ἐν ᾧ καὶ περιετμήθητε περιτομῇ ἀχειροποιήτῳ, ἐν τῇ ἀπεκδύσει τοῦ σώματος τῆς σαρκός, ἐν τῇ περιτομῇ τοῦ Χριστοῦ. In its historical gospel import, see Rom. iii. 1 sqq., iv. 11; Phil. iii. 5.

Ἀπερίτμητος, ον, uncircumcised, in the LXX. usually = לח , see under ἀκροβυστία. The word seems to be of Jewish Alexandrine origin, for in profane Greek it occurs first in Plut. *De amore prolis*, 3 (495 C) = *unmutilated*. Its employment answers to the twofold sense of circumcision, for primarily (a) with reference to its historical and gospel import, it does not simply designate the non-Israelitish peoples, but marks out and expresses the fact of their not belonging to the people of God; cf. Gen. xvii. 14; Ex. xii. 48; Judg. xiv. 3, 15, 18; 1 Sam. xiv. 6, xvii. 26, 36, xxxi. 4, *et al.*; Add. Esth. iv. 12; 1 Macc. i. 48, ii. 46; compare in particular Ezek. xxviii. 10, xxxi. 18. (b) With a reference to the symbolical meaning of circumcision, Lev. xxvi. 41, καρδία ἀπ.; Jer. ix. 25, ἀπ. τῇ καρδίᾳ, as also Ezek. xlv. 7, 9.—Jer. vi. 10, ἀ. ὄτα. Accordingly in the N. T. Acts vii. 51, σκληροτράχηλοι καὶ ἀπερίτμητοι καρδίαις καὶ τοῖς ὤσιν.

Ὁρθοτομέω, a form like ὀρθοδρομέω, ὀρθοποδέω, καινοτομέω, which occurs only in biblical Greek, twice in the LXX., Prov. iii. 6, πάσαις ὁδοῖς σου γνώριζε αὐτήν (*sc.* τὴν σοφίαν), ἵνα ὀρθοτομή τὰς ὁδοὺς σου; xi. 5, δικαιοσύνη ἀμώμους ὀρθοτομεῖ ὁδοὺς, ἀσέβεια δὲ περιπίπτει ἀδικίᾳ; and once in the N. T., 2 Tim. ii. 15, σπούδασον σεαυτὸν δόκιμον παραστήσαι τῷ θεῷ ἐργάτην ἀνεπαίσχυντον, ὀρθοτομοῦντα τὸν λόγον τῆς ἀληθείας, and hence employed in patristic Greek. In the LXX. it answers in both places to רָחַץ Piel, for which, with the same object, κατευθύνειν is used, Ps. v. 9; cf. Prov. xxix. 28, ix. 15, xv. 22, iv. 26; Ps. cxix. 5. The meaning is clear in Prov. iii. 6 = **to make straight, to level the way, to open a road**, corresponding with the use of τέμνειν; Thuc. ii. 100, ὁδοὺς εὐθείας ἔτεμε; Herod. iv. 136, τετμημένη ὁδός, *a way opened*; Pindar, Plato, Plutarch. In Prov. xi. 5 also it might thus be explained, but it is preferable to take the thought τέμνειν ὁδόν in another way, “to take or pursue a course,” which according to the connection is tenable especially where the way is described according to its nature or its goal; see Lexica. The epithet ἀμώμους sanctions this, but it is specially confirmed by the contrast in the second clause. At any rate the usage of τέμνειν influences both passages. It is a question whether this is the case in 2 Tim. ii. 15. To assume a

figurative application of the meaning "to open a way" is, apart from the rareness of the word, inadmissible, because ὀρθοτ. here has a different object from ὁδός. The attempt to explain the expression as a metaphor borrowed from sacrifices (Melanchthon, Beza) is opposed by its union with ὀρθός, which is not used of *legalis victimarum sectio ac distributio*, and denotes the tendency only, not the literalness of the τέμνειν. The same remark applies to Luther's interpretation, lately espoused by Beck, taking it as *the right handling of the word*, according to its several parts, or to the several needs of those addressed (after Luke xii. 42, 43). The thought is true in itself, but we have still to ask whether τέμνειν can be combined with λόγος, ῥῆμα, etc., as with ὁδός above. This is certainly not the case with the simple verb; but συντέμνειν may be thus combined in the sense "to cut or make the word short" (with or without λόγους, but oftener with), akin to which in biblical Greek we have the expression λόγον συντελεῖν καὶ συντέμνειν, Isa. x. 22; λόγος συντετμημένος, ver. 23, of a sharp, finely-cut expression, convincingly put (in the N. T. Rom. ix. 28). Now the expression in 2 Tim. ii. 15 is akin to this in the application of τέμνειν to the object λόγος, so that ὀρθοτομεῖν τὸν λόγον τῆς ἀληθείας is equivalent to *so to put and express* (zuschneiden) *the word of truth that it be a λόγος ὀρθός*; see ὀρθός, i.e. *that it be really a λόγος τῆς ἀληθείας*; compare μόρφωσις τῆς εὐσεβείας, iii. 5. That this is what is meant, the keen and exact exposition or testifying of the truth, is clear both from the ἐργάτης ἀνεπαίσχυντος, ver. 15, and from the admonition, ver. 16, τὰς δὲ βεβήλους κενοφωνίας περιῖστασο. We do not gain a different explanation by supposing a perfect suppression of the idea lying in τέμνειν, analogous to καινοτομέω; this (originally a miner's expression for hewing out a stone) is = *to make new, to renew, to alter*; and thus ὀρθοτ. would be = *to make right*. The expression is transferred from our text into patristic Greek as a synonym for orthodoxy; compare *Const. Ap.* vii. 30, ὀρθοτομεῖν ἐν τοῖς τοῦ κυρίου δόγμασι; Euseb. *H. E.* iv. 3, ἐξ οὗ κατιδεῖν ἐστὶ λαμπρὰ τεκμήρια τῆς τε τοῦ ἀνδρὸς διανοίας καὶ τῆς ἀποστολικῆς ὀρθοτομίας; Theod. *Stud.* p. 474 A, ὑποδεικνύων ὀρθὴν τὴν πίστιν καὶ τὴν ἐφ' ἅπασαν ὀρθοτομίαν τοῦ λόγου τῆς ἀληθείας (in Steph. *Theo.* s.v.); cf. Chrysost. in Suicer, τέμνε τὰ νόθα καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς σφοδρότητος ἐφίστασα καὶ ἔκκοπτε . . . τῇ μαχαίρᾳ τοῦ πνεύματος πάντοθεν τὸ περιττὸν καὶ ἀλλότριον τοῦ κηρύγματος ἔκτεμε; Anna Comnena, *Alexias*, xiv. 6 (ed. Schopen. ii. p. 301. 8), τούτους τὴν ὀρθοτόμον ἐδίδασκε πίστιν ἐξελέγχων τὸ διεστραμμένον τῆς αὐτῶν αἵρέσεως. So Oecumen., Theophyl.; cf. 2 Cor. iv. 2, x. 13.—From the earlier literature, cf. Elsner, *observ. sacr.* ii. 311 sqq.; Kypke, *observ. scr.* ii. 370 sqq.; Lange, *idea doctoris sacri ex 2 Tim.* ii. 15 *delineata, in ejusd. observ. sacr.* pp. 267–345, where the fullest review of the explanations hitherto attempted is given.

Τίθημι. — Ἀνατίθιμι occurs in Micah vii. 5, ἀπὸ τῆς συγκοίτου σου φύλαξαι τοῦ ἀναθέσθαι αὐτῇ τι; 2 Macc. v. 16; Judith xvi. 19. — Ἀνάθημα, τό, offering, Luke xxi. 5; Judith xvi. 19, εἰς ἀνάθημα τῷ θεῷ ἔδωκεν, where the Alex. reads ἀνάθεμα;

Deut. vii. 26; Josh. vi. 17, 18, vii. 1, 11, 12, 13, 15. The LXX. read only *ἀνάθεμα*.

Ἀναθεματίζω, only in biblical Greek; LXX. = *הָרַם*, to make *נָתַן*, to give up to the curse of destruction; oftener = *ἐξολοθρεῖω*, Ex. xxii. 20; Deut. ii. 34, iii. 6; Josh. ii. 10, x. 1, 28, 37, 39, 40, xi. 11, 12, 20, 21; Judg. i. 17; 1 Sam. xv. 9, 15, 18, 20; 1 Kings ix. 21; 2 Chron. xx. 24, xxxii. 14; see *ἀνατίθημι*. It occurs Num. xxi. 2, 3; Deut. xiii. 15, xx. 17; Josh. vi. 21, viii. 26; Judg. i. 17, xxi. 11; 1 Sam. xv. 3; 2 Kings xix. 11; 1 Chron. iv. 41; 2 Esdr. x. 8; Dan. xi. 44, and signifies to give a person over on God's account to the curse of ruin; of *ἀφανισμός*, *ἐρήμωσις*, etc., to devote to destruction; cf. the combination of *βδέλυγμα* and *ἀνάθεμα* in Deut. vii. 26. — In the Apocrypha only in 1 Macc. v. 5. — In the N. T. *ἀναθεματίζω ἑαυτόν*, Acts xxiii. 12, 21; *ἀναθέματι ἀναθεματίζειν ἑαυτόν*, ver. 14 (cf. Deut. xiii. 15, xx. 17), to devote oneself to destruction (with an *ἀνάθεμα*, a curse or imprecation) before God, and on account of God; cf. Mark xiv. 71, *ὁ δὲ ἤρξατο ἀναθεματίζειν καὶ ὀμνύναι* = to confirm by imprecation; that the object is not *τὸν Ἰησοῦν*, as if *ἀναθεμ.* were = *ἀρνεῖσθαι* in the parallel passages, is clear from the combination with *ὀμνύναι*, which requires us to supply *ἑαυτόν* with *ἀναθεματίζειν*. The oath is in the issue directed against the person who swears; cf. Matt. v. 36. It is characteristic of the Gospel of Mark that here, in Peter's denial, it has the strongest expression; cf. the parallels.

Διατίθημι is, actively, to put right, to deal with, Hos. xi. 9, *τί σε διαθῶ*, Ἐφραίμ; Ezek. xvi. 29; cf. Lucn. *Nigrin.* 38, *κἂν τινὰς ἐτέρους ἐν τῇ μανίᾳ τὸ αὐτὸ τοῦτο διαθῶσι*; 4 Macc. viii. 8, *ἐὰν ὀργίλως με διάθῃσθε διὰ τῆς ἀπειθείας ὑμῶν*; Xen., Plat. — To come to an agreement with, cf. 2 Kings xxiii. 3, *καὶ ἔστη ὁ βασιλεὺς πρὸς τὸν στυλὸν καὶ διέθετο διαθήκην ἐνώπιον κυρίου τοῦ πορεύεσθαι ὀπίσω κυρίου, τοῦ φυλάσσειν τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ κ.τ.λ. καὶ ἔστη πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ἐν τῇ διαθήκῃ*. The LXX. employ *διατίθεσθαι* always for *כָּרַת* in the combination *כָּרַת בְּרִית* = *διατίθεσθαι διαθήκην*.

Διαθήκη. The plural does not occur in the LXX.; in the Apocrypha, Ecclus. xlv. 18, *διαθήκαι αἰῶνος ἐτέθεσαν πρὸς τὸν Νῶε, ἵνα μὴ ἐξαλειφθῇ κατακλυσμῶ πάσα σάρξ*; also Wisd. xviii. 22; 2 Macc. xviii. 15, *et al.*, where the word is not = *testament*, yet has a sing. meaning. — *Συνθήκη*, which is common in profane Greek, occurs very seldom in the LXX.; only in Isa. xxviii. 15 = *הַבְרִית*, parallel with *בְּרִית*, *διαθήκη*; Dan. xi. 6 = *בְּרִית*; Isa. xxx. 1 = *בְּרִית*; while in Aquila and Symmachus, as far as the fragments extend, it is the usual rendering for *בְּרִית*, Gen. vi. 18; 1 Sam. vi. 19; Ps. xxv. 14, lv. 21, lxxxix. 40; Isa. xxviii. 15, xlix. 8, lix. 21; Jer. xi. 2. Theodotion, however, in Jer. xi. 2, 8, has *διαθήκη*. — In the Apocrypha, *συνθήκη* occurs in the singular only in Wisd. i. 16, and the plural in other places (which is more frequent than the singular in profane Greek likewise); and once of the *בְּרִית יְהוָה* in Wisd. xii. 20, *τοῖς πατέραςιν ὄρκους καὶ συνθήκας ἔδωκας ἀγαθῶν ὑποσχέσεων*; elsewhere of human cove-

nants, 1 Macc. x. 26; 2 Macc. xii. 1, xiii. 25, xiv. 20, 26, 27, in the same combinations with *διαθήκη*; cf. Wisd. xii. 20, ὅρκους καὶ συνθήκας, with xviii. 22, ὅρκους πατέρων καὶ διαθήκας ὑπομνήσας. Again, 1 Macc. x. 26, συνετηρήσατε τὰς πρὸς ἡμᾶς διαθήκας, with Ecclus. xlv. 18; Jer. xxxiv. 8, 13, *et al.* It is clear that *διαθήκη* has supplanted the use of *συνθήκη*; cf. 1 Macc. xi. 9, συνθώμεθα πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς διαθήκην, with i. 1, διαθώμεθα διαθήκην μετὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν,—passages which make the signification *covenant* for *διαθήκη* certain; cf. also Ecclus. xlv. 20, Ἀβραὰμ συνετήρησε νόμον ὑψίστου καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν διαθήκῃ μετ' αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν σαρκὶ αὐτοῦ ἔστησε διαθήκην, with ver. 22. Further compare 2 Macc. i. 2, μνησθεὶς ὁ θεὸς τῆς διαθήκης αὐτοῦ τῆς πρὸς Ἀβρ.; viii. 15, διὰ τὰς πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας αὐτῶν διαθήκας; 1 Macc. i. 15, ἀπέστησαν ἀπὸ διαθήκης ἀγίας καὶ ἐξευγίσθησαν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν; Ecclus. xlv. 18; Baruch ii. 35, στήσω αὐτοῖς διαθήκην αἰῶνιον τοῦ εἶναι με αὐτοῖς εἰς θεὸν καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔσονται μοι εἰς λαόν. It signifies, as also does חֵרֶךְ, the *tax* or *impost* which is imposed by a stronger, by a victor or the like, Ecclus. xiv. 12, ἡ γὰρ διαθήκη ἀπ' αἰῶνος θανάτῳ ἀποθανῇ,—not, therefore, a command to be obeyed, but a condition which the person subject to it must acquiesce in; and in this sense δ. ᾄδου. Hence, also, the combination with the divine ordinances, Ecclus. xxxviii. 33, διαθήκην κρίματος οὐ διανοηθήσονται; xlv. 17, ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ ἐν ἐντολαῖς αὐτοῦ ἐξουσίαν ἐν διαθήκαις κρίματων; ver. 7, διδάξαι τὸν Ἰακώβ διαθήκην καὶ κρίματα αὐτοῦ τὸν Ἰσρ., where, therefore, κρίματα is perfectly parallel with διαθήκην; cf. xvii. 10, διαθήκην αἰῶνος ἔστησεν μετ' αὐτῶν καὶ τὰ κρίματα αὐτοῦ ὑπέδειξεν αὐτοῖς, and hence are explained the combinations with ἐντολαί, νόμος; xlii. 2, μὴ αἰσχυνηθῇς περὶ νόμου ὑψίστου καὶ διαθήκης; xxxix. 8, xxviii. 7, xxiv. 22, ταῦτα πάντα βίβλος διαθήκης θεοῦ ὑψίστου, νόμον δὲ ἐνετείλατο ἡμῖν Μωυσῆς, where the conceptions νόμος and διαθήκη have the same import, save that διαθήκη designates the νόμος as a stipulation or conditional agreement, which God has imposed upon Israel in their relations to Him. Thus, also, like 2 Kings xxiii. 3, it denotes a self-pledging, self-imposition, as in Ecclus. xi. 18, στήθι ἐν διαθήκῃ σου. On the other hand, however, it signifies not an imposition, but a covenant-gift, *e.g.* in Ecclus. xlv. 7, ἔστησεν τῷ Ἀαρὼν διαθήκην αἰῶνος καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ ἱερατεῖαν λαοῦ; ver. 24, διὰ τοῦτο ἐστάθη αὐτῷ διαθήκη εἰρήνης προστατεῖν ἀγίων καὶ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ; ver. 25, διαθήκην τῷ Δαβὶδ — κληρονομία βασιλείως υἱοῦ ἐξ υἱοῦ μόνου; cf. xlvii. 12; 1 Macc. ii. 54; and hence it becomes the special designation of God's gracious relation to Israel, in which Israel in turn finds himself placed; cf. Ecclus. xlv. 22, ἐν τῷ Ἰσαὰκ ἔστησεν οὕτως διὰ Ἀβραάμ τὸν πατέρα ἡμῶν εὐλογίαν πάντων ἀνθρώπων καὶ διαθήκην; xlv. 11, ἐν ταῖς διαθήκαις ἔστη τὸ σπέρμα αὐτῶν; ver. 18, διαθήκαι αἰῶνος ἐτέθησαν πρὸς αὐτόν; 2 Macc. i. 2, viii. 15; 1 Macc. iv. 10; Prayer of Azarias 10. Διαθήκη = חֵרֶךְ appears in one or other of these meanings according to the connection, but they all have their root in the fact that *διαθήκη* = חֵרֶךְ denotes the covenant relation or agreement existing or established between God and Israel (except in the passages cited, 1 Macc. i. 15, 57, 63, ii. 20, 27, 54; 2 Macc. vii. 36; Ecclus. xvi. 20, xli. 19, xlv. 15; Judith ix. 13). It is at

the same time manifest that the LXX. deliberately chose *διαθήκη* instead of *συνθήκη*. This was not to get rid of the signification *covenant*, as is clear from Zech. xi. 14; Isa. xxviii. 15; 1 Macc. xi. 9, *et al.*; for *διαθήκη* has fully succeeded to the meaning of *συνθήκη*. Even the plural *διαθήκαι*, which the LXX. do not use, and which in the Apocrypha occurs in Wisd. xviii. 22, 2 Macc. viii. 15, Eccclus. xlv. 11, 18, xlv. 17, does not answer to the plural *διαθήκαι* in profane Greek, but, as Wisd. xviii. 22, 2 Macc. viii. 15 especially show, to the plural of *συνθήκη*, as it is employed in a singular sense, or as a collective word in profane Greek. But Israel's *ברית* differed from the profane *συνθήκη* in this, that it is not so much an argument established between two parties, like *συνθήκη*, but in its essential reference is a relationship established on one side only, a relation established by God between Him and His people, consisting both of the imposition of ordinances and of the pledge of promises, *ὅρκοι καὶ διαθήκαι, ὅρκοι καὶ συνθήκαι*, Wisd. xii. 20, xviii. 22; compare this one-sidedness in establishing the *διαθήκη*, and, on the other side, the self-engagement of the people, in 2 Kings xxiii. 3, *διέθετο ὁ βασιλεὺς διαθήκην ἐνώπιον κυρίου τοῦ πορεύεσθαι ὀπίσω κυρίου, τοῦ φυλάσσειν τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰ δικαιώματα αὐτοῦ ἐν πάσῃ καρδίᾳ καὶ ἐν πάσῃ ψυχῇ, τοῦ ἀναστῆσαι τοὺς λόγους τῆς διαθήκης ταύτης . . . καὶ ἔστη πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ἐν τῇ διαθήκῃ*. It is nothing more than a thoughtful conjecture in explaining the choice of *διαθ.* instead of *συνθ.*, when Isidor. Pelus. ii. *ep.* 196, says, *τὴν συνθήκην τουτέστι τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν διαθήκην ἢ θεία καλεῖ γραφὴ διὰ τὸ βέβαιον καὶ ἀπαράβατον συνθήκαι μὲν γὰρ πολλάκις ἀνατρέπονται, διαθήκαι δὲ νόμιμοι οὐδαμῶς*. This explanation illustrates the influences of the N. T. *διαθήκη*, which differs from the *διαθ.* of the LXX. herein, that the conception of a *covenant* vanishes, and that of a *testament* takes its place.

This, then, was the price at which the introduction of this word to represent the Hebrew *ברית* on the part of the LXX. was attained,—a complete change in the conception, the possibility and admissibility of which must now be examined. While the Apocrypha shows no trace of this change, Philo uses the *διαθήκη* of the LXX. only in the sense of *disposal of property, testament*. Its connection with the idea of a *covenant* does not escape him, for he endeavours to do justice to it; he says, *De nomin. mutat.* i. 586. 2 sqq., *τῷ δ' ἡρημένῳ ξὴν τὸν τρόπον τοῦτον καὶ κλῆρον κατὰ διαθήκας ἀπολείψειν ὁμολογεῖ, τὰ ἀρμόζοντα δοῦναι μὲν θεῷ, λαβεῖν δὲ σοφῷ*. Φησὶ γὰρ θήσω τὴν διαθήκην μου ἀνὰ μέσον ἐμοῦ καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον σου (Deut. ix. 4), *διαθήκαι δὲ ἐπ' ὠφελείᾳ γράφονται τῶν δωρεᾶς ἀξίων ὥστε σύμβολον εἶναι διαθήκην χάριτος, ἣν μέσσην ἔθηκεν ὁ θεὸς ἑαυτοῦ τε ὀρέγοντος καὶ ἀνθρώπου λαμβάνοντος*. Cf. *de sacrific. Abel et Cain*, i. 172. 47 (with reference to Deut. ix. 4), *διαθήκη δὲ ἐστὶ θεοῦ συμβολικῶς αἱ χάριτες αὐτοῦ*. Cf. Carpzov, *sacr. exercitt. in ep. ad Hebr. e Philone Al.* pp. 338 sqq., 418 sq., 462 sq.

This same phenomenon appears in the N. T. The *ברית* of the O. T. is taken quite as a matter of course as *διαθήκη*, in the sense of *testament, disposal of property*, and is to be explained thus in Gal. iv. 24, *αὗται γὰρ εἰσιν δύο διαθήκαι, μία μὲν ἀπὸ ὄρων Σινᾶ, εἰς δουλείαν γεννώσα*; cf. ver. 26. The manner of expression as a whole in Gal.

iii. 15, 17, obliges us to regard this meaning of *διαθήκη* as the current, obvious, and simple one in the apostle's view; and thus also in 2 Cor. iii. 6, *διάκονοι καινῆς δ.*; ver. 14, *ἀνάγνωσις τῆς παλαιᾶς δ.*; and 1 Cor. xi. 25, *τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι*; Rom. xi. 27, *αὕτη αὐτοῖς ἡ παρ' ἐμοῦ διαθήκη ὅταν ἀφέλωμαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν*, the word must be = *testament*. We have further, in the Pauline writings, Rom. ix. 4, *ὧν ἡ νίοθεσία, καὶ ἡ δόξα, καὶ αἱ διαθήκαι, καὶ ἡ νομοθεσία*; and Eph. ii. 12, *ξένοι τῶν διαθηκῶν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας*. The plural here does not at all oblige another rendering, because the plural is more common in profane Greek (in a singular sense) than is the sing.; cf. Plut. *Romp.* xv. 2, *ἐδήλωσε δὲ μάλιστα Σύλλας ὅτι πρὸς Πομπήιον οὐκ εὐμενῶς εἶχε ταῖς διαθήκαις ἃς ἔγραψεν*; *Caes.* lxviii. 1, *ἐπεὶ δὲ τῶν διαθηκῶν τῶν Καίσαρος ἀνοιχθειῶν εὐρέθη δεδομένη Ῥωμαίων ἐκάστῳ δόσις ἀξιόλογος, et al.*. The usage of the Apocrypha did not suggest the idea of "many covenants." We may trace the reason, however, why the plural was used in both texts. In Rom. ix. 4 the apostle could not say *ὧν ἡ διαθήκη* without destroying the point of his intended argument, namely, to vindicate Israel only, for *ἡ διαθήκη* would have been that of which he speaks in Gal. iii. 15, 17; but *αἱ δ.* are = *the promises*, just as in the Apocrypha this is the prevailing reference. In Eph. ii. 12 also the plural must be used for the same reason; *ἡ διαθ. κατ' ἐξ.* is, with the apostle, the N. T. blessing; whereas Israel had only *διαθήκαι τῆς ἐπ.*, the promise in a testamentary form. The question whether the expression *πλάκες τῆς διαθήκης* was in his mind, may therefore be set aside. The codification of the O. T. writings as a collection, 2 Cor. iii. 14, favours the rendering of *διαθήκη* as = *testament*, and the use of the plural. With the Epistle to the Hebrews the case is similar. That *διαθήκης ἑγγυος, μεσίτης*, Heb. vii. 22, viii. 6, ix. 15, xii. 24, forbid the rendering *testament* (Delitzsch) is improbable when we compare Heb. ix. 17, 20 with ver. 15, and the passage cited from Philo, *De nom. mut.* Far simpler and obvious is the *διαθήκη*, ix. 17, so often mentioned previously (vii. 22, viii. 6, 8, 9, 10, ix. 4, 15, 16), if taken as = *testament*, and it is most fitting to retain this meaning in all the passages in the Hebrews. The same may be affirmed regarding the few passages which remain. Whether in Rev. xi. 19, *ἡ κίβωτος τῆς διαθήκης τ. Κ.*, it is = *covenant* or *testament*, can hardly be decided, and is irrelevant as far as the sense is concerned. In the words of the institution of the Holy Supper, Matt. xxvi. 28, Mark xiv. 24, Luke xxii. 20, it is at least probable that *διαθήκη* is = *testament*, if we compare 1 Cor. xi. 25, *ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι*. Luke i. 72, *μνησθῆναι διαθήκης ἀγίας αὐτοῦ, ὅρκον ὃν ὤμοσεν πρὸς Ἀβρ. τοῦ δοῦναι ἡμῖν κ.τ.λ.*, is a mode of expression recognised as from the Apocrypha, in which *διαθήκη* is used of God's self-engagement, a sense, in substance at least, not far removed from the N. T. meaning, *testament*. Thus it stands also in Acts iii. 25; and only in Acts vii. 8, *ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ διαθήκην περιτομῆς, καὶ οὕτως ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἰσαὰκ καὶ περιέτεμεν αὐτόν*, does it denote the imposition or obligation which was put upon Abraham, by virtue of his relation, and that of his seed, to God. While thus Luke's writings and Rev. xi. 19 stand somewhat apart from the

Pauline Epistles and the Hebrews in their use of *διαθ.*, they lie sufficiently near to obviate the necessity of introducing the different meanings, *covenant* and *testament*. It is sufficiently clear, however, when we consider the passage cited from Philo, and the fact that the promises appear as the form and contents of the *διαθήκη*, how the transference of *διαθήκη* = בְּרִית in the LXX. and the Apocrypha to תְּרִיבָּ = *διαθήκη* = *testament*, in Philo and the N. T. took place. The conception of κληρος, the תְּרִיבָּ, both in the tenor of the promises and by the peculiar relation of Israel to God and to His promises, was closely connected with that of בְּרִית; cf. Heb. ix. 15; see κληρος, κληρονομεῖν, κατακληρονομεῖν. Now, as in the N. T., the conception of *sonship* comes in the place of a *covenant*, the transference to the meaning *testament* was almost unavoidable; and yet notwithstanding, the conception of *διαθήκη* was applied to N. T. blessing only where there was some reference to the O. T., or to O. T. revelation. *Διαθήκη* is not a specifically N. T. conception; it grew up with and into that of the *promise*, and the fulfilment of the promise caused it to disappear. Bengel hints at this in his note on Matt. xxvi. 28, "Ipsa vocabula בְּרִית et *διαθήκη* differunt, eamque habent differentiam, quae rei ipsi mirabiliter respondet, nam בְּרִית magis congruit oeconomiae veteri, quae habet formam foederis, *διαθήκη* oeconomiae novae, quae habet formam testamenti. — Foederis autem ratio non ita congruit cum plena filiatione quae est in N. T."

Προτίθημι occurs in the LXX. seldom; Ex. xl. 4 = עָרַם; = שָׂם in Ps. liv. 5, οὐ προέθεντο τὸν θεὸν ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν, cf. lxxxvi. 14. = נָשָׂא, Ps. ci. 3, οὐ προεθέμην πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν μου πρᾶγμα πονηρόν. If in this sense it be reflective, = *sibi propinquare*, still it needs, as these texts show, an addition, and in Rom. iii. 25, δὲν προέθετο ὁ θεὸς ἱλαστήριον, we are not to supply an *ἐαυτῷ*; cf. also 3 Macc. ii. 27.

Τέκνον denotes *adoption* as little as does παῖς; this is expressed by υἰοθεσία, and this difference appears in the N. T. in the choice of the phrases τέκνα θεοῦ and υἱοὶ θεοῦ to denote "children of God" in the N. T. sense. In the LXX. = יָלַד, for which, however, υἱός is oftener used, with this difference, that τέκνον occurs very seldom in the singular (only in address, Gen. xxii. 7, 8, xxvii. 18, 25, 26, 37, 43, xliii. 29, xlviii. 19; 1 Sam. iii. 6, 16, iv. 17; rarely otherwise, as in Gen. xvii. 16; Deut. xxviii. 57); and thus it denotes only the children of parents, the young of the old, not, like υἱός and υἱοί, of wider relations, e.g. υἱοὶ Ἰσρ., and rarely in a figurative sense, such as τέκνα Σιών, Joel ii. 23; Zech. ix. 13. Very seldom in the O. T. in the senses (I.) (II.).—Πρωτοτόκος in Heb. i. 6 cannot contain a reference to the angels, because in ver. 5 the relationship of sonship is denied to the angels. In explaining the word we must keep in mind Ex. iv. 22, Jer. xxxi. 9, that others follow the first-born, and therefore Christ's relation to the N. T. children of God; cf. Heb. ii. 5 sqq. Hofmann rightly says, "He who as Son came into the world will come again into it as first-begotten, because in the interval many will have been born of God;" we should therefore compare πρ. ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς, Rom. viii. 29; there is no reason for thinking here of πρ. ἐκ νεκρῶν.

Τύπτω is in the LXX. = כנן Hiphil, usually rendered πατάσσω, also by κόπτω, παίω, *et al.*—Τύπος in the LXX. only in Ex. xxv. 40 and Amos v. 26 (= כִּנָּן); 4 Macc. vi. 19, καὶ αὐτοὶ μὲν ἡμεῖς γενοίμεθα τοῖς νέοις ἀσεβείας τύπος, ἵνα παράδειγμα γενώμεθα τῆς μιαιοφαγίας; Cyrill. Alex. *ad Amos* vi. p. 315 (see Suicer, *Thes.*), ὁ τύπος οὐκ ἀλήθεια, μόρφωσιν δὲ μᾶλλον τῆς ἀληθείας εἰσφέρει.—Τύπος is the prefiguration, ἀντίτυπος the copy which answers to the original, and thus τύπος as compared with ἀντίτ. is the prototype, thus particularly in patristic Greek, *e.g.* Apophth. patr. in Cotelieri Monum. i. 421 B, οὐκ ἔστι φύσει ὁ ἄρτος ὃν λαμβάνομεν σῶμα Χυ, ἀλλ' ἀντίτυπον; Gregor. Naz. *Or.* xxviii. p. 509 B, Ἀβραὰμ θύει θυσίαν ξένην καὶ τῆς μεγάλης ἀντίτυπον; thus what elsewhere is called τύπος is here called the antitype, and hence Salmasius denies any material difference between τύπος and ἀντίτυπος; see Suicer, *Thes. s.v.* But τύπος is κατ' ἐξ. the pattern or prefigurement, and ἀντίτυπος is not opposed to this but to the ἀρχέτυπος, and thus *e.g.* Gregory Nazianzen denies to the brazen serpent the character τύπος, and claims for it only the designation ἀντίτυπος; *Or.* xlii. p. 692, ὁ χαλκοῦς ὄφης κρεμάται μὲν κατὰ τῶν δακνόντων ὄφεων, οὐχ ὡς τύπος δὲ τοῦ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν παθόντος, ἀλλ' ὡς ἀντίτυπος. In this sense ἀντίτ. is used in Heb. ix. 24, ἀντίτυπα τῶν ἀληθινῶν; cf. *Const. Ap.* iv. 14, τὰ ἀντίτυπα μυστήρια τοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος Χυ. Very seldom it signifies that which answers to the type or pattern, as in Caesar. *Quaest. ult.* p. 208 (in Suicer), πᾶσι τοῖς ὅποσόν παιδείας μετεληφόσι δῆλον, ἀντίτυπον τῆς περιτομῆς ὑπάρχειν τὸ σωτήριον βάπτισμα, whereas Cyrill. Hieros. *catech.* 2 calls baptism ἀντίτυπον τῶν τοῦ Χυ παθημάτων. When ἀντίτ. answers to the prefiguring τύπος, τύπος is regarded as the prototype; and as it is essential to the τύπος κατ' ἐξ., as Cyril of Alex. says (*On Amos*, vi. p. 315), ὁ τύπος οὐκ ἀλήθεια, μόρφωσιν δὲ μᾶλλον τῆς ἀληθείας εἰσφέρει, we can understand the rareness of ἀντίτυπος in the sense in which we use type and antitype.—Ἑποτύπωσις may signify an outline or summary of a science, Sext. Emp. *hyrotyp. pyrrhon.* ii. 79, ταῦτα μὲν ἀρκεῖ νῦν εἰπεῖν ὡς ἐν ὑποτυπώσει καὶ πρὸς τὸ κριτήριον κ.τ.λ. Hence=*form*, not strictly *pattern*, ὑπόδειγμα, ὑπόγραμμα, but *copy*, 2 Tim. i. 13, ὑποτύπωσιν ἔχε ὑγιαίνοντων λόγων ὧν παρ' ἐμοῦ ἤκουσας. Timothy is said to have a copy of the ὑγ. λογ., which the apostle had himself given him. And thus even Paul himself, in 1 Tim. i. 16, is a pattern to all who should after believe, and a design of the mercy shown him was to provide such an example; see Hofmann *in loc.*, who on 2 Tim. i. 13 rightly dwells upon the emphatic position in which ὑποτύπωσιν stands.

Ἑργός, ἐς, *sound*, (a) physically, in the LXX. seldom, = יָה, דִּלְשָׁא. In the Apocalypse likewise rare; in the N. T. Matt. xii. 13, xv. 31; Mark v. 34; John v. 6, 9, 11, 14, 15, vii. 23; Acts iv. 10 (Rec. also in Mark iii. 5; Luke vi. 10; John v. 4), always in contrast with previous suffering, of restoration to a normal state of health. (b) Frequently in profane Greek figuratively applied to the spiritual sphere, especially in Plato, yet nowhere uncommon; thus in Herod., Thuc., Dem., Aristotle, Plut., *e.g.* of the soul, Plato,

Gorg. 524 E, οὐδὲν Ἱγίης ὃν τῆς ψυχῆς; 526 D, σκοπῶ ὅπως ἀποφαγοῦμαι τῷ κριτῇ ὡς Ἱγιστάτην ἔχων τὴν ψυχὴν, referring not to mental capability, but to moral character, = ὁσίως βεβιωκέναι καὶ μετ' ἀληθείας; *ibid.* C, in contrast with the πονηρός, who is condemned to Tartarus with the words, εἴν τε ἰάσιμος εἴν τε ἀνιάτος δοκῇ εἶναι. In like manner Ἱγίης ἦθος, *Rep.* iii. 409 D, and in a moral sense with ἀνὴρ, *Phaed.* 89 D, σφόδρα τιμὴ πιστεῦσαι . . . καὶ ἡγήσασθαι παντάπασί τε ἀληθῆ εἶναι καὶ Ἱγιά καὶ πιστὸν τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ἔπειτα ὀλίγον ὕστερον εὑρεῖν τοῦτον πονηρόν τε καὶ ἄπιστον; *Legg.* i. 630 B, πιστὸς καὶ Ἱγίης, over against ἄδικοι καὶ ὕβρισται καὶ ἀφρονέστατοι; the application of the word in the moral sense prevails in Plato, *Phaed.* 90 C, οὔτε τῶν πραγμάτων οὐδενὸς οὐδὲν Ἱγίης οὐδὲ βέβαιον οὔτε τῶν λόγων, with ἀληθής, *Phaed.* 69 B (ἀρετή); *Phaed.* 242 E, μηδὲν Ἱγίης λέγοντε μηδὲ ἀληθές, "nothing reasonable, good, or true;" cf. Herod. i. 8. 2, of an immoral and pernicious demand, τίνα λέγεις λόγον οὐκ Ἱγιά, κελεύων με δέσποιναν τὴν ἐμὴν θεήσασθαι γυμνὴν; ἅμα δὲ κιθῶνι ἐκδυομένῳ συνεκδύεται καὶ τὴν αἰδῶ γύνη; also of what is good and wholesome, *Rep.* 6, 496 C; the wise man knows the *μανία* of the great multitude and sees ὅτι οὐδὲν Ἱγίης περὶ τὰ τῶν πόλεων πράττει. So Thuc. iii. 75. 1, οὐδὲν αὐτῶν Ἱγίης διανοουμένων τῇ τοῦ μῆ ξυμπλεῖν ἀπιστία, on which Krüger observes, χρηστόν, ἀγαθόν; cf. iv. 22. 2, where both seemingly coincide; Ar. *Plut.* 37, χρῆ μεταβαλόντα τοὺς τρόπους εἶναι πανούργον, ἄδικον, Ἱγίης μηδὲ ἔν. So also of women, αἱ οὐδὲν Ἱγίης, *Thesm.* 394; cf. *Dem.* xli. 22, τὰ μηδὲν Ἱγίης ὄντα μηδ' ἀληθῆ γράμματα; *Aristot. Met.* xiii. 3, γίνεται ὁ μακρὸς λόγος, ὥσπερ ὁ τῶν δούλων, ὅταν μηδὲν Ἱγίης λέγωσιν; *Plut. Otho* 3, *Cat.* 53, Ἱγίης οὐδὲν δίκαιον ἔπραττεν; *Hrdt.* vi. 100. 1, οὐδὲν Ἱγίης βούλευμα; *Joseph. c. Apion.* i. 22. 16. It simply denotes what is thought or said as *correct* or *true* in *Pol.* ix. 22. 10, x. 2. 4; cf. *Plat. Rep.* 584 E, εἰ καὶ ἄπειροι ἀληθείας περὶ πολλῶν τε ἄλλων μὴ Ἱγίεις δόξας ἔχουσιν. The connection must decide whether the meaning is *correctness* or *wholesomeness*, i.e. *rightness*. It is clear from these examples, which might be multiplied, that Ἱγίης in its figurative sense denotes what is *right* or *correct*, what possesses no fault, whether in relation to its normal state or to its effects; so that in the latter sense it signifies the *right and good*, or *wholesome*, and in the former the *right and exact or correct*. This explains the use of Ἱγίης, Ἱγιάινειν, in the Pastoral Epistles, Ἱγίης, *Titus* ii. 8; Ἱγιάινειν oftener, so that "sound doctrine" is an expression characteristic of these Epistles; *Titus* ii. 8, (σεαυτὸν παρεχόμενος) λόγον Ἱγίῃ ἀκατάγνωστον, ἵνα ὁ ἐξ ἐναντίας ἐντράπη μηδὲν ἔχων λέγειν περὶ ἡμῶν φαῦλον, where it clearly signifies not only the *correct* word, but the word in its moral and religious import, as the faultless word, expressing and effecting what is right and good. The Philonic λόγος Ἱγίης, *de Abr.* ii. 32. 29, has nothing akin to this, for there λόγος is = *ratio*, ψυχὴ μήπω κεκαθαρμένη ἔτι τῶν πᾶθων καὶ νοσημάτων παρενημερούντων τοὺς Ἱγιάινοντας λόγους ἐταράττετο.

Ἱγιάινω, to be in health, in biblical Greek only in the present, in O. T. Greek only physically, = חָיָה , in N. T. Greek for the most part figurative. (I.) Physically,

Luke vii. 10, xv. 27; 3 John 2; figuratively in Luke v. 31, οὐ χρεῖαν ἔχουσιν οἱ Ἰγιαίνοντες τοῦ ἱατροῦ, of sinners who need μετάνοια and ἄφεσις ἁμαρτίων. (II.) Figuratively, of mental and spiritual life, of sound thinking, *to be sober, understanding, prudent, to think and to purpose rightly*; Herod., Plato, Dem., Aristoph., Polyb., Plut., e.g. Herod. iii. 33, τὰς φρένας Ἰγιαίνειν, as opposed to ἐξεμάνη; Herod. vii. 157. 2, τὸ Ἰγιαῖνον τῆς Ἑλλάδος, to denote patriots who aim at what is right and good for Greece. Similarly in Plutarch, Polyb. xxviii. 15. 12, οἱ Ἰγιαίνοντες, over against οἱ δὲ κίνηται καὶ καχέκται; Plut. *Aristid.* ed. Cat. iv. 3, βίος καὶ οἶκος Ἰγιαίνων, in a moral sense. With δόξα, λόγος, cf. Plut. *de aud. poet.* 4 (20 F), αὐταὶ γὰρ εἰσι Ἰγιαίνουσαι περὶ θεῶν δέξαι καὶ ἀληθεῖς, ἐκεῖνα δὲ πέπλασται πρὸς ἐκπληξιν ἀνθρώπων; *De puer. educ.* 9 (6 A), παιδεία ἀδιάφθορος καὶ Ἰγιαίνουσα, *institutio liberorum corruptelarum vacua et sana*. According to this the usage of the Pastoral Epp. is to be explained, in which Ἰγιαίνειν ἐν τῇ πίστει, Titus i. 13, and τῇ πίστει in ii. 2, are contrasted with that sickliness or decline of the life of faith which goes hand in hand with ἀποστρέφειν τὴν ἀλήθειαν, i. 14; whose lowest state is expressed in 1 Tim. vi. 5, διεφθαρμένοι τὸν νοῦν καὶ ἀπεστερημένοι τῆς ἀληθείας. It is to be distinguished from ἀσθενεῖν τῇ πίστει, inasmuch as the integrity of faith is affected, but in the ἀσθενεῖντες only the energy of faith; cf. Titus ii. 2, ὑγ. τῇ πίστει, τῇ ἀγάπῃ, τῇ ὑπομονῇ. As to the combination with the dative, cf. Joseph. *c. Apion.* i. 24. 4, οἱ δὲ Ἰγιαίνοντες τῇ κρίσει πολλὴν αὐτῶν μοχθηρίαν καταδικάζουσιν. Instead of the usual accusative, we find in profane Greek prepositions also, περὶ, ἐν. Besides the Ἰγιαίνοντες λόγοι in 2 Tim. i. 13, which contain what is right and just and also health-giving, cf. 1 Tim. vi. 3, εἴ τις ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖ καὶ μὴ προσέχεται Ἰγιαίνουσιν λόγοις τοῖς τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ τῇ κατ' εὐσέβειαν διδασκαλίᾳ. This passage decides the meaning; the doctrine which is qualitatively different (ἑτερο.) is not so contrasted with the words of Jesus as to imply that it is absolutely false, but the words of Jesus are what that doctrine is not, namely *health-giving*; see ὑγίης. Hence Luther rightly translates Ἰγιαίνουσα διδασκαλία as "*healthful teaching*;" cf. the contrast in 1 Tim. i. 10. In 2 Tim. iv. 3 in like manner, as the contrast shows, it means teaching which expounds what is right and true as opposed to misleading or seducing teaching. Also in Titus i. 9, ii. 1.

Τίος τοῦ ἀνθρ. occurs in the post-biblical literature of the synagogue as influenced by Christianity. Thus Hieros. Taanith ii. 1, "Saith R. Abbahu, If a man say to thee *I am God*, he lies; *I am the son of man*, he will repent it; *I go to heaven*,—if he affirm it thus, he will not prove it true" (see Oehler, art. "Messias" in Herzog's *Realencycl.* ix. 437). Here ὁ υἱὸς τ. ἀ. is manifestly recognised as Messiah's name; cf. also Fürst, *Heb. Lex.* i. 29. The expression also occurs several times in the Book of Enoch, xlvi. 2, 3, 4, xlviii. 2, lxii. 9, 14, lxiii. 11, lxix. 26, 27, lxx. 1; and its connection with the passage in Daniel is clear, especially vi. 2, lxix. 27. Nevertheless it is equally evident that the meaning of the expression is that above developed, for in lxii. 5, 9 the expressions are

interchanged, "son of the woman" and "son of the man;" ver. 5, "terror will seize upon thee when you see the *son of the woman* sitting upon the throne of his glory;" ver. 9, "they will put their trust in that *son of man* and will entreat him." The statement also of Trypho in Justin, *Dial. c. Tryph.* 49, πάντες ἡμεῖς τὸν Χριστὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐξ ἀνθρώπων προσδοκῶμεν γενήσεσθαι, implies this meaning. For the literature, cf. Baur, *Zeitschr. f. wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1860, p. 274 sqq.; Hilgenfeld in ditto, 1863, p. 327; Holtzmann in ditto, 1865, p. 212; Weiss, *Bibl. Theol. d. N. T.* § 16; Schultze, *vom Menschensohn u. Logos*, p. 1 sqq.; Nösgen, *Christus der Menschen- u. Gottessohn*, p. 11 sqq.

Φ α ί ν ω occurs in the LXX., Isa. lx. 2 as = פור; Num. xxiii. 3 = פור Niphal; Isa. xlvi. 3 = פור Niphal. 1 Macc. xi. 12, et al. It is = פור, Gen. i. 17; Ex. xiii. 22, xxv. 37; Ps. lxxvii. 19, xcvi. 4.

Φ ω τ ί ζ ω, fut. φωτιῶ, Rev. xxii. 5, Tisch., Treg., but Westc. φωτίσω, as in 1 Cor. iv. 5. LXX. = פור, פור Hiphil, פור Hiphil, and is occasionally used to render other words. (I.) Intrans. (a) literally, to lighten, to shine, to glitter; Num. iv. 9, viii. 3; Ecclus. xlii. 16. (b) Figuratively, to appear gloriously, of God's glorious saving revelation, Ps. lxxvi. 5; cf. Rev. xxii. 5, κύριος ὁ θεὸς φωτιεῖ ἐπ' αὐτούς. Of the redeemed, φωτίζου, φωτίζου 'I. ἡκει γάρ σου τὸ φῶς κ.τ.λ.; cf. Baruch vi. 67; Prov. iv. 18. To this belongs φωτίζειν τινί, to give light to one, to enlighten, i.e. to give help and salvation, Micah vii. 8, ἐὰν καθίσω ἐν τῷ σκότει κύριος φωτιεῖ μοι. Cf. 1 Sam. xxix. 10, ὀρθρίσατε ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ καὶ φωτισάτω ὑμῖν καὶ πορεύθητε. (II.) Transitive, to enlighten, (a) literally, τὴν νύκτα, Ps. cv. 39; τὴν ὁδὸν τινος, Neh. ix. 12, 19; Rev. xxi. 23. Passive, to be enlightened, to be bright, to shine, Ps. cxxxix. 12; Rev. xviii. 1; Luke xi. 36. (b) Figuratively, Ps. xviii. 29, φωτιεῖς λύχνον μου κύριε, ὁ θς μου φωτιεῖς τὸ σκότος μου; Eccles. viii. 1, σοφία ἀνθρώπου φωτιεῖ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ; cf. Ps. xxxiv. 6, προσέλθατε πρὸς αὐτὸν καὶ φωτισθήτε καὶ τὰ πρόσωπα ὑμῶν οὐ μὴ καταισχυθῇ. In this sense = to give help and health (see φῶς), John i. 9, ἦν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινὸν ὃ φωτίζει πάντα ἄνθρωπον (cf. Rev. xxi. 23, ἡ δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐφώτισεν αὐτήν, καὶ ὁ λύχνος αὐτῆς τὸ ἀρνίον), answers to the Johannine use of φῶς, and so perhaps Heb. x. 32, φωτισθέντες πολλὴν ἀθλήσιν ὑπεμείνατε παθημάτων, where the thought does not (see Heb. vi. 4) warrant the possibility of taking it to mean instruction received; the connection in both places with what follows shows the reference to be to the actual experience of redemption; cf. Col. i. 13. In Heb. x. 32 we cannot fairly compare ver. 26, for there the import of the expression μετὰ τὸ λαβεῖν τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τῆς ἀληθείας is determined by the antithesis ἐκουσίως ἁμαρτανόντων.—With another reference in 1 Cor. iv. 5, ὁ κύριος φωτίσει τὰ κρυπτὰ τοῦ σκότους, of the manifestation of that which shuns the light.—Φωτ. also appears with ὀφθαλμούς = to cause one to see or recognise something; Ps. xix. 9, τὰ δικαιοῦματα κυρίου εὐθέα εὐφραίνοντα καρδίαν, ἡ ἐντολὴ κυρίου τηλαυγὴς φωτίζουσα ὀφθαλμούς; cxix. 130, ἡ δόξα σου τῶν λόγων σου φωτιεῖ καὶ συνετιεῖ νηπίους; 2 Esdr. ix. 8, τοῦ φωτίσαι ὀφθαλμούς ἡμῶν καὶ δοῦναι ζωοποίησιν μικρὰν ἐν τῇ δουλείᾳ ἡμῶν; Ps. xlii. 4,

φώτισον τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς μου, μήποτε ὑπνώσω εἰς θάνατον. The idea is clearly twofold; in the two last-named texts it is = *to let one see life, to live to see salvation*, life or salvation being a thing present, to be seen. So perhaps also Ps. xix. 9; cf. Judg. xiii. 23, εἰ οὖν βούλεται κύριος θανατῶσαι ἡμᾶς, οὐκ ἂν ἐδέξατο ἐν τῶν χειρῶν ἡμῶν ὀλοκαυτώματα καὶ θυσίαν καὶ οὐκ ἂν ἐφώτισεν ἡμᾶς ταῦτα πάντα, according to the Alex.; Bar. i. 12, δώσει κύριος ἰσχὺν ἡμῖν καὶ φωτίσει τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς ἡμῶν καὶ ζησόμεθα. But in Ps. cxix. 130, the reception of salvation renders possible and leads on to enlightenment in the right way; and so also in Hos. x. 12, φωτίσατε ἑαυτοὺς φῶς γνώσεως; cf. 2 Kings xii. 2, ἐποίησεν Ἰωὰς τὸ εὐθὲς ἐνώπιον κυρίου πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας ἃς ἐφώτισεν αὐτὸν Ἰωδαὲ ὁ ἱερεὺς; xvii. 27, 28; Judg. xiii. 8 = 𐤒𐤓, Hiph. In both cases enlightenment goes hand in hand with salvation, only that in the one it is represented as the effect, in the other the cause. The former also in Ecclus. xxxi. 20, ἀνυψῶν ψυχὴν καὶ φωτίζων ὀφθαλμούς, ἵασις διδούς ζωὴν καὶ εὐλογίαν, the latter in xlv. 17 parallel with διδάσκειν. The N. T. texts, Eph. i. 18, πεφωτισμένους τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς τῆς καρδίας ὑμῶν εἰς τὸ εἰδέναι ὑμᾶς τίς ἐστὶν ἡ ἐλπίς κ.τ.λ., and iii. 9, φωτίσαι τίς ἡ οἰκονομία, belong to the second; but John i. 9, Heb. vi. 4, x. 32 to the first, if we are to connect them with the O. T. phraseology. Again, 2 Tim. i. 10, Χὺ, Ἰὺ. καταργήσαντος μὲν τὸν θάνατον φωτίσαντος δὲ ζωὴν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, is not to be taken in the first sense as = *to make to perceive*, but as = *actually to make present*, and therefore a dative of the remoter object is wanting; cf. φωτισμός.

Φωτισμός ὁ, enlightening; LXX. = 𐤒𐤓, and in Ps. xc. 8 = 𐤒𐤓𐤁; only in later Greek, Plutarch, Sext. Emp. (a) *The illumination going forth from something, the light proceeding therefrom*, Sext. Emp. Adv. math. x. 224 (p. 522, Bekker, 9th ed.), ἡ μὲν ἡμέρα κατὰ τὴν ἐξ ἡλίου φωτισμὸν συμβαίνει, ἡ δὲ νύξ κατὰ φωτισμοῦ στέρησιν τὸν ἐξ ἡλίου ἐπιγίνεται; Plut. de facie lunae, xvi. 17 (929 E, 931 A). So with the genitive of the subject, Ps. lxxviii. 14, ὠδήγησεν αὐτοὺς ἐν φωτισμῷ πυρός; Ps. xc. 8, ὁ αἰὼν ἡμῶν εἰς φωτισμὸν τοῦ προσώπου σου, in keeping with the passive form of the word = *our walk is determined, enlightened by*, etc. Otherwise applied in Ps. xlv. 4, ἔσωσεν αὐτοὺς . . . ὁ βραχίον σου καὶ ὁ φωτισμός τοῦ προσώπου σου. So 2 Cor. iv. 6, ἔλαμψεν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν πρὸς φωτισμὸν τῆς γνώσεως τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ, "that He may bring to light and show the γνώσις τῆς δ. τ. θ." κ.τ.λ. In like manner 2 Cor. iv. 4, εἰς τὸ μὴ αὐγάσαι τὸν φωτισμὸν τοῦ εὐαγγ. τῆς δόξης τοῦ Χὺ, "lest the light should shine," etc. (b) *Passively, the enlightenment that has taken place, light*, as risen and diffused brightness; so in the LXX. Job iii. 9, εἰς φωτισμὸν μὴ ἔλθοι, parallel with σκοτωθεῖη τὰ ἄστρα. Figuratively, Ps. xxvii. 1, κύριος φωτισμός μου καὶ σωτήρ μου.—Φανερός is rare in the LXX., Deut. xxix. 29 = 𐤒𐤓𐤁; Prov. xvi. 5 = 𐤒𐤓; Gen. xlii. 16 = 𐤒𐤓 Niph.; oftener in 2 Macc. i. 33, vi. 30, et al. Φανερώς does not occur in the LXX. In the Apocrypha, 2 Macc. iii. 28, φανερώς τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ δυναστείαν ἐπεγνωκότες. Φανερώω occurs only (if we except the place in Herod. vi. 122, rejected by Valckenaer) in later Greek, in Dion.

Hal., Dio Cass., Josephus, once in the LXX. Jer. xxxiii. 6 = הַל, which is usually rendered by ἀποκαλύπτω, also ἀνακαλύπτω, ἐκκαλύπτω, and by other words occasionally (against Voigt, *Fundamental Dogmatik*, p. 201). Not in the Apocrypha. Voigt considers that φανεροῦν, φανέρωσις refer to the divine revelation generally, natural and supernatural, but ἀποκάλυψις only to God's supernatural revelation, either its general manifestation, or as enlightenment by the Spirit of God. But this is incorrect; as is also his statement that the LXX. employ sometimes ἀποκαλ. and sometimes φαν. to render הַל, הָלָה, because the effort to distinguish between the natural and supernatural by the use of these terms was not fully carried out till in the N. T. usage. Φανεροῦν stands for the so-called natural revelation (revelation in nature) only in Rom. i. 19, nowhere else; ner does φανέρωσις; and φανερός in Rom. i. 19 cannot here be cited. If we examine those places where ἀποκαλ. and φανερ. cannot be interchanged—and by these we must decide—e.g. φαν., Mark xvi. 12, 14, 2 Cor. iv. 10, 11, Col. iii. 4, 1 Tim. iii. 16, Titus i. 3, Heb. ix. 8, 1 John i. 2, iii. 2, and ἀποκαλ., 1 Cor. xiv. 6, 2 Cor. xii. 1, Rom. xvi. 25, Gal. iii. 23, we must acquiesce in the distinction which we have pointed out between the two words, a distinction which explains why φαν. should be more fully used than ἀποκ., because the state of the object (φανέρωσις) brought about by the ἀποκ. comes mainly into consideration; cf. especially Gal. iii. 23, εἰς τὴν μέλλ. πίστιν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι, where φανερωθῆναι would convey a totally different thought. Again, Rom. i. 17, δικ. γὰρ θεοῦ ἐν τῷ εὐ. ἀποκαλύπτεται, but in iii. 21, νυνὶ δὲ χωρὶς νόμου δικ. θεοῦ πεφανέρωται, μαρτυρουμένη κ.τ.λ. Trench (*Synonyms*, etc.) rightly represents ἀποκάλυψις and ἐπιφάνεια as synonymous, but this does not hold of φανέρωσις.—Ἐπιφαίνω in the LXX. is = הִפְאִין, הָלָה Niph., הָלָה, but is as rare as the simple verb.

Φημί is in the LXX. = הִפְאִין, rarely = הִפְאִין.—Προφητικός, ἡ, ὄν, belonging to the prophet, or coming from him; rare in profane Greek, e.g. Lucian, *Alex.* 60. Not in the LXX. In the N. T. Rom. xvi. 26; 2 Pet. i. 19.—Προφητεία is in the LXX. = הִפְאִין, 2 Chron. xv. 8; 2 Esdr. vi. 14; Neh. vi. 12; cf. 2 Esdr. v. 1. It is = הִפְאִין in 2 Chron. xxxii. 32. So too in Ecclus. xxiv. 33, xxxvi. 20, xxxix. 1, xlv. 3, xlv. 1, 20; Tobit ii. 6.

Φόβος, ὁ, from φέβεσθαι, still appearing as the poetic form of φοβεῖσθαι, of the same root with the German *beben*, "to quake" (Curtius, 298). = fear, dread, Plato, *Prot.* 358 D, προσδοκίαν τινα λέγω κακοῦ τούτου, εἴτε φόβον εἴτε δέος καλεῖτε; *Legg.* i. 644 C, πρὸς δὲ τούτοις ἀμφοῖν αὐτῷ δόξας μελλόντων, οἷν κοινὸν μὲν ὄνομα ἐλπίς, ἴδιον δὲ φόβος μὲν ἢ πρὸ λύπης ἐλπίς, θάρρος δὲ ἢ πρὸ τοῦ ἐναντίου; see also ἐλπίς. In Herod. and Dem. combined with δέος, from which it is distinguished, according to Ammonius, in that δέος πολυχρόνιος κακοῦ ὑπόνοια, φόβος δὲ ἢ παραντίκα πτόησις, a difference which is not heeded subsequently at least; and Passow says (under δέος) that φόβος, *metus*, is fear as a mental state; δέος, *timor*, is a sensation of terror, fear, as a bodily state. The usage for the most part makes no distinction; φόβος, φοβεῖσθαι is more frequent; δέος,

δειδεν, or δεδοικέναι, is rarer; δέος stands specially for momentary fright, φόβος is more abiding; on the other hand, φοβεῖσθαι is to cherish anxiety, δεδοικέναι to cherish alarm or watchfulness. In biblical Greek δεδοικέναι hardly ever occurs,—Isa. lx. 14, Job xxxviii. 40 = חַחַשׁ, also Job iii. 19, 25, xxvi. 13, xli. 2; not in the Apocrypha, nor in the N. T. Δέος not in the LXX., sometimes in 2 Macc. iii. 17, 30, xii. 22, xiii. 16, xv. 23; in the N. T. Heb. xii. 28, where, however, Lachm. reads αἰδώς. Φόβος, φοβεῖσθαι, occur very often, φόβος as the usual rendering of פָּחַד (sometimes εὐσέβεια, θεοσέβεια), מִדָּרָה (once = τρόμος), מִדָּאֵי, מִדָּאֵי (once = δειλία), and פָּחַד, which more rarely is = ἔκστασις, θάμβος, πτόησις, occasionally = פָּחַד, פָּחַד, פָּחַד, פָּחַד, פָּחַד, et al. Of all these terms, פָּחַד is the most important, as used of the bearing of man towards God, and as standing in a religious sense (as also sometimes, though rarely, פָּחַד), and it is just so with φόβος, φοβεῖσθαι. The proper Greek word for reverential fear of God is indeed σέβεισθαι (= σέβ. and its derivatives, Josh. iv. 24, xxii. 25; Job i. 9; Jonah i. 9; Isa. xxix. 13); but φοβεῖσθαι and φόβος are also much used, and with this difference, that σέβ. includes worship and religious conduct, but φόβος denotes only the latter, cf. Thuc. ii. 53. 4, θεῶν δὲ φόβος ἢ ἀνθρώπων νόμος οὐδεὶς ἀπειργε; Plat. Legg. xi. 927 A, πρῶτον μὲν τοὺς ἄνω θεοὺς φοβεῖσθων, οἱ τῶν ὀρφανῶν τῆς ἐρημίας αἰσθήσεις ἔχουσιν; Soph. Aj. 253. Plut. puer. educ. 14 (10 F), ἐπὶ τὴν τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων μυστηρίων πίστιν τὸν ἀπὸ τῶν θεῶν μεταφέρωμεν φόβον; De aud. poet. 12 (34 A); De superst. 2 (165 B), τέλος ἐστὶ τοῦ μὴ νομίζειν θεοὺς τὸ μὴ φοβεῖσθαι; Liban. 4, p. 73, 22, ed. Reisk., πᾶς ὄρκος ἐκ τοῦ πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς φόβου τὴν ἰσχὺν λαμβάνει. There also occur δεδιέναι, αἰδεῖσθαι, αἰσχύνεσθαι τοὺς θεοὺς; see Nägelsbach, nachhom. Theol. v. 2. 64. Τιμῇ, τιμαὶ θεῶν, τιμᾶν τοὺς θεοὺς have reference chiefly to acts of worship, Plat. Regg. Apophth. 172 C, εὐτελεστάτας ἐποίησεν τὰς θυσίας, ἵνα αἰεὶ τοὺς θεοὺς τιμᾶν ἐτοιμῶς δύνωνται; on the other hand, φόβος, φοβεῖσθαι, do not denote positive acts, but a spiritual bearing, having as its foundation the fear of judgment and of punishment; the τὰ πρὸς θεοὺς καὶ τὰ πρὸς γονεῖς καὶ φίλους ὅσια καὶ δίκαια διαφυλάσσειν (Plut. Consol. ad Apoll. 1) also springs from this; but indications are not wanting, e.g. in Plut., that φόβος θεῶν serves only as a subordinate standing-point; it cannot be said φόβος τὰ θεῖα τοῖσι σώφροσι βροτῶν, but θάρσος τὰ θ. τ. σ. β., φόβος δὲ ἄφροσι καὶ ἀχαρίστοις καὶ ἀνοήτοις, ὅτι καὶ τὴν παντὸς αἰτίαν ἀγαθοῦ δύναμιν καὶ ἀρχὴν ὡς βλάπτουσαν ὑφορῶνται καὶ δεδίασιν, cf. de superst. 11 (170 E), μισῶν δὲ θεοὺς καὶ φοβούμενος, et al. This, however, is a perversion of the primary idea which was embodied in δεισιδαιμονία; originally the fear of the gods was a perfectly right and necessary moral motive. Theog. 1179, θεοὺς αἰδοῦ καὶ δειδίθι· τοῦτο γὰρ ἄνδρα εἵργει μήθ' ἔρδειν μήτε λέγειν ἄσεβῆ.

In Holy Scripture also the fear of God appears as a ruling motive of the moral and religious life; in Luke xviii. 2 we find an expression just like that of Thucydides, τὸν θεὸν μὴ φοβούμενος καὶ ἄνθρωπον μὴ ἐντροπέμενος, but it is not only a motive, Ex. i. 17, ἐφοβήθησαν αἱ μαῖαι τὸν θεόν; ver. 21; Lev. xix. 14; Prov. iii. 7, φοβοῦ δὲ τὸν θεόν καὶ ἔκκλινε ἀπὸ παντὸς κακοῦ, et al.; it is a comprehensive designation of the religious

character as a whole; cf. φοβεῖσθαι τὸν θεὸν καὶ φυλάσσειν τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ, Deut. iv. 29, with Prov. xiii. 13, φοβεῖσθαι τὴν ἐντολήν, and specially a comprehensive designation of religious life and conduct; cf. the expression φοβεῖσθαι θεοὺς ἑτέρους, 2 Kings xvii. 7, 35, 37, 38, with 1 Sam. xii. 24, φοβεῖσθε τὸν κύριον καὶ δουλεύσατε αὐτῷ; 2 Kings xvii. 36, αὐτὸν φοβηθήσεσθε καὶ αὐτῷ προσκυνήσεσθε; Deut. x. 12, *et al.* The fear of God, moreover, is in its essence not only fear of His power and judgment, Ps. xxxiii. 8, φοβηθήτω τὸν κύριον πᾶσα ἡ γῆ,—cf. ver. 9, Job xxxvii. 24,—but a dread springing from reverence lest we should sin against Him or displease Him; cf. the words in Lev. xix. 3, ἕκαστος πατέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ μητέρα αὐτοῦ φοβεῖσθω, and the expression in Deut. xxviii. 58, φοβεῖσθαι τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ἐντιμον καὶ τὸ θαυμαστόν; Neh. i. 11, φοβ. τὸ ὄνομα σου; 2 Chron. vi. 31, ὅπως φοβῶνται πᾶσας ὁδοὺς σου πᾶσας τὰς ἡμέρας κ.τ.λ. It differs from δεισιδαιμόνια in that it takes away all fear from him who possesses it, as the frequent exhortation μὴ φόβου shows; compare also Ex. xiv. 31, ἐφοβήθη ὁ λαὸς τὸν κύριον καὶ ἐπίστευσαν τῷ θεῷ κ.τ.λ.; Ps. lxxxvi. 11, εὐφρανθήτω ἡ καρδιά μου τοῦ φοβεῖσθαι τὸ ὄνομά σου; Deut. xxviii. 66; Luke viii. 50; Ps. cxviii. 1, cxxxv. 20, οἱ φοβούμενοι τὸν κύριον εὐλογήσατε τὸν κύριον. Cf. Isa. xii. 2; Jer. xxx. 10; Ps. xxxiii. 18, with ἐλπίζειν ἐπὶ τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ. The fundamental idea nevertheless remains, which is *awe of God's judgment*; cf. Ps. xc. 13, ἀπὸ τοῦ φόβου τοῦ θυμοῦ σου, which qualifies the demeanour throughout, and thus it becomes the disposition and bearing of one who in everything is guided by a reference to God, and it is designated the fear of God; cf. Proverbs and Eccles., where the conception φόβος θεοῦ is so prominent, with Eccles. xii. 1 sqq.

This appears all the more strikingly in the N. T. (cf. 1 Pet. i. 17; Phil. ii. 12), which differs, however, from the O. T. in this, that the fear of God is mentioned far less frequently than in the O. T. The expression occurs hardly twenty times, and in place of it, and corresponding therewith, we have something answering more to the change brought about by redemption; cf. Rom. viii. 15; 1 John iv. 18. Hence φόβος and φοβεῖσθαι are among the conceptions which mark the difference between the Old and New Testament. Φόβος appears (I.) in an objective, or rather an active sense, as that which prompts to fear, what alarms, what is the object of fear; cf. φοβέω, Hes., Hom., Plut. So in Ps. xxxi. 12, ἐγενήθην φόβος τοῖς γνωστοῖς μου; Isa. xxiv. 18 = 77. So also Gen. xxxi. 53, ὤμοσεν Ἰακώβ κατὰ τοῦ φόβου τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ; cf. ver. 42, ὁ φόβος Ἰσαάκ, as a designation of God = *He whom Isaac feared*.—In the N. T., only in Rom. xiii. 3, οἱ γὰρ ἄρχοντες οὐκ εἰσὶν φόβος τῷ ἀγαθῷ ἔργῳ ἀλλὰ τῷ κακῷ. (II.) In a subjective, or, more properly, a passive sense, of the sensation (*a*) of fear, Prov. xviii. 8; Isa. vii. 25; Ezek. xxvii. 28; Job iv. 13, xxxiii. 15; Jer. xxx. 5, φόβος καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν εἰρήνη, *et al.*; Matt. xiv. 26, xxviii. 8, μετὰ φόβου καὶ χαρᾶς; Mark iv. 41, ἐφοβήθησαν φόβον μέγαν; Luke i. 12, 65, ii. 9, v. 26, vii. 16, viii. 37, xxi. 26, ἀποψυχόντων ἀνθρώπων ἀπὸ φόβου καὶ προσδοκίας τῶν ἐπερχομένων; Acts ii. 43, v. 5, 11, xix. 17; 1 Cor. ii. 3; 2 Cor. vii. 5, 11, 15; 1 Tim. v. 20; Rev. xi. 11;—

φόβος καὶ τρόμος, Gen. ix. 2; Ex. xv. 16; Deut. ii. 25, xi. 25; Ps. lv. 6; 1 Cor. ii. 3; 2 Cor. vii. 15; Eph. vi. 5; Phil. ii. 12. Cf. Mark v. 33, *φωβηθεῖσα καὶ τρέμουσα*. With the gen. of the object, Gen. ix. 2, ὁ φόβος ὑμῶν; Isa. viii. 12; Esther viii. 17, διὰ τὸν φόβον τῶν Ἰουδ., *et al.* In the N. T. John vii. 13, xix. 38, xx. 19, διὰ τὸν φ. τῶν Ἰουδ.; 1 Pet. iii. 14, from Isa. viii. 12; Heb. ii. 15, φόβος θανάτου; Rev. xviii. 10, 15, τοῦ βασανισμοῦ. With the gen. of the subject, only in Deut. xxviii. 67, τῆς καρδίας; Job iv. 4. The gen. of the object occurs mainly in the phrase (b) φόβος κυρίου, θεοῦ, 2 Sam. xxiii. 3; Prov. i. 7, 29, ii. 5, viii. 13, ix. 10, x. 28, xiv. 28 sq., xv. 17, xvi. 4, xix. 23, xxii. 4, xxiii. 17; Ps. v. 8, xviii. 10, xxxiv. 12, cxi. 10, cxix. 38; Isa. xi. 3; Jer. xxxii. 40, here everywhere = *פחד*. Mal. i. 6 = *פחד*. 1 Chron. xiv. 17; Ps. xxxvi. 2; Isa. ii. 10, 19, 21 = *פחד*. Prov. x. 30 = *פחד*. In the N. T. Acts ix. 31, πορεύεσθαι τῷ φόβῳ τοῦ κυρ.; 2 Cor. v. 11, εἰδότες τὸν φόβον τοῦ κυρ.; vii. 1, ἐπιτελεῖν ἀγῳσύνην ἐν φ. θ.; Rom. iii. 18 from Ps. xxxvi. 2. Once ἐν φόβῳ *Χυ.*, Eph. v. 21. Without the genitive added, very seldom, Ps. ii. 11, δουλεύσατε τῷ κυρίῳ ἐν φόβῳ. The N. T. φόβος, when by itself, is in many, nay, in most places, a *fear of God* and His judgment, either evoked by certain events, such as miracles, or awakened by what one knows of God and His judgment, but this is certainly not what κατ' ἐξ. is called *the fear of God*. The latter only in Phil. ii. 12, μετὰ φόβου καὶ τρόμου τὴν ἑαυτῶν σωτηρίαν κατεργάζεσθε, cf. ver. 13; 1 Pet. i. 17, εἰ πατέρα ἐπικαλεῖσθε τὸν ἀπροσωπολήπτως κρίνοντα, ἐν φόβῳ . . . ἀναστράφητε; iii. 2, τὴν ἐν φόβῳ ἀγνὴν ἀναστροφὴν; iii. 15, μετὰ πραύτητος καὶ φόβου, but not Matt. xxviii. 8; Luke i. 12, 65, ii. 9, etc.—See above under (a); cf. Rom. viii. 15, οὐ γὰρ ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα δουλείας πάλιν εἰς φόβον; 1 John iv. 18, φόβος οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ κ.τ.λ.; Jude 23; 1 Tim. v. 20.—There is no need to suppose another meaning, *reverence*, in 1 Pet. ii. 18, iii. 15; Rom. xiii. 7; cf. ver. 5.

Φοβέω; the future passive in profane Greek usually in the middle form φοβήσομαι, but the aor. ἐφοβήθην, future φοβηθήσομαι, only rarely, and as *fut. exact.*, still rarer the aor. ἐφοβησάμην; but in biblical Greek usually the future φοβηθήσομαι, aorist ἐφοβήθην. (I.) Active = to terrify, to make afraid, to make to fly in terror, τινὰ, Homer, Xen., Plato, *et al.* In biblical Greek only in Wisd. xvii. 9, εἰ μὴδὲν αὐτοὺς παραχῶδες ἐφόβει. Elsewhere always (II.) the passive = to be afraid, to fear, to be fearful, still in Homer always = to be terrified, to be put to flight, to flee, afterwards with δεδιέναι, τρέμεσθαι, *et al.*; opposed to θαρρύν, Isoc., Thuc., Plut., see Passow; LXX. see above under φόβος. (a) Without object, to be afraid; that it is properly passive is clear from the construction φοβεῖσθαι ὑπό τινος, *Il.* viii. 149, and φοβ. τινὶ, to be put into fear by anything, *Il.* xvi. 294; Eurip. *Rhes.* 37, Κρονίου Πανὸς τρομερᾷ μαστιγι φοβεῖ. But usually in profane Greek we find other prepositional combinations, ὑπό τινος, περί τινος or τινι, ὑπέρ τινος, πρὸς with the gen. dat. or acc., ἐκ τινος, as equivalent to to be afraid on account of something. In biblical Greek—apart from the combinations

under (b) with the acc.—standing quite alone, or φόβον φοβεῖσθαι, Ps. liii. 6; Jonah i. 5; 1 Macc. x. 8; Mark iv. 41; Luke ii. 9; φόβῳ φοβεῖσθαι, Ezek. xxvii. 28; cf. ἐν φόβῳ φοβ., Isa. xxxiii. 7; or the phrase which is foreign to profane Greek, φοβεῖσθαι ἀπὸ τινος = פֶּחַדָּתִי, Lev. xix. 30, xxvi. 2; Deut. v. 5; 1 Sam. vii. 7, xviii. 12, xxi. 12; 1 Kings iii. 28; Neh. iv. 14; thus especially of the fear of God, see (c); once περὶ with the gen., Josh. ix. 24, ἐφοβήθημεν σφόδρα περὶ τῶν ψυχῶν ἡμῶν.—In the N. T. by itself, Matt. x. 31, xiv. 27, 30, xvii. 6, 7, xxv. 25, xxvii. 54, xxviii. 5, 10; Mark v. 15, 33, 36, vi. 50, x. 32, xvi. 8; Luke i. 13, 30, ii. 10, v. 10, viii. 25, 35, 50, ix. 34, xii. 7, 32; John vi. 19, 20, xii. 15, xix. 8; Acts xvi. 38, xviii. 9, xxii. 29, xxvii. 24; Rom. xi. 20, xiii. 4; Heb. xiii. 6; 1 John iv. 18; Rev. i. 17. With following infinitive = *to be afraid to do something*, Matt. i. 20, ii. 22; Mark ix. 32; Luke ix. 45. With following μή, μήπως, μήποτε = *to be afraid lest something should happen*, Acts xxiii. 10, xxvii. 17; 1 Cor. xi. 3, xii. 20; Gal. iv. 11; Heb. iv. 1. The combination φοβεῖσθαι ἀπὸ τινος is very rare in the N. T., only in Matt. x. 28 and Luke xii. 4.—(b) φοβεῖσθαί τι, τινά, *to fear something or some one, to stand in fear of, to be afraid of, to quake before, to draw back trembling, and go out of the way of*, Judg. vi. 27, ἐγενήθη ὡς ἐφοβήθη τὸν οἶκον τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ τοὺς ἄνδρας τῆς πόλεως τοῦ ποιῆσαι ἡμέρας καὶ ἐποίησε νυκτός; 2 Sam. iii. 11; 1 Kings i. 51; Ps. xxiii. 4, xxvii. 1, cf. Ps. lvi. 5, 12; Jer. x. 5, *et al.* Then = *to stand in fear of, to fear one, so as to take care not to have him as an antagonist, to be afraid of*, either because opposition is presupposed, and the person or thing is therefore to be avoided, or because the opposition is impending; cf. Rom. xiii. 3, 4. In the former sense φοβεῖσθαί τινα is = *to avoid the opponent*, in the latter it is = *to avoid the opposition, to be on one's guard against it*, and therefore to yield to its will; cf. 1 Sam. xv. 24, ἐφοβήθη τὸν λαὸν καὶ ἤκουσα τῆς φωνῆς αὐτῶν. In this sense it stands (c) of the fear of God, φοβεῖσθαι τὸν θεόν, κύριον; cf., with the passage last cited, Judg. vi. 10, εἶπα ὑμῖν, Ἐγὼ κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν, οὐ φοβηθήσεσθε τοὺς θεοὺς τοῦ Ἀμορραίου . . . καὶ οὐκ εἰσηκούσατε τῆς φωνῆς μου. That the fear of God lies in the conception is clear from the combination φ. ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ, Eccles. iii. 14, viii. 12, 13; Haggai i. 12; 1 Chron. xvi. 30; Dan. v. 21, vi. 26 (never ἀπ' αὐτοῦ,—Trommius mistakenly names Ps. xxii. 24); Ps. cxix. 120, ἀπὸ τῶν κριμάτων σου ἐφοβήθη. But God is not regarded as an opponent who is to be avoided and withdrawn from (Ex. ii. 14, xxiv. 30); the emotion is not that of the profane δεισιδαιμόνια, it is the final opposition and condemnation of God that is shunned, so that, instead of avoiding Him, the desire is δουλεύειν αὐτῷ, 1 Sam. xii. 14, 24; λατρεύειν, Josh. xxiv. 14; αὐτῷ προσκυνεῖν, 2 Kings xvii. 36; πορεύεσθαι ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτοῦ, Deut. viii. 6; φυλάσσειν τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ, Deut. iv. 29, xiii. 4; nay more, πιστεύειν αὐτῷ, Ex. xiv. 31, cf. Deut. xxviii. 66; all these are included in the conception φοβεῖσθαι τὸν θεόν; cf. φοβ. τὸν πατέρα καὶ μητέρα, Lev. xix. 3, Josh. iv. 14, Mal. i. 6, with the totally different Ἀδωνίας ἐφοβήθη τὸν βασιλέα, 1 Kings i. 50, 51. The conception “reverence” is not, however, adequate for

φοβ. τ. θ., because in it fear of God's judgment falls too much out of thought. Cf. also 1 Sam. xiv. 26, ἐφοβήθη ὁ λαὸς τὸν ὄρκον κυρίου; Eccles. ix. 2, ὁ ὀμνύων καὶ τὸν ὄρκον φοβούμενος; Prov. xiii. 13, ὁ φοβούμενος ἐντολήν. Moreover, in φοβ. τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου there comes in still the element of dread, with reference to Ex. xx. 7, see Deut. xxviii. 58; 2 Chron. vi. 33; Neh. i. 11; Ps. cii. 16, lxxxvi. 11. Cf. Lev. xix. 30, ἀπὸ τῶν ἁγίων μου φοβηθήσεσθε; xxvi. 2.—Ex. ix. 21, ὁ φοβ. τὸ ῥῆμα κυρίου.—We find it thus in Gen. xxii. 12, xxxii. 11, xlii. 18; Ex. i. 17, 21, ii. 31, xiv. 31; Lev. xix. 14, 32, xxv. 17, 36, 43; Deut. iv. 10, 29, vi. 2, 13, 24, viii. 6, x. 12, xiii. 4, xiv. 23, xvii. 19, xxv. 18, xxxi. 12, 13; 1 Sam. xii. 14, 24; 2 Sam. vi. 9; 1 Kings xviii. 12; 2 Kings iv. 1, xvii. 25, 28, 32, 33, 36, 39; 1 Chron. xiii. 12; 2 Chron. vi. 31, 33; Neh. i. 11, vii. 2; Job xxxvii. 24; Ps. xv. 4, xxii. 24, 26, xxv. 12, 14, xxxi. 20, xxxiii. 8, 18, xxxiv. 8, 10, lv. 20, lx. 6, lxi. 6, lxvi. 16, lxvii. 8, lxxxv. 10, lxxxvi. 11, cii. 16, ciii. 11, 13, 16, cxi. 5, cxii. 1, cxiii. 19, 22, cxviii. 4, cxix. 63, 74, 79; cxxviii. 1, 4, cxxxv. 20, cxlv. 19, cxlvii. 11; Prov. iii. 7, xiv. 2, xxiv. 21; Eccles. v. 6, vii. 19, viii. 12, xii. 13; Isa. xxix. 23, l. 10, lvii. 11, lix. 19, lxvi. 14; Jer. v. 22, 24, xxvi. 19, xxxii. 39; Zeph. iii. 8; Mal. ii. 5, iii. 5, 16, iv. 2. In the Apocrypha it is specially frequent in Ecclesiasticus. In the N. T., on the other hand, it is rare; see φόβος, Matt. ix. 8; Luke i. 50, xviii. 2, 4, xxiii. 40; Col. iii. 22; Rev. xiv. 7, xv. 4, xix. 5; Rev. xi. 18, τὸ ὄνομά σου. In all these passages it is clear that φοβ. τὸν θεόν is somewhat different from that required under God's N. T. revelation, a step towards it, Luke xxiii. 40; Rev. xiv. 7. The expression in the book of the Acts, φοβούμενος τὸν θεόν, οἱ φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν, of the proselytes as distinct from the Israelites, is peculiar, Acts xiii. 16, 26, x. 2, 22, 25, also σεβόμενοι (which see); cf. 2 Chron. v. 6, πᾶσα συναγωγὴ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ οἱ φοβούμενοι καὶ οἱ ἐπισυνηγμένοι αὐτῶν. Cf. Schürer, *N. T. Zeitgesch.* p. 644 sqq.

Σύνφυτος occurs twice in the LXX., Zech. xi. 2, ὁ δρυμὸς ὁ σύνφυτος (= 𐤓𐤕𐤔) = "the grown-up and interlaced oak forest." But in Amos ix. 13, πάντες οἱ βουνοὶ σύνφυτοι ἔσονται (= 𐤁𐤕, Hithpael), probably = "grown into one another."

Χαίρω is in the LXX. = 𐤇𐤓, Hiphil (see ἀγαλλιάω), 𐤇𐤓𐤕, 𐤇𐤓𐤕𐤕, but upon the whole not frequent.—Χάρις is = 𐤇𐤓, but once = 𐤇𐤓𐤕, Esth. ii. 9; 𐤇𐤓𐤕𐤕, Gen. xliii. 14; 𐤇𐤓𐤕𐤕, Esth. vi. 3; and twice = 𐤇𐤓𐤕, Prov. x. 33, xii. 2.—Χαρίζεσθαι does not occur in the LXX., once in Eccles. xii. 3, and in 2 Macc. iii. 31, 33, iv. 32, vii. 22; 3 Macc. vii. 6; 4 Macc. v. 7, xi. 2.—Χάρισμα occurs in Philo, *De alleg. lib.* 3, I. 102. 31 sqq., ζητῶν ὁ δίκαιος τὴν τῶν ὄντων φύσιν, ἐν τούτῳ εὕρισκει ἄριστον εὔρεμα, χάριν ὄντα τοῦ θεοῦ τὰ σύμπαντα; γενέσεως δὲ οὐδὲν χάρισμα, ὅτι γε οὐδὲ κτήμα. . . . δωρεὰ γὰρ καὶ εὐεργεσία καὶ χάρισμα θεοῦ τὰ πάντα ὅσα ἐν κόσμῳ καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ κόσμος ἐστίν, therefore = present, a gift of pure free inclination and affection, a gift of grace; in Rom. i. 11, ἵνα τι μεταδῶ χάρισμα ὑμῖν πνευματικὸν εἰς τὸ στηριχθῆναι ὑμᾶς, a gift proceeding from and fulfilled in the Holy Spirit, such as comfort, enlightenment, which they needed to strengthen them.

Εὐχάριστος, *ον*, (a) **thankful**, Xen., Plut., Diod.; Col. iii. 15, in a religious sense; cf. ἀχάριστος, Wisd. xvi. 19, Luke vi. 35; 2 Tim. iii. 2. (b) **Agreeable, loveable, graceful**, Xen., Herod.; Prov. xi. 16, γυνὴ εὐχ = נִשְׂתֵּינָה.

Εὐχαριστεῖω; regarding the augment, see Buttmann, § 84, 5; cf. εὐλογέω, εὐδοκέω; = **to be thankful, to thank**, not in better Greek; Polyb., Plut., Diod. Sic. In Demosthenes it occurs, as does the substantive εὐχαριστία in the decrees of the Byzantines, *pro cor.* 91, 92, instead of χαρίζεσθαι, χάρις, in better Greek. Not in the LXX., where we find εὐλογεῖν, in some respects a narrower and in others a wider conception. Often in the Apocrypha, and in Philo and Josephus; Judith viii. 25; 2 Macc. i. 11; 3 Macc. vii. 16, in a religious sense = **to thank God**, τῷ κυρίῳ, σωτήρι. So also Wisd. xviii. 2, where it stands by itself; in 2 Macc. xii. 31 also by itself, but of *thanks to men*. In the N. T., excepting Rom. xvi. 4, only in a religious sense, with or without τῷ θεῷ, and in Luke's and Paul's writings with the dative. But there is a difference between εὐχαριστεῖν with the dative and εὐχ. absolutely or by itself. (a) With the dative it always stands where there is implied a kindness done, a favour, a χάρις, or the like, received, where it appears as thanks for any good experienced; thus Luke xvii. 16; Acts xxvii. 35, xxviii. 15; Rom. xiv. 6; 1 Cor. xiv. 18; Col. i. 12, iii. 17. The ground of thanks is introduced by ὑπέρ, Rom. i. 8; 1 Cor. x. 30; Eph. i. 16, v. 20; by περί with the gen., 1 Cor. i. 4; 1 Thess. i. 2; 2 Thess. i. 3, ii. 13; Philem. 4; by ἐπί with the dative, 1 Cor. i. 4; Phil. i. 3, 5; by διὰ with the acc., Col. i. 3; or joined on with ὅτι, Luke xviii. 11; John xi. 41; Rom. i. 8; 1 Cor. i. 14; 1 Thess. ii. 13; Rev. xi. 17. (b) εὐχαριστεῖν τι, **τινά, thankfully to praise God for**, 2 Cor. i. 11, ἵνα τὸ εἰς ἡμᾶς χάρισμα διὰ πολλῶν εὐχαριστηθῇ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν; Rom. i. 21, οὐκ ὡς θεὸν ἐδόξασαν ἢ ἡνυχάριστησαν. This construction, unknown in profane Greek, which is used of consecration in patristic Greek (see εὐλογεῖν), has its origin manifestly from (c) the absolute εὐχαριστεῖν, synon. with εὐλογεῖν, and is an index to its meaning, namely, that it signifies **praising and glorifying God**, which is prompted only by God Himself, and His revealed glory; cf. Mark viii. 6 with ver. 7; Matt. xiv. 19, ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, εὐλόγησε, and Matt. xxvi. 27, λαβὼν ποτήριον καὶ εὐχαριστήσας; cf. ver. 26 and 1 Cor. x. 16. Also 1 Cor. xiv. 17, καλῶς εὐχαριστεῖς, is somewhat different from ver. 18, εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ, for the former refers to and is in fact the γλώσσαις λαλεῖν, but ver. 18 means a direct thanksgiving. Thus it occurs in Matt. xv. 36; Mark viii. 6; John vi. 11, 23, in connection with Christ's breaking of bread at the miraculous feeding, and Matt. xxvi. 27, parallel with εὐλογεῖν, ver. 26 (as in Mark viii. 6, 7), at the Last Supper, and in like manner εὐλόγησας and εὐχαριστήσας changing places, in Mark xiv. 22, 23.—Luke xxii. 17, 19, compared with 1 Cor. x. 16. This meaning explains also the declaration in John vi. 23, ὅπου ἔφαγον τὸν ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσαντος τοῦ κυρίου. To this class belong also 1 Thess. v. 18, ἐν παντὶ εὐχαριστεῖτε, cf. Phil. iv. 6, so that it denotes not *thanks for everything*, but *praising God in every occupation and situation*,—which is to form part of every prayer.

Cf. also Eph. v. 20. This absolute εὐχαριστεῖν is not the same with that in Dem. *pro cor.* 92, where it is = *to be thankful*, αἰῶνι παντὶ οὐκ ἐλλείψει εὐχαριστῶν καὶ ποιῶν ὅτι ἂν δύνηται ἀγαθόν.

Εὐχαριστία ἡ, (a) *thankfulness*, Dem. *pro cor.* 91, parallel with ἀρετή. Polyb. viii. 14. 8; Ecclus. xxxvii. 11. Add. Esth. vi. 4; 2 Macc. ii. 27. In the N. T. Acts xxiv. 3. (b) *Giving of thanks, thanks*, not in profane Greek; in biblical Greek always in a religious sense, Wisd. xvi. 28; 1 Cor. xiv. 16; 2 Cor. iv. 15; 1 Tim. iv. 3, 4; Col. ii. 7, iv. 2; Phil. iv. 6; 1 Thess. iii. 9, εὐχαριστίαν τῷ θεῷ ἀποδοῦναι περί τινος. 2 Cor. ix. 11, 12, εὐχαριστία τῷ θεῷ. The plural, 2 Cor. ix. 12. (c) *The thankful praise of God*, Eph. v. 4, πορνεία δὲ . . . μηδὲ ὀνομαζέσθω ἐν ὑμῖν, καθὼς πρέπει ἀγίοις, καὶ αἰσχροῦτης ἢ μωρολογίας ἢ εὐτραπείας, ἃ οὐκ ἀνήκεν, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον εὐχαριστία. So also Rev. iv. 9, vii. 12, synon. with εὐλογία, and distinguished therefrom only as thanksgiving and acknowledgment are from extolling and glorifying exaltation, εὐλογεῖν synon. with ὑψοῦν.

Χοῖκος, ἡ, ὄν, in profane Greek late and very seldom, in biblical Greek only in Paul's writings, 1 Cor. xv. 47, 48, 49, as a strengthening of the preceding ἐκ γῆς in ver. 47, and expressing a qualitative antithesis to ἐξ οὐρανοῦ or ἐπουράνιος. In the corresponding passage, in the Mosaic account of the creation, the LXX. have not the adj., but in close connection with the original the substantive χοῦς as an epithet of man, = רֶפֶץ in distinction from מֶלֶךְ, Gen. ii. 7, ἐπλασεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον χοῦν, ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς, מֶלֶךְ הָאָדָם רֶפֶץ. The LXX. use χοῦς side by side with γῆ, and as frequently to translate רֶפֶץ; but γῆ is the regular word for מֶלֶךְ and מֶלֶךְ, Gen. iii. 10, where one might have expected χοῦς, because מֶלֶךְ had just preceded (ἕως τοῦ ἀποστρέφαι σε εἰς τὴν γῆν, ἐξ ἧς ἐλήμφθης); yet they translate מֶלֶךְ רֶפֶץ by γῆ εἰ καὶ εἰς γῆν ἀπελεύσῃ.

In itself χοῦς is not a term of degradation; cf. Gen. xiii. 16, ὡς τὴν ἄμμον τῆς γῆς, for which Ecclus. xlv. 21 has ὡς χοῦν τῆς γῆς. Further cf. Gen. iii. 14; 1 Sam. ii. 8; 1 Kings xvi. 2; Job xlii. 6; Ps. cxii. 6, *et al.*, where רֶפֶץ is used to designate lowliness and humiliation, in which cases the LXX. employ γῆ. The Pauline χοῖκος may however be meant depreciatively, like רֶפֶץ in the places cited, so that it is an expression like 2 Cor. iv. 7, ἔχομεν τὸν θησαυρὸν τοῦτον ἐν ὀστρακίνοις σκεύεσιν. Thus it is also meant in the passage quoted in Walz, *rhet. gr.* i. 613. 4, γυμνοὶ τούτους τοῦ χοϊκοῦ βάρους, and thus it is taken also by v. Wilamowitz, *commentariolus gramm.* II. p. 17 (Gryph. 1880), who calls it an *audacissima vocabuli novatio* on Paul's part, like the term afterwards employed for it, ὑλικός, Theodot. in Clem. Alex. opp. ed. Sylb. p. 346, see Wilamowitz; cf. Orac. Sibyll. viii. 445 sqq., ᾧ θνητῷ περ ἑόντι, τὰ κόσμικα πάντα λατρεύσει, καὶ χοϊκῷ πλασθέντι τὰ πανθ' ὑποτάξομεν αὐτῷ; Hesych., πῆλινος, γῆϊνος; Clem. Alex. (Zonar), γηγενῆς καὶ γῆϊνος.

Χρίω is in the LXX. = מָצַח, which is a syn. with מָצַח, rendered ἐπιχέειν, ἐκχέειν (with

which the expression "outpouring of the Holy Spirit" coincides), which occurs but seldom of the anointing of the high priest, Ex. xxix. 7, Lev. viii. 12; of the anointing of a king, 1 Sam. x. 1, 2 Kings ix. 3; though מָשַׁח is, if we omit Ex., Lev., Num., mostly used for kingly anointing, cf. Χριστός.

Ψευδόχριστος, ὁ, false Messiah, distinguished from ἀντίχριστος, as denoting one who sets himself up falsely as the promised Messiah; whereas the ἀντίχριστος opposes the Messiah. Matt. xxiv. 24; Mark. xiii. 22, where the connection refers to Jewish ψευδόχρ. Cf. Bengel on John v. 43, "*a tempore veri Christi ad nostram aetatem lxiv. Pseudomessiae numerantur, per quos decepti sunt Judaei.*"

Ψύχω is = מָשַׁח in Jer. viii. 2; Num. xi. 32.

Ψυχή answers in the LXX. to the Hebrew נַפְשׁ, which is otherwise rendered only occasionally, e.g. by the reflective pronoun of the third person, once by πνοή, Prov. xxiv. 12, σῶμα, Gen. xxxvi. 6, never by πνεῦμα or καρδιά (but cf. ὀλιγόψυχος). Ψυχή is also = נַפְשׁ, Ps. lxiv. 2; נַפְשׁ, Ps. lxxiv. 19; Job xxxviii. 39; and = לֵב, כֶּבֶד, in the passages cited under καρδιά, cf. ψυχικῶς, 2 Macc. iv. 37, xiv. 24.—Cf. נַפְשׁ יְשׁוּבָה, 1 Sam. xix. 5, xxviii. 21; Judg. xii. 2; Job xiii. 14; Ps. cxix. 109, τιθέναι τὴν ψυχὴν ἐν τῇ χειρὶ. 1 Kings xix. 2, מָהֵם יְהוָה נַפְשׁוֹתָיִם וְנַפְשׁוֹתָיִם יִשְׁמְרוּ = θήσομαι τὴν ψυχὴν σου καθὼς ψυχὴν ἑνὸς ἐξ αὐτῶν, and Isa. liii. 10, יְשׁוּבָה נַפְשׁוֹתָיִם וְנַפְשׁוֹתָיִם, see Delitzsch; נַפְשׁוֹתָיִם always contains the thought of pledging one's life for something; see E. Haupt on 1 John iii. 16. As to Matt. xx. 28, John x. 11, cf. the expression ἀντίψυχον, 4 Macc. vi. 29, ἀντίψυχον αὐτῶν λάβε τὴν ἐμὴν ψυχὴν; xvii. 21, ὥσπερ ἀντίψυχον γεγοιότας τῆς τοῦ ἔθρους ἀμαρτίας. Σῶμα and ψυχή may be divided, or separated from each other; πνεῦμα and ψυχή can only be distinguished from each other.—Ἰσόψυχος occurs in the LXX., Ps. lv. 14, σὺ δὲ ἄνθρωπε ἰσόψυχε, ἡγεμών μου καὶ γνωστὴ μου = אֲנִי וְאַתָּה יְשׁוּבָה.

Ὀλιγόψυχος, ον, faint-hearted, Artemidor. *Oneirokrit.* iii. 5, ἀηδεῖς δὲ ὅτι μάχιμοί εἰσι καὶ ὀλιγόψυχοι. The verb ὀλιγοψυχεῖν in Isoc., ὀλιγοψυχία in Hippocr. All three words often in the LXX.; ὀλιγόψυχος, Isa. lvii. 15, ὀλιγοψύχοις διδούς μακροθυμίαν, מַתְּנָה לְעַמּוּלָא דְּתַתָּא, Prov. xviii. 14 = מַתְּנָה לְעַמּוּלָא; Isa. liv. 6 = מַתְּנָה לְעַמּוּלָא, xxxv. 4 = מַתְּנָה לְעַמּוּלָא. As to Prov. xiv. 31, see μακροθυμία. The subst. = מַתְּנָה לְעַמּוּלָא, Ex. vi. 9. = מַתְּנָה לְעַמּוּלָא, Ps. lv. 9. The verb = מַתְּנָה לְעַמּוּלָא, Num. xxi. 4; Judg. x. 6, xvi. 17; הִלֵּךְ, Judg. viii. 4; הִלֵּךְ, Hithp. Jonah iv. 9; הִלֵּךְ, Hithp. Ps. lxxvii. 4, ὀλιγοψύχησεν τὸ πνεῦμά μου.—Ecclus. iv. 9, vii. 10, μὴ ὀλιγοψυχῆσης ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ σου; Judith vii. 19 as Ps. lxxvii. 4, Judith viii. 9.—In the N. T. only the adjective, 1 Thess. v. 14. Cf. ἀσθενόψυχος, 4 Macc. xv. 4.

Ἀποψύχω, to leave off breathing, to become faint, Od. xxiv. 348, εἶλεν ἀποψύχοντα Ὀδυσσεύς; cf. v. 457, ὁ δ' ἄρ' ἄπνευστος καὶ ἀναυδος κείτ' ὀλιγηπελέων. So Luke

xxi. 26, ἀποψυχίντων ἀνθρώπων ἀπὸ φόβου; cf. Matt. xxviii. 4, ἀπὸ τοῦ φόβου . . . ἐγενήθησαν ὡς νεκροί. Otherwise mostly to breathe one's last, to die, e.g. βίον, πνεῦμα; Soph., Thuc., Philo, Joseph., *et al.*; 4 Macc. xv. 15 parallel with ἀποπνεῖν.

Ἐκψύχω, to breathe out, to give up the ghost, to expire, Hippocr., Jambl., LXX., Judg. iv. 21, ἐξέψυξε καὶ ἀπέθανε, the Alex. = הָלַךְ, Vat. ἐξεστὼς ἐσκοτώθη καὶ ἂ; Ezek. xxi. 12, ἐκψύξει πᾶσα σὰρξ καὶ πᾶν πνεῦμα = הָלַךְ Piel, like ἀποψύ, Luke xxi. 26.—In the N. T., Acts v. 5, 10, xii. 23, instead of the nobler word ἐκπνέω, Mark xv. 37, 39; Luke xxiii. 46.

Καταψύχω, to cool, to refresh, Aristotle, Plut., *et al.*; Luke xvi. 24, τὴν γλῶσσαν. Intransitive, Gen. xviii. 4, καταψύξατε ὑπὸ τὸ δένδρον, for which we have seemingly no examples in profane Greek (in Plut. *Mor.* 652 C it is transitive).

Ὠρα is in the LXX. = הָלַךְ, Gen. xviii. 10; Ex. ix. 19, xviii. 22, 26, *et al.* הָלַךְ, Dan. iii. 6, iv. 16, 30, v. 5. See also Num. ix. 2; Dan. ix. 21; Hos. ii. 9.

Ἀπρόσκοπος, ον (not to be confounded with ἀπρό-σκοπος, Aesch. *Eum.* 105; 3 Macc. iii. 8), only in Ecclus. xxxv. 21, the N. T., and ecclesiastical Greek; once in Sext. *adv. gramm.* i. 195; = one who has not offended, like προσκόπτειν, of offence either taken or given. The remark of Eustath. *Il.* 159. 64 (cf. Steph. *Thes. s.v.*), that it primarily was used ἐπὶ ποδῶν, seems to be based upon the first appearance of the word in Ecclus. xxxv. 21, μὴ πιστεύσης ἐν ὁδῷ ἀπροσκοπῶ; cf. Eust. *Od.* 1395. 18, εὐδον καὶ ἀπρόσκοπον. In the N. T. (a) he who gives no offence, or occasion of stumbling, as in Ecclus. xxxv. 21. Thus in 1 Cor. x. 32, ἀπρόσκοποι καὶ Ἰουδαίοις γίνεσθε καὶ Ἕλλησιν καὶ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ; cf. ver. 33. So also in Sext. *Emp.* as above cited, ἀπρόσκοπον τοῖς πολλοῖς εἶναι φαίνεται, and in this sense in patristic Greek, e.g. *Const. Apost.* ii. 9, οὐ μόνον ἀπρόσκοπον εἶναι χρὴ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀπροσωπόληπτον. Then (b) of one who has taken no offence, experienced no injury, Acts xxiv. 16, ἀσκῶ ἀπρόσκοπον συνείδησιν ἔχειν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν καὶ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους διαπαντός; cf. 1 Cor. viii. 12, τύπτειν τὴν συνείδησιν ἀσθενοῦσαν, like πρόσκομμα in ver. 9, so that it is not equivalent to “*unshaken, kept in undisturbed equilibrium*” (Wendt), which is inappropriate to our conception of conscience, but = uninjured. In Phil. i. 10 in the same sense, ἵνα ᾗτε εἰδικρινεῖς καὶ ἀπρόσκοποι εἰς ἡμέραν Χριστοῦ, compare the preceding εἰς τὸ δοκιμάζειν τὰ διαφέροντα, and ver. 9, the design of which is the preservation of the Philippians from injury in their Christian character.

Μισθός, οὐ, ὁ, pay. The statement that it means both *merces* and *praemium*, whereby the difficulties of O. T. and specially N. T. usage are said to be solved, is

incorrect. A *praemium* is designated *μισθός* from a special point of view only, see (b).—
 (a) **Pay, wages** for work done or service rendered, *e.g.* of soldiers' pay, of sailors' or watchmen's wages, of the *honorarium* of teachers, the fees of lawyers, the payment fixed for the citizens upon the visit of the national assembly, in short, **the pay stipulated, agreed to, or guaranteed for any work or service rendered**; Dem. *De Cor.* xviii. 51, εἰ μὴ καὶ τοὺς θερισταῖς καὶ τοὺς ἄλλοι τι μισθοῦ πράττοντας φίλους καὶ ξένους δεῖ καλεῖν τῶν μισθωσαμένων; Thuc. i. 142. 2, ὀλίγων ἡμερῶν ἔνεκα μεγάλου μισθοῦ δόσεως ἐκείνοις ξυναγωνίζεσθαι; Phot. (in Steph. *Thes.*), τὸ δὲ παρ' ἡμῖν ὀψώνιον μισθὸν λέγουσι καὶ σιτηρέσιον. Thus as a rule in the LXX. = מִשְׁכָּר (only once = ναῦλον, *fare*, Jonah i. 3), Gen. xxx. 18, 28, 32, 33, xxxi. 8; Ex. ii. 9, xxii. 15; Num. xviii. 31; Deut. xv. 18, xxiv. 15; 2 Chron. xv. 7; Micah iii. 11, *et al.*; Apocrypha, Tob. ii. 12, 14, and often; Ecclus. xxxi. 22. In the N. T. Matt. xx. 8; Luke x. 7; 1 Cor. iii. 8; 1 Tim. v. 18; Jas. v. 4; Jude 11. The expression ὁ μισθὸς τῆς ἀδικίας, Acts i. 18 (cf. 2 Pet. ii. 15, μ. ἀδικίας ἀγάπησεν), of the betrayal-pay of Judas, must not be taken as the same with μισθὸς ἀδικίας in 2 Pet. ii. 13, φθαρήσονται κομιούμενοι μισθὸν ἀδικίας, see (c).—
 (b) Sometimes in profane Greek *μισθός* is used to designate a *praemium*, a remuneration for services which are not for the profit of him who gives the reward, and therefore have no appraisable value. This is a transference of the word to a sphere foreign to the idea it contains, and arises from the circumstance that the recognition embodied in the *praemium* is viewed in the light of payment, though there exists no acquired, stipulated, or legal claim. Thus sometimes in Plato, *e.g.* *Rep.* x. 614 A, ἃ μὲν τοῖνον ζῶντι τῷ δικαίῳ παρὰ θεῶν τε καὶ ἀνθρώπων ἄθλα τε καὶ μισθοὶ καὶ δῶρα γίγνεται πρὸς ἐκείνοις τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς οἷς αὐτὴ παρείχετο ἡ δικαιοσύνη. ii. 363 D, ἡγησάμενοι κάλλιστον ἀρετῆς μισθὸν μέθην αἰώνιον; Plut. *Regg. apophth.* 183 D, ἀνδραγαθίας οὐ παθραγαθίας μισθοὺς καὶ δωρεὰς δίδωμι; Lucian, *Vitt. Auct.* 24, μόνος ὁ σπουδαῖος μισθὸν ἐπὶ τῇ ἀρετῇ λήψεται. But upon the whole this usage is very rare even in Plutarch and Lucian (against Pape, *Wb.*). In Biblical Greek, on the contrary, it is comparatively frequent, and *μισθός* is used to designate the reward which God guarantees to those who hope in Him and do His will, **the recompense brought about through the grace and redeeming righteousness of God**, so that Paul, in Rom. iv. 4, distinguishes between the pay guaranteed and recognised κατὰ χάριν, and that κατὰ ὀφείλημα, τῷ δὲ ἐργαζομένῳ ὁ μισθὸς οὐ λογίζεται κατὰ χάριν ἀλλὰ κατὰ ὀφείλημα, compare ver. 5, τῷ δὲ μὴ ἐργαζομένῳ πιστεῦντι δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν δικαιούντα τὸν ἀσεβῆ, λογίζεται ἡ πίστις αὐτοῦ εἰς δικαιοσύνην. The apostle has in his mind the example of Abraham, and therein we find this very idea of a reward promised and guaranteed κατὰ χάριν, in connection with the idea of δικαιοσύνη, Gen. xv. 1, מִשְׁכָּר הָאֱלֹהִים אֲנִי יְהוָה לְךָ אֲנִי מְבַרְכְּךָ לְכָל מַעֲשֶׂיךָ, LXX. ἐγὼ ὑπερασπίζω σου, ὁ μισθός σου πολὺς ἔσται σφόδρα; cf. ver. 6. In like manner the saving revelation of God's righteousness in the Messianic time will bring a reward to them who in faith and suffering have waited for it, Isa. xl. 10, ἰδοὺ κύριος μετὰ ἰσχύος ἔρχεται καὶ ὁ βραχίον αὐτοῦ μετὰ κυρίας· ἰδοὺ ὁ μισθὸς αὐτοῦ μετ' αὐτοῦ; lxii. 11, ἰδοὺ σοι ὁ σωτὴρ παραγίνεται.

ἔχων τὸν ἑαυτοῦ μισθὸν μετ' αὐτοῦ. Compare Jer. xxxi. 16, *διαλειπέτω ἡ φωνή σου ἀπὸ κλαυθμοῦ καὶ οἱ ὀφθαλμοί σου ἀπὸ δακρύνων, ὅτι ἔστιν μισθὸς τοῖς σοῖς ἔργοις*. The view here presented (cf. also Ruth ii. 12; Prov. xi. 21, *ὁ σπείρων δικαιοσύνην λήψεται μισθὸν πιστόν*) is in exact keeping with the idea of God's redeeming righteousness, which works for righteousness, and therefore shows itself gracious; see *δίκαιος, δικαιοσύνη*. The same view underlies 1 John i. 9, 2 Tim. iv. 8, save that there is traceable a somewhat different adjustment of the idea of righteousness with that of grace. God's grace is the exhibition of His righteousness, and the exhibition of His righteousness is grace. Grace does not exclude recompense; on the contrary, it includes it (cf. Ecclus. ii. 8 with ver. 11, see below). It is utterly misleading to make a distinction between the grace which is vouchsafed to the sinner and the reward bestowed upon the pardoned. What God promises and what He vouchsafes is all grace, and is all likewise righteousness, according to the point of view specially dwelt upon. In this way the term *μισθός* is applied to the recompense which in the divine judgment is to be bestowed on His servants in Rev. xi. 18, *ἦλθεν ὁ καιρὸς . . . δοῦναι τὸν μισθὸν τοῖς δοῦλοις σου τοῖς προφήταις καὶ τοῖς ἁγίοις καὶ τοῖς φοβουμένοις τὸ ὄνομά σου*; Rev. xxii. 12, *ἰδοὺ ἔρχομαι ταχὺ καὶ ὁ μισθός μου μετ' ἐμοῦ ἀποδοῦναι ἐκάστῳ ὡς τὸ ἔργον ἔστιν αὐτοῦ*. See *μισθαποδότης* and *μισθαποδοσία* in the Epistle to the Hebrews. Hence *μισθός* in the discourses of Jesus, Matt. v. 12, *ὁ μισθὸς ὑμῶν πολὺς ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς*; v. 46, vi. 1, *μισθὸν οὐκ ἔχετε παρὰ τῷ πατρὶ ὑμῶν τῷ ἐν οὐρανοῖς*; vers. 2, 5, 16; x. 41, *μισθὸν προφήτου, δικαίου, λήψεται*; ver. 42, *οὐ μὴ ἀπολέσῃ τὸν μισθὸν αὐτοῦ*; Mark ix. 41; Luke vi. 23, 35. Connected with this representation is also John iv. 36, *ἦδη ὁ θερίζων μισθὸν λαμβάνει καὶ συνάγει καρπὸν εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον κ.τ.λ.*, and equally even 1 Cor. iii. 8, *ἕκαστος τὸν ἴδιον μισθὸν λήψεται κατὰ τὸν ἴδιον κόπον*; ver. 14, *εἴ τις τινος τὸ ἔργον μένει ὁ ἐποικοδόμησεν, μισθὸν λήψεται*; ix. 17, *εἰ γὰρ ἐκὼν τοῦτο πράσσω, μισθὸν ἔχω*; ver. 18; 2 John 8; cf. Matt. xix. 27 sqq.—In the O. T. Apocrypha, compare Wisd. ii. 22, *οὐκ ἔγνωσαν μυστήρια θεοῦ οὐδὲ μισθὸν ἠλπισαν ὁσιότητος*; v. 15, *δίκαιοι εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ζῶσι καὶ ἐν κυρίῳ ὁ μισθὸς αὐτῶν*; compare ver. 16, x. 17, *ἀπέδωκεν ὁσίοις μισθὸν κόπων αὐτῶν*; Ecclus. ii. 8, *οἱ φοβούμενοι τὸν κύριον πιστεύσατε αὐτῷ, καὶ οὐ μὴ πταίσῃ ὁ μισθὸς ὑμῶν*; cf. vv. 9–11, *διότι οἰκτίρμων καὶ ἐλεήμων ὁ κύριος καὶ ἀφίησιν ἁμαρτίας καὶ σώζει ἐν καιρῷ θλίψεως*, xi. 15, 16, 20, xxxvi. 21, *δὸς μισθὸν τοῖς ὑπομένουσί σε*; li. 30.

The Dissertations of B. Weiss, "Die Lehre Christi vom Lohne" (in the *Zeitschr. für christl. Wissenschaft*, 1853, No. 40 sqq.), Mehlhorn, "Der Lohnbegriff Jesu" (*Jahrb. für Protest. Theol.* 1876, p. 721 sqq.), Neumeister, *Die N. T. Lehre vom Lohn*, Halle 1880, altogether mistake the O. T. basis of the conception, and therefore arrive at no satisfactory result. Also in Menken, "Christl. Homilien" (*Schriften*, iv. pp. 138–160, on Heb. xi. 26), the delineation of the O. T. conception is imperfect and lacks clearness. Materials for a right apprehension occur in Collenbusch, *Erkl. bibl. Wahrheiten*, Elberfeld 1813, i. p. 154; Erlangen 1820, pp. 18, 21.—Achelis, on Matt. v. 11, 12, quotes also J. F. Frisch,

Schriftgemässe Abhandl. von Belohnungen in ewigen Hütten, Leipzig 1749. Flacius, *Clavis scr.* s.v. *merces*, does not make good the criticism which he gives s.v. *justitia*.

(c) The reverse of this *recompense* is **punishment**, for which *μισθός* is in the classics only used euphemistically; cf. Plato, *Legg.* i. 650 A, *μισθὸς ζημιώδης*, of the dangerous results of thoughtless conduct; Eurip. *Hippol.* 1050, *μισθὸς γὰρ οὗτός ἐστιν ἀνδρὶ δυσσεβείῃ*; 2 Macc. viii. 33, *τὸν ἄξιον τῆς δυσσεβείας ἐκομίσατο μισθόν*. So in the N. T. 2 Pet. ii. 13; see above.

From *μισθός* we have in the N. T. *μισθιος*, *hired servant*; *μισθοῦσθαι*, *to hire*; *μισθωμα*, *a hired dwelling*; *μισθωτός*, *a labourer hired upon wages*, and the two following compounds.

Μισθαποδότης, *ου, ό*, only in Heb. xi. 6, and in patristic Greek, of God; in profane Greek *μισθοδότης*, with this difference, that the latter denotes him who pays wages, whereas *μισθαποδότης* is chosen for the sake of the idea of divine recompense, to which *ἀποδιδόναι* as the usual expression corresponds better than the simple *δίδοναι*; cf. Matt. vi. 4, 6, 18, xii. 27; Rom. ii. 6, xii. 17; 1 Thess. v. 15; 2 Tim. iv. 14; 1 Pet. iii. 9; Rev. xviii. 6, xxii. 12; see *μισθός* (b); Heb. xi. 6, *πιστεῦσαι δεῖ τὸν προσερχόμενον θεῷ, ὅτι ἔστιν, καὶ τοῖς ἐκζητοῦσιν αὐτὸν μισθαποδότης γίνεται*.

Μισθαποδοσία, *ή*, occurs like the preceding only in biblical and patristic Greek, in lieu of the classical *μισθοδοσία*, with the same difference and for the same reason. Of divine recompense or reward, see *μισθός* (b). (a) Of *saving recompense*, Heb. x. 35, *μὴ ἀποβάλλετε οὖν τὴν παρρησίαν ὑμῶν ἣτις ἔχει μεγάλην μισθαποδοσίαν*; xi. 26, *ἀπέβλεπεν (Μωυσῆς) εἰς τὴν μισθ.* (b) Of *punitive recompense*, Heb. ii. 2, *πᾶσα παράβασις καὶ παρακοή ἔλαβεν ἔνδικον μισθαποδοσίαν*.

Σπέρμα, *τος, τό*, **seed for sowing**, and **seed springing**, both what is sown, as containing the germ of new fruit, and the seed which is growing out of the seed sown. In the first sense figuratively in Josephus, *Ant.* ii. 5. 3, *παρεκάλει δὲ τὸν θεὸν σπέρμα τι καὶ λείψανον ἐκ τῆς τότε συμφορᾶς αὐτῶν καὶ αἰχμαλωσίας περισώσαντα καὶ πάλιν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα καὶ τὴν οἰκίαν γῆν ἀποκαταστήσαντα*; *ibid.* xii. 7. 3, *τὰ αἰσχιστα παθεῖν καὶ μηδὲ σπέρμα τοῦ γένους ὑμῶν ὑπολειφθῆναι*; Plato, *Tim.* 23 B, *περιλειφθέντος ποτὲ σπέρματος βραχέος*. So in the LXX. = *רִצְוָה*, Deut. iii. 3, *ἐπατάξαμεν αὐτὸν ἕως τοῦ μὴ καταλιπεῖν αὐτοῦ σπέρμα*; Isa. i. 9, *εἰ μὴ κύριος σαβαὼθ ἐγκατέλιπεν ἡμῖν σπέρμα*, and this again quoted in Rom. ix. 27. So also Isa. xiv. 22, *ἀπολῶ αὐτῶν ὄνομα καὶ κατάλειμμα καὶ σπέρμα*, *וְנִכְרְתוּ וְנִכְרְתוּ וְנִכְרְתוּ*; Isa. xv. 9, *ἀρῶ τὸ σπέρμα Μωᾶβ καὶ τὸ κατὰλοιπον Ἀδαμά*, *וְאֶת מוֹצֵי חַיִּל*. Also Isa. vi. 13, *σπέρμα ἅγιον τὸ στήλωμα αὐτῆς*, may be included here. Thus originally used of the germs of plants *σπέρμα* is figuratively used of living beings, and the usage of the word must be arranged accordingly; Hebrew, *רִצְוָה*—(I.) Of plants, (a) **seed**; in the N. T. Matt. xiii. 24, 27, 32, 37, 38; 2 Cor. ix. 10. The plural, Mark iv. 31; 1 Cor. xv. 38, as in profane Greek of many

species of seed, all sorts of grain, Lev. xxvi. 16; Dan. i. 12; differently in Isa. lxi. 11. (b) Seed sown and growing, produce; 1 Sam. viii. 15, καὶ τὰ σπέρματα ὑμῶν καὶ τοὺς ἀμπελῶνας ὑμῶν ἀποδεκατώσει, Hebrew עֲרֵבְיָה, the only place where ער occurs in the plural, Alex. τὸ σπέρμα ὑμῶν.—(II.) Figuratively used of living beings, (a) of the seed of man; thus in Xen., Plato, Aristotle, Plutarch, etc.; see Lexica. In biblical Greek compare Lev. xv. 16, 17, 18, and often. Not in the N. T.; for Heb. xi. 11 see καταβολή; 1 John iii. 9, πᾶς ὁ γεγεννημένος ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἁμαρτίαν οὐ ποιεῖ, ὅτι σπέρμα αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ μένει, is akin to this, and σπέρμα θεοῦ denotes God's power working the divine life in believers, who thence derive the divine nature, therefore denotes the Holy Spirit working in them; cf. John i. 13. See Huther, *in loc.* (b) Of posterity or descendants. This use of the word answering to ער occupies the widest place in biblical Greek; it is indeed similar to the poetic use of σπέρμα in the classics, but it must not be confounded with this. The Scripture use of σπέρμα in this way was, as will be seen, quite uninfluenced by classical usage, and is closely allied with the use of the Hebrew ער, bearing which in mind the apparent difficulties of Gal. iii. 16 disappear. In the classics σπέρμα is used of descendants only poetically, in Pindar and the Tragedians, whence all the examples given by Georgi, *Vindiciæ N. T. ab hebraïsmis*, p. 87 sqq., are taken. Thuc. v. 16. 5 is taken from the utterance of an oracle, and in the only place in prose, Plato, *De legg.* ix. 853 C, ἄνθρωποι τε καὶ ἀνθρώπων σπέρμασι νομοθετοῦμεν, the expression is designedly chosen as figurative, borrowed from the seeds of plants for the sake of the comparison immediately following. As a poetic expression σπέρμα in this sense so far lacks its appropriate range, that in Soph. *Oed. Rex.* 1077, τοῦμόν δ' ἐγώ, κεί σμικρόν ἐστι, σπερμ' ἰδεῖν βουλήσομαι, it denotes the father, akin therefore to its use under II. (a), cf. Soph. *Oed. Col.* 214, τίνος εἰ σπέρματος ξεῖνε πατρόθεν; whereas σπέρμα, when used of descendants, allies itself to the signification seed growing, produce, I. (b). Further, the classical σπέρμα does not strictly signify descendants collectively, still less posterity as a whole, but primarily and in the main only the individual, the child, the offspring, son or daughter; so in Aesch. *Choeph.* 496, σπέρμα Πελοπιδῶν; Sept. 456, Μεγαρεὺς Κρέοντος σπέρμα; *Prom.* 705, Ἰνάχειον σπ., the daughter of Inachus; more rarely, on the contrary, collectively = the children as a whole, the brothers and sisters (never really posterity), e.g. Soph. *Trach.* 1147, κάλει τὸ πᾶν μοι σπέρμα σὼν ὁμαιμόνων; Eurip. *Med.* 669, παίδων ἐρευνῶν σπερμ' ὅπως γένοιτό μοι. Oftener in Aeschylus. But that this collective signification is also a purely poetic use of the word, and has no basis whatever in linguistic usage anywhere confirmed, is clear from the fact that instead of this collective singular the plural sometimes occurs, Soph. *Oed. Col.* 600, γῆς ἐμῆς ἀπηλάθην πρὸς τῶν ἐμαντοῦ σπερμάτων; 1275, ὦ σπέρματ' ἀνδρὸς τοῦδ', ἐμαὶ δ' ὁμαίμονες.

In Holy Scripture, on the contrary, σπέρμα, answering to the Hebrew ער, is primarily a collective conception, indeed we may say *only* a collective, for in the few places where it is used of an individual, such as Gen. iv. 25, 1 Sam. i. 11, this individual is and

includes in himself or represents the progeny; cf. 1 Sam. ii. 20, ἀνταποδῶ σοι κύριος σπέρμα ἐκ τῆς γυναικὸς ταύτης, with i. 11, δὲ τῇ δούλῃ σου σπέρμα ἀνδρός = יְשׁוּנָא יְרֵי, *proles mascula*. With Gen. iv. 25, ἐξανέστησέ μοι ὁ θεὸς σπ. ἕτερον ἀντὶ Ἀβελ ὃν ἀπέκτεινε Καὶν, compare ver. 26, iii. 15. Besides these two passages it occurs of a single person only in Gen. xxi. 13, also 2 Sam. vii. 12; 1 Chron. xvii. 11 in the promise made to David, in the last-mentioned place, הַקִּימוֹתַי אֶת־יִרְעָךָ אֶת־רִיבְךָ אֲשֶׁר יְהוָה מִבְּנֵי. As Isa. lix. 21, יְרֵעַ יְרֵעַ מִפִּי יְרֵעַ יְרֵעַ, shows, יְרֵעַ signifies primarily *the immediate descendants, the children*, Gen. xxi. 13, xv. 3, and hence σπέρμα is once = יֵשׁ, Deut. xxv. 5; yet prevaillingly it denotes the descendants collectively traced back to one ancestor, hence Gen. xiii. 16, ποιήσω τὸ σπέρμα σου ὡς τὴν ἄμμον τῆς γῆς; xv. 13, 18, xxii. 17, πληθύνων πληθυνῶ τὸ σπέρμα σου; xxviii. 14, xxxii. 12, *et al.* Hence it passes into the meaning *family, stock*, e.g. הַמִּלְכָּה יְרֵעַ הַמִּלְכָּה יְרֵעַ, *stirps regia*, 2 Kings xi. 1, xxv. 25, Jer. xli. 1, and of Israel collectively, Ezra ix. 2, παρήχθη σπέρμα τὸ ἁγίου ἐν λαοῖς τῶν γαιῶν, unless this passage be classed under II. (a). Nay more, in expressions such as σπ. τῶν δούλων σου, Ps. lxix. 37; Prov. xi. 18, σπ. δικαίων; Isa. lxv. 23, σπ. εὐλογημένον, הָיָה בְּרִיבִי יְרֵעַ; Isa. i. 4, יְרֵעַ מִרְעִים, σπ. πονηρόν; Isa. lvii. 4, יְרֵעַ שָׁרָר, σπ. ἄνομον; Ps. xxxvii. 28, יְרֵעַ מִרְעִים, like γέννημα elsewhere, it signifies an *ethico-spiritual fellowship* without reference to relationship of race. Cf. Gesenius, *Thes. s.v.* Specially is יְרֵי, σπέρμα, used of the people of Israel as the descendants of Abraham or of Jacob Israel, with whom Ishmael or Esau and their descendants were not reckoned; cf. Gen. xxi. 12, ἐν Ἰσαὰκ κληθήσεται σοι σπέρμα, with ver. 13, καὶ τὸν υἱὸν τῆς παιδείας εἰς ἔθνος μέγα ποιήσω αὐτόν, ὅτι σπέρμα σὸν ἐστίν; Gen. xxviii. 4, 13, 14; Ps. cv. 6; Isa. xli. 8; Jer. xxxiii. 25; 2 Kings xvii. 20; Isa. xlv. 25; Jer. xxxi. 36, 37; Neh. ix. 2. Besides these, we find it employed of individual families, such as the family of Aaron, of David, and others.

With the few above-named exceptions, יְרֵי, and therefore σπέρμα, is everywhere a collective concept, for which the plural is never used; and this continues in the O. T. Apocrypha, Wisd. iii. 16, x. 15, xii. 11; Eccclus. i. 13, x. 19, xli. 6, xlv. 11, 12, 13, 21, xlv. 15, 21 sqq., xlvii. 9, xlvii. 20 sqq.; Tobit i. 1, 9, iv. 12; Prayer of Azarias 12; 1 Macc. v. 62, vii. 14; 2 Macc. vii. 17; 3 Macc. vi. 3. Only in Susannah 56 is an individual addressed, σπέρμα χαναὰν καὶ οὐκ Ἰούδα, τὸ κάλλος ἐξηπάτησέ σε, just as in German we chide a person with the abstract "Brut."

Σπέρμα continues a collective in the N. T., compare Rev. xii. 17, μετὰ τῶν λοιπῶν τοῦ σπέρματος αὐτῆς, *sc. τῆς γυναικός*. Thus it denotes *the immediate descendants, children*, Matt. xxii. 24, 25; Mark xii. 19–22; Luke xx. 28. The expression ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυὶδ, John vii. 42, Rom. i. 3, 2 Tim. ii. 8, might be classed under II. (a), but the meaning here also is probably *progeny, posterity*; cf. Ps. lxxxix. 5, ὥμοσα Δαυὶδ τῷ δούλῳ μου ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐτοιμάσω τὸ σπέρμα σου, καὶ οἰκοδομήσω εἰς γενεὰν καὶ γενεὰν τὸν θρόνον σου, a passage which has reference to 2 Sam. vii. 12. Cf. Acts xiii. 23, τοῦτου (*sc. Δαυὶδ*) ὁ θεὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ σπέρματος κατ' ἐπαγγελίαν ἤγαγεν τῷ

Ἰσραὴλ σωτήρα Ἰησοῦν. In all the remaining passages σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ, Luke i. 55 ; John viii. 33, 37 ; Acts iii. 25, vii. 5, 6 ; Rom. iv. 13, 16, 18, ix. 7, 8, xi. 1 ; 2 Cor. xi. 22 ; Gal. iii. 29 ; Heb. ii. 16, xi. 18. With such a steady and continuous usage as this, particularly in Paul's writings, it is not easily conceivable that in Gal. iii. 16, τῷ δὲ Ἀβραάμ ἐρρέθησαν αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι καὶ τὸ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ. οὐ λέγει καὶ τοῖς σπέρμασιν, ὡς ἐπὶ πολλῶν, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐφ' ἑνός· καὶ τῷ σπερματί σου, ὅς ἐστι Χριστός, the apostle, with whom the singular is always collective, distinguishes the singular and plural as *descendant* and *descendants*, or progeny, while in ver. 29, εἰ δὲ ὑμεῖς Χριστοῦ, ἄρα τοῦ Ἀβραάμ σπέρμα ἐστέ, κατ' ἐπαγγελίαν κληρονόμοι (to which ver. 19 points, ἄχρισ οὐ ἔλθῃ τὸ σπέρμα φ' ἐπήγγελται), σπέρμα is undoubtedly collective. The ὅς ἐστι Χριστός, ver. 16, need not perplex us, for Christ, *i.e.* the Messiah, is, like Isaac, the progeny or offspring of Abraham, including and exhibiting in himself that progeny ; cf. Rom. ix. 7, οὐδ' ὅτι εἰσὶν σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ, πάντες τέκνα, ἀλλ' ἐν Ἰσαὰκ κληθήσεται σοι σπέρμα. Moreover, the ὅς ἐστι Χριστός does not express the inference which the apostle draws from the singular σπέρμα ; this inference is contained in vv. 17-29, and is completed in vv. 28, 29, the conclusion to which the apostle hastens, ἅπαντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς εἰς ἐστέ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. εἰ δὲ ὑμεῖς Χριστοῦ, ἄρα τοῦ Ἀβραάμ σπέρμα ἐστέ κατ' ἐπαγγελίαν κληρονόμοι. The ὅς ἐστι Χριστός is not the explanation of the singular σπέρμα, as if it ran τὸ δὲ σπ. ἐστι Χριστός, but is a reminder of what the readers knew, that the seed or progeny of Abraham is represented in the Messiah, and that from this the question is to be answered, who are numbered among the heirs of the promise. There are, indeed, σπέρματα Ἀβραάμ, *lines of descent*, those, namely, of Ishmael or Esau, besides Isaac or Israel ; yet the promise does not apply to all the lines of descent, but to the one line which alone is always meant by the σπέρμα Ἀβ., which we behold in the Messiah, and which henceforward is brought into existence through Christ. Σπέρματα, or *lines of descent*, there would still be, if the intervening law were maintained, either as an addition to the promise or a limitation of it ; but the covenant-promise suffers no one to remain as he is, but obliges each to enter upon a relationship with Christ, wherein everything else, all separation or division, comes to an end ; hence the reference to the effect of baptism, ver. 27. To take σπέρματα as a collective term, and σπέρμα of an individual person, is not only foreign to Pauline phraseology, but would not in the least be in keeping with the poetic usage above indicated, about which, moreover, the readers of the Galatian Epistle knew nothing. With them, in the application of it in this passage, σπέρμα could have been known only by the usage of Biblical Greek. How little this usage had to do with that poetic σπέρμα appears finally, if we consider what the interpretation arrived at for Gal. iii. 16 establishes. The Jewish authors who write in Greek avoid using σπέρμα for posterity collectively, and use instead—and even this in a very few places—the plural σπέρματα. Thus the author of the Fourth Book of Maccabees, which goes under the name of Josephus, *De rationis imperio*, xviii. 1, ὧ τῶν Ἀβραμαίων σπερμάτων ἀπόγονοι παῖδες Ἰσραηλῖται. Again Josephus, *Ant.* viii. 7. 6, παῖς οὗτος ἦν, Ἰδουμαῖος γένες, ἐκ

βασιλικῶν σπερμάτων (cf. τὸ σπέρμα τῆς βασιλείας, 2 Kings xi. 1; 2 Chron. xxii. 10; ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματος τῶν βασιλέων, 2 Kings xxiv. 45); and finally, Phocyl. 18, σπέρματα μὴ κλέπτειν, a mistaken paraphrase of Lev. xviii. 21, ἀπὸ τοῦ σπέρματός σου οὐ δώσεις λατρεύειν κ.τ.λ. These are the only places where the expression occurs in Hellenistic authors, whereas the use of σπέρμα might easily have recurred at least to Josephus. Manifestly the O. T. σπέρμα sounded strange to a Greek ear, and the Hellenists used the plural seemingly through the precedent of σπέρματα in the tragedians, at least as regards the elevated diction of 4 Macc. xviii. 1, and probably for the poem of Phocylides; and thus, as a prose example, only Josephus, *Ant.* viii. 7. 6, remains. Possibly this σπέρματα is in imitation of the plural מִי־בְנֵי, which occurs sometimes in post-biblical Hebrew, Mishna Sanhedrin iv. 5, Onkelos on Gen. iv. 10, a plural supposed to denote the later descendants, while the singular בְּנֵי signified the immediate offspring, the children; cf. Geiger, *Zeitschr. des deutsch-morgenländ. Gesellschaft*, xii. (1858) pp. 307 sqq. This use of the plural would only explain the plural in Josephus, not in the other two places, least of all in Phocylides. But this observation is of no use as regards Gal. iii. 16, because first, this distinction between the singular and the plural occurs very rarely in post-biblical Hebrew, and even here the singular is usual; and secondly, this kind of distinction between בְּנֵי as denoting the immediate offspring, and מִי־בְנֵי of the later descendants, does not in the least correspond to the distinction upon which Paul insists between εἰς and πολλοί, for the singular is—and remains even in the passages cited by Geiger, what he himself only fails to perceive—a collective term. It remains for us, therefore, in Gal. iii. 16, simply to distinguish between one line of progeny and more than one, σπέρμα, *seed*, collectively σπέρματα, *seeds, lines of descendants*, and to bear in mind Gen. xxi. 12, 13, with which Gal. iii. 28, οὐκ ἔνι Ἰουδαῖος οὐδὲ Ἕλλην, very well agrees; and that Paul has in mind the several lines of descendants from Abraham is evident from Gal. iv. 22, so that there cannot in the remotest be ground for the suspicion of *rabbini*zing on Paul's part. Finally, by the explanation here given, the difficulty of having to take Χριστός in ver. 16 collectively (for which 1 Cor. xii. 12 is appealed to) does not arise.—Compare Wieseler, Hofmann, Meyer, and others, *in loc.*, likewise Tholuck, *Das A. T. im N. T.*, 6th ed. p. 61 sqq. Surenhusius, *βίβλος καταλλαγῆς*, p. 573 sqq. The usage of σπέρμα has been nowhere thoroughly examined.

INDEX.

I.

WORDS ALPHABETICALLY ARRANGED.

A		PAGE		PAGE	
	PAGE				
α,	1	ἄγνωστος,	157	αἶτημα,	73
ἄβυσσος,	2	ἄγορά,	59	αἰών,	74, 620
ἀγαθοεργέω,	8	ἀγοράζω,	60	αἰώνιος,	79
ἀγαθοποιέω,	8	ἀγορεύω,	603	ἀκαθαρσία,	320
ἀγαθοποιία,	8	ἄγω,	61	ἀκαθάρτης,	321
ἀγαθοποιός,	8	ἀγωγή,	61	ἀκάθαρτος,	320
ἀγαθός,	3	ἀγών,	607	ἀκαίρως,	740
ἀγαθωσύνη,	7	ἀγωνία,	608	ἄκακος,	327
ἀγαλλιόμαι,	590	ἀγωνίζομαι,	609	ἀκατάγνωστος,	676
ἀγαλλίασις,	592	ἀδελφός,	66	ἀκαταστασία,	739
ἀγαπάω,	9, 592	ἀδελφότης,	67	ἀκατάστατος,	739
ἀγάπη,	13, 593	ἄδης,	67, 610	ἀκοή,	82, 623
ἀγαπητός,	17	ἀδιάκριτος,	376	ἀκολουθέω,	80
ἀγγελία,	18	ἀδικέω,	201	ἀκούω,	82
ἀγγέλλω,	18	ἀδίκημα,	696	ἀκροβυστία,	625
ἄγγελος,	18, 594	ἀδικία,	201	ἄκων,	247
ἀγενεαλόγητος,	152	ἄδικος,	200	ἀλήθεια,	86, 627-631
ἀγιάζω,	53, 602	ἀδόκιμος,	212, 698	ἀληθεύω,	89, 631
ἀγιασμός,	55, 602	ἄζυμος,	724	ἀληθής,	84, 631
ἅγιος,	34, 594-601	ἀθανασία,	285	ἀληθινός,	85
ἀγιότης,	52, 601	ἄθεος,	281	ἀλλάσσω,	89
ἀγιωσύνη,	52	ἄτιδος,	611	ἀλληγορέω,	96
ἀγνεία,	58	αἰδώς,	611	ἀλλογενής,	150
ἀγνίζω,	59	αἷμα,	69, 612	ἄλλος,	89
ἀγνισμός,	59	αἵματεκχυσία,	71	ἄλλοτριεπίσκοπος,	528
ἀγνοέω,	162	αἵρεσις,	614	ἄλλότριος,	94
ἀγνόημα,	163	αἰρέω,	613	ἄλλοτριόν,	95
ἄγνοια,	163	αἰρετίζω,	615	ἁμαρτάνω,	98, 633
ἀγνός,	57	αἰρετικός,	614	ἁμάρτημα,	100
ἀγνότης,	58	αἶρω,	617	ἁμαρτία,	100
ἀγνώως,	58	αἰσθάνομαι,	619	ἁμαρτωλός,	102, 634
ἀγνωσία,	158	αἰσθησις,	620	ἁμίαντος,	784
		αἰσθητήριον,	620	ἁμός,	102, 635
		αἰτέω,	71	ἁμωμος,	425, 788

	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
ἀναγγέλλω, . . .	24	ἀνταναπληρώω, . . .	839	ἀποκαραδοκία, . . .	177
ἀναγεννάω, . . .	147	ἀνταποκρίνομαι, . . .	375	ἀποκαταλλάσσω, . . .	93
ἀναγινώσκω, . . .	158	ἀντίδικος, . . .	696	ἀποκατάστασις, . . .	312
ἀναγνωρίζω, . . .	679	ἀντίκειμαι, . . .	746	ἀποκόπτω, . . .	751
ἀνάγνωσις, . . .	158	ἀντιλαμβάνω, . . .	386	ἀπόκριμα, . . .	375
ἀναδέχομαι, . . .	685	ἀντίληψις, . . .	386	ἀποκρίνω, . . .	374
ἀναζάω, . . .	722	ἀντίλυτρον, . . .	409	ἀπόκρισις, . . .	375
ἀνάθεμα, . . .	547	ἀντίτυπος, . . .	557	ἀπόλλυμι, . . .	451
ἀναθεματίζω, . . .	887	ἀντίχριστος, . . .	581	ἀπολλύνων, . . .	453
ἀναίδεια, . . .	612	ἀνυπόκριτος, . . .	380	ἀπολούω, . . .	406
ἀνακαινίζω, . . .	323	ἄνω, . . .	106	ἀπολύτρωσις, . . .	410
ἀνακαινίζω, . . .	323	ἄνωθεν, . . .	106, 638	ἀποστασία, . . .	308
ἀνακαινώσις, . . .	324	ἀπαγγέλλω, . . .	25	ἀποστέλλω, . . .	529
ἀνακεφαλαιόω, . . .	354, 748	ἀπαίδευτος, . . .	815	ἀποστολή, . . .	530
ἀναλογία, . . .	397	ἀπαιτέω, . . .	73	ἀποστολος, . . .	530
ἀναμάρτητος, . . .	102, 634	ἀπαλλάσσω, . . .	90, 632	ἀποστρέφω, . . .	880
ἀνανεόω, . . .	428	ἀπαλλοτριόω, . . .	95, 633	ἀποσυνάγωγος, . . .	64, 607
ἀνάπαυσις, . . .	827	ἀπαράβατος, . . .	653	ἀποψύχω, . . .	905
ἀναπαύω, . . .	826	ἀπαρνέομαι, . . .	111	ἀπώλεια, . . .	453, 797
ἀναπληρώω, . . .	838	ἀπαρχή, . . .	117	ἄρά, . . .	108, 639
ἀνάστασις, . . .	307	ἀπαύγασμα, . . .	118	ἀργέω, . . .	260
ἀναστατώω, . . .	738	ἀπειθεια, . . .	476	ἀργός, . . .	259
ἀνασταυρώω, . . .	877	ἀπειθέω, . . .	475	ἀρεσκεία, . . .	642
ἀνατίθηναι, . . .	546	ἀπειθής, . . .	475	ἀρέσκω, . . .	640
ἀναψύχω, . . .	588	ἀπείραστος, . . .	497	ἀρεστός, . . .	641
ἀναψύξις, . . .	588	ἀπεκδέχομαι, . . .	175	ἀρετή, . . .	109, 644
ἀνέγκλητος, . . .	742	ἀπελεύθερος, . . .	252	ἀρνέομαι, . . .	110
ἀνελήμων, . . .	712	ἀπελπίζω, . . .	712	ἀρνίον, . . .	112
ἀνέλεος, . . .	249	ἀπερίτμητος, . . .	885	ἀρπαγή, . . .	648
ἀνεξίκακος, . . .	330	ἀπιστέω, . . .	492	ἀρπαγμός, . . .	649
ἀνθομολογέομαι, . . .	771	ἀπιστία, . . .	492	ἀρπάζω, . . .	648
ἀνθρωπάρεσκος, . . .	642	ἄπιστος, . . .	491	ἄρραβών, . . .	113
ἀνθρώπινος, . . .	106, 635	ἀπλότης, . . .	108	ἄρρητος, . . .	714
ἀνθρωποκτόνος, . . .	636	ἀπλοῦς, . . .	107, 639	ἀρτυγέννητος, . . .	666
ἄνθρωπος, . . .	103, 635	ἀπογίνομαι, . . .	149, 668	ἄρτιος, . . .	651
ἀνίστημι, . . .	306, 738	ἀπόδεκτος, . . .	176, 686	ἀρχάγγελος, . . .	24
ἀνόητος, . . .	438, 790	ἀποδέχομαι, . . .	686	ἀρχαῖος, . . .	116
ἄνοια, . . .	790	ἀποδιορίζω, . . .	806	ἄρχειν, . . .	113
ἀνομία, . . .	434	ἀποδοκιμάζω, . . .	701	ἀρχή, . . .	113
ἄνομος, . . .	433	ἀποδοχή, . . .	686	ἀρχηγός, . . .	117
ἀνορθόω, . . .	807	ἀποθνήσκω, . . .	286	ἀρχιερεύς, . . .	294
ἀνόσιος, . . .	464	ἀποκαθίστημι, . . .	312	ἀρχιποίμην, . . .	842
ἀνταγωνίζομαι, . . .	609	ἀποκαλύπτω, . . .	342	ἄρχω, . . .	653
ἀντάλλαγμα, . . .	90	ἀποκάλυψις, . . .	343	ἀσέβεια, . . .	523

[illegible]

	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
λυτρώω, . . .	408	μονογενής, . . .	150	όλόκληρος, . . .	359
λύτρωσις, . . .	409	μορφή, . . .	422, 785	όμοιος, . . .	798
λυτρωτής, . . .	409	μορφώω, . . .	423	όμοιότης, . . .	800
λύω, . . .	406, 776	μόρφωσις, . . .	423	όμοίωμα, . . .	802
Μ		μῦθος, . . .	786	όμοίως, . . .	800
μαθητεύω, . . .	412	μυστήριον, . . .	424, 787	όμοιώσις, . . .	801
μαθητής, . . .	411	μῶμος, . . .	425	όμολογέω, . . .	402, 771
μαθήτρια, . . .	412	N		όμολογία, . . .	402
μακάριος, . . .	776	νεκρός, . . .	426	όμολογουμένως, . . .	402
μακαρίζω, . . .	778	νεκρώω, . . .	788	όνομα, . . .	453
μακαρισμός, . . .	778	νέκρωσις, . . .	427	όργη, . . .	460
μακροθυμέω, . . .	289	νέος, . . .	428	όρθος, . . .	807
μακροθυμία, . . .	289	νεόφυτος, . . .	571	όρθοτομέω, . . .	885
μακρόθυμος, . . .	288	νεώω, . . .	428	όρίζω, . . .	461
μαμωνᾶς, . . .	778	νοέω, . . .	437	όσιος, . . .	462
μανθάνω, . . .	410	νόημα, . . .	438	όσιότης, . . .	464
μαρτυρέω, . . .	416, 779	νομικός, . . .	788	ούράνιος, . . .	467
μαρτυρία, . . .	414	νομίμως, . . .	789	ούρανός, . . .	464
μαρτύριον, . . .	414	νομοδιάσκαλος, . . .	790	όφειλέτης, . . .	469, 810
μαρτύρομαι, . . .	415	νόμος, . . .	428	όφειλή, . . .	810
μάρτυς, . . .	412	νουθεσία, . . .	442	όφείλημα, . . .	468
ματαιολογία, . . .	781	νουθετέω, . . .	441	όφελω, . . .	468, 809
ματαιολόγος, . . .	419	νοῦς, . . .	435	όφθαλμοδουλεία, . . .	703
μάταιος, . . .	418, 781	O		Π	
ματαιότης, . . .	419	όδός, . . .	442	πάθημα, . . .	819
ματαιώω, . . .	419	οἶδα, . . .	229	παθητός, . . .	819
μάτην, . . .	417	οἰκείος, . . .	446	πάθος, . . .	820
μεθοδεΐα, . . .	444	οἰκέω, . . .	446	παιδαγωγός, . . .	815
μένω, . . .	419	οἰκοδομέω, . . .	448	παιδεία, . . .	814
μεσιτεύω, . . .	422	οἰκοδομή, . . .	449	παιδευτής, . . .	815
μεσίτης, . . .	421	οἰκοδόμος, . . .	448	παιδεύω, . . .	812
μέσος, . . .	420	οἰκονομία, . . .	450	παῖς, . . .	810
μεταλλάσσω, . . .	91	οἰκονόμος, . . .	449	πάλαι, . . .	816
μεταμορφώω, . . .	423	οἶκος, . . .	445	παλαιός, . . .	816
μετανοέω, . . .	440, 792	οἰκτείρω, . . .	796	παλαιότης, . . .	817
μετάνοια, . . .	441, 792	οἰκτιρμός, . . .	797	παλαιόω, . . .	817
μετριοπαθέω, . . .	821	οἰκτίρμων, . . .	797	παλιγγενεσία, . . .	150, 669
μιαίνω, . . .	782	όλιγόπιστος, . . .	492	πανήγυρις, . . .	604
μίσμα, . . .	783	όλιγόψυχος, . . .	905	παραβαίνω, . . .	119
μιασμός, . . .	783	όλλυμι, . . .	451	παραβάλλω, . . .	123, 657
μολύνω, . . .	784			παράβασις, . . .	120
μολυσμός, . . .	785			παραβάτης, . . .	120

II.

SYNONYMS COMPARED.

	PAGE		PAGE
ἄβυσσος — ἄδης,	2	ἁμαρτάνω, see ἄσεβέω.	
ἀγαθός — δίκαιος, καλός,	3, 183	ἁμαρτία, see παράβασις, παράπτωμα, ἁνομία.	
ἀγαπάω — ἐράω, φιλέω (see also εὐδοκέω),	10	ἁμαρτωλός, see ἄσεβής.	
ἀγάπη — φιλαδελφία, φιλανθρωπία,	14	ἁμίαντος — καθαρός,	784
ἀγγέλλω, see κηρύσσω.		ἀναγγέλλω, see κηρύσσω.	
ἀγιάζω — καθαρίζω, ἀφορίζω (see also καθαρίζω, ἀγνίζω),	53	ἀνακαινίζω — ἀνακαινίζω,	323
ἅγιος — ἱερός, ὅσιος, σεμνός, ἄγνός,	36, 298	ἁνομία — ἁμαρτία,	434
ἀγνίζω — καθαρίζω, ἀγιάζω,	59	ἄνομος — ἄδικος, ἀνόσιος (see also ἄσεβής, ἄδικος),	433
ἄγνός, see ἅγιος.		ἀνόσιος, see ἄδικος, ἄνομος.	
ἀγωνία — φόβος,	608	ἀντίνομος, see παράνομος.	
ἄδης, see ἄβυσσος.		ἀντίτυπος, see τύπος.	
ἄδικος — κακός, πονηρός, ἄσεβής, ἀνόσιος (see also ἄνομος),	200, 326, 523	ἄνωφελής, see μάταιος.	
ἄϊδιος — αἰώνιος,	79, 611	ἀπαγγέλλω, see μαρτυρέω.	
αἰδώς — αἰσχύνη, δέος, σωφροσύνη,	612	ἀποκαλύπτω, see γνωρίζω, φανερώω.	
αἰρέομαι — ἐκλέγομαι, βούλομαι, θέλω, εὐδοκέω (see also εὐδοκέω),	613, 774	ἀποκατάστασις, see παλιγγενεσία.	
αἵρεσις — σχίσμα, διχοστασία,	614	ἀπολούω, see λούω.	
αἰρετίζω, see εὐδοκέω.		ἀπολύω, see ἀφήμι.	
αἴσθησις — ἐπίγνωσις,	620	ἀπόστολος, see κήρυξ.	
αἰσχύνη, see αἰδώς.		ἀρνέομαι — ψεύδομαι,	110
αἰτέω — δέομαι, ἐπιθυμέω, ἐρωτάω (see also προσεύχομαι),	71, 683	ἀρπάζω — κλέπτω,	648
αἵτημα — αἵτησις, δέησις,	73, 174	ἀρχηγός — αἴτιος,	117
αἴτιος, see ἀρχηγός.		ἄσεβέω — ἁμαρτάνω,	523
ἀκάθαρτος, see κοινός.		ἄσεβής — ἄνομος, ἄδικος, ἁμαρτωλός,	523, 857
ἀκοή — κήρυγμα,	82, 623	ἀσφαλής, see βέβαιος.	
ἀλήθεια — δικαιοσύνη,	86, 630	ἀφαιρέω, see καθαιρέω, καθυρίζω.	
ἀληθής — ἀληθινός,	84	ἄφεςις — πάρεσις,	297
ἄλλογενής — ἄλλοφύλος, ἄλλότριος,	150	ἀφίημι — ἀπολύω, ἀπαλλάσσω, συν-γινώσκω, παρίημι,	296
ἄλλος — ἕτερος,	89	ἀφορίζω — ἀγιάζω, ἐκλέγομαι,	805
ἄλλότριος, see ἄλλογενής.		Βαπτίζω, see λούω, ἀπολούω.	
ἄλλοφύλος, see ἄλλογενής.		Βασιλεύς — τύραννος,	131
		Βασιλεύω, see κυριεύω.	

	PAGE		PAGE
βέβαιος — στέρεος, ἀσφαλής, . . .	138	δόξα — φήμη, τιμή, . . .	206
βέβηλος — κοινός, . . .	140, 862	δουλεύω, see διακονέω, λατρεύω, λει- τουργέω.	
βδέλυγμα, see μίasma, σκάνδαλον.		δουλεύω — ἐργάζομαι, . . .	217
βίος, see ζήν, ζωή.		δοῦλος, see διάκονος, παῖς.	
βουλή — θέλημα, . . .	145	δύναμις, see ἐξουσία.	
βούλομαι — θέλω (see also αἰρέο- μαι), . . .	143, 726	Ἐγγυος — μεσίτης, . . .	222, 421
βωμός, see θυσιαστήριον.		ἔθνος — λαός . . .	226, 760
Γινώσκω, see ἐπιγινώσκω, νοέω, εἰδέ- ναι, συνήμι.		εἰδέναι — γινώσκειν, . . .	229
γνώμη — νοῦς, . . .	671	εἶδος — μορφή, . . .	230, 785
γνωρίζω — δηλώω, ἀποκαλύπτω, φανερώνω (see also φανέρον), . . .	677	εἰκόν, see ὁμοίωμα.	
γνώσις — σοφία, ἐπίγνωσις, . . .	156, 870	ἐκκλησία — συναγωγή, . . .	332
γνωστός — συγγενής, . . .	155	ἐκλέγομαι — αἰρέομαι (see also εὐ- δοκέω, προγινώσκω, ἀφορίζω), . . .	402, 774
γραμματεὺς, see νομικός.		ἐλεέω, see οἰκτεῖρω.	
Δέησις — προσευχή (see also αἷτημα), . . .	684	ἐλεημοσύνη — ἔλεος, δικαιοσύνη, . . .	711
δεῖ — ὀφείλει, . . .	683, 809	ἐλεήμων — οἰκτῖρμων, . . .	710
δεισιδαίμων — θεοσεβής, εὐσεβής (see also θρησκός), . . .	681	ἔλεος — χάρις, ἐλεημοσύνη (see also χάρις), . . .	248, 711
δέομαι, see αἰτέω, προσεύχομαι.		ἐλπὶς, ἐλπίζω — ὑπομονή, . . .	252, 712
δέος, see αἰδώς, φόβος.		ἐνδικος — δίκαιος, . . .	204
δεσπότης, see κύριος.		ἐνθύμησις, see ἔννοια.	
δέχομαι, see εὐδοκέω.		ἔννοια — ἐνθύμησις, . . .	439
δηλώω, see γνωρίζω.		ἐντολή, see νόμος, δόγμα.	
διακονέω — δουλεύω, λατρεύω, . . .	179, 889	ἐξουσία — δύναμις, . . .	236
διάκονος — δοῦλος, ὑπηρέτης, θερά- πων, λειτουργός, . . .	177, 764	ἔξω ἄνθρωπος — σάρξ, . . .	104
διαλέγομαι, see διαλογίζομαι.		ἐπαγγέλλομαι — ὑπισχνέομαι, . . .	27
διαλογίζομαι — διαλέγομαι, . . .	400	ἐπιγινώσκω — γινώσκω, . . .	159
διάνοια — νοῦς, . . .	438, 791	ἐπίγνωσις — γνώσις (see also αἷσ- θησις), . . .	159
διδασκαλία — διδασχὴ, . . .	182	ἐπιθυμέω, see αἰτέω.	
διδάσκω, see κηρύσσω.		ἐπίσκοπος, see πρεσβύτερος.	
διδασχὴ, see διδασκαλία.		ἐπιστήμη, see σοφία.	
δίκαιος, see ἀγαθός, ἔνδικος, καλός.		ἐπιστρέφω — μετανοέω, . . .	531, 440
δικαιοσύνη, see ἀλήθεια, ἐλεημοσύνη, κρίσις.		ἐράω, see ἀγαπάω.	
δικαίω, see καθαρίζω, κρίνω.		ἐργάζομαι, see δουλεύω.	
δικαστής — κριτής, . . .	200, 755	έρχομαι — ἤκω, . . .	263, 714
διχοστασία, see αἵρεσις.		ἐρωτάω, see αἰτέω.	
δόγμα, see νόμος.		ἔσω ἄνθρωπος — νοῦς, πνεῦμα, καρδία, . . .	104
δοκιμάζω, see πειράζω.		ἕτερος, see ἄλλος.	
		εὐαγγελιστής — προφήτης, διδάσ- καλος, . . .	34

	PAGE		PAGE
εὐδοκέω — θέλω, ἐκλέγομαι, αἰρε- τίζω, δέχομαι, προσδέχομαι, ἀγαπάω,	213, 175, 688	καταλλάσσω — ἰλάσκομαι, .	91, 801
εὐλογέω — εὐχαριστέω,	766, 903	κενοφωνία, see ματαιολογία.	
εὐσεβής, see δεισιδαίμων, θρησκός.		κήρυγμα, see ἀκοή.	
εὐχαριστέω, see προσεύχομαι, εὐλογέω.		κήρυξ — ἀπόστολος,	355
εὐχαριστία — εὐλογία,	904	κηρύσσω — ἀγγέλλω, ἀναγγέλλω, εὐαγγελίζομαι, διδάσκω,	355, 180
Zῆν, ζῶν — βίος,	270, 721	κλέπτω, see ἀρπάζω.	
Ηκω, see ἔρχομαι.		κληρονομέω, see κατακληρονομέω.	
Θανατόω, see νεκρόω.		κοινός — ἀκάθαρτος, βέβηλος,	361, 140, 320
θειότης, see θεότης.		κοινωνέω — μετέχω,	362
θέλημα, see βούλημα.		κολάζω, see νουθετέω.	
θέλω, see αἰρέομαι, βούλομαι, εὐδοκέω.		κρέας, see σάρξ.	
θεοσεβής, see δεισιδαίμων.		κρίνω — δικαιοῶ, λυτρώω, ῥύομαι, σώζω,	369, 753
θεότης — θειότης,	281	κρίσις — δικαιοσύνη,	371, 754
θεράπων, see διάκονος.		κριτής, see δικαστής.	
θεσμός, see νόμος.		κύριος — δεσπότης,	757
θρησκεία, see λατρεία.		κυριεύω — βασιλεύω,	757
θρησκός — δεισιδαίμων,	732	Λαός — ἔθνος,	760
θυμός, see ὄργη.		λατρεία — θρησκεία,	390
θυσιαστήριον — βωμός,	292	λατρεύω, see διακονέω, λειτουργέω, προσκυνέω.	
Ἰδέα, see μορφή.		λειτουργέω — λατρεύω, δουλεύω, διακονέω,	761
ἴδιος, see οἰκείος.		λόγος — ῥῆμα, λόγιον (see also μῦθος),	266, 890, 397, 715
ἱερός, see ἅγιος.		λούω — ἀπολούω, νίπτω, πλύνω, βαπ- τίζω,	406
ἰλάσκομαι, see καταλλάσσω.		λυτρώω, see κρίνω.	
ἴσος, see ὅμοιος.		Μαρτυρέω — ἀναγγέλλω (see also συμμαρτυρέω),	416
Καθαρίζω — δικαιοῶ, ἰλάσκομαι, ἀγιάζω, ἀφαιρέω,	317	ματαιολογία — κενοφωνία,	781
καθαρός, see ἀμίαντος.		μάταιος — ἀνωφελής,	418, 781
καινός — νέος,	321, 428	μεσέγγυος, see μεσίτης.	
καινὸς ἄνθρωπος — πνεῦμα,	105	μεσίτης — μεσέγγυος, ἑγγυος,	421, 222
καιρός — χρόνος,	324	μετανοέω — ἐπιστρέφω,	531, 792
κακός — ἄδικος, ποιηρός (see also ἄδικος),	325, 741, 842	μετέχω, see κοινωνέω.	
καλός — ἀγαθός, δίκαιος,	339, 743	μιαίνω — μολύνω,	782, 784
κανών — νόμος,	744	μίασμα — βδέλυγμα,	783
καρδία — ψυχή, πνεῦμα (see also ἔσω ἄνθρωπος),	343, 503	μνήμη, see συνείδησις.	
κατακληρονομέω — κληρονομέω,	361	μολύνω, see μιαίνω.	

	PAGE		PAGE
μορφή — είδος, ιδέα, σχῆμα (see also ὁμοίωμα),	422, 785	πέποιθα — πιστεύω,	829
μῦθος — λόγος,	786	πιστεύω, see πέποιθα.	
Νεκρός — τεθνηκώς,	426	πληρώω, see τελειόω.	
νεκρόω — θανατόω,	788	πλύνω, see λούω.	
νέος, see καινός.		πνεῦμα — ψυχή (see also ἔσω ἄν- θρωπος, καρδιά),	504
νίπτω, see λούω, βαπτίζω.		πονηρός — κακός,	325, 842
νοέω — γινώσκω (see also συνίημι), . .	428	πρεσβύτερος — ἐπίσκοπος,	513, 527
νομικός — γραμματεὺς,	788	προγινώσκω — ἐκλέγομαι,	160
νόμος — θεσμός, ἐντολή, δόγμα (see also κανόν, γράμμα),	429	πρόκριμα — πρόσκλισις,	378
νουθετέω — κολάζω,	441	προφήτης, see εὐαγγελιστής.	
νοῦς, see ἔσω ἄνθρωπος, καρδιά, διά- νοια, γνώμη.		προσάγω, see προσέρχομαι.	
Ξένος, see πάροικος.		προσδέχομαι — εὐδοκέω,	213, 688
Οἰκεῖος — συγγενής, ἴδιος,	446	προσέρχομαι — προσάγω, προσ- φέρω,	265
οἶκος, see πατριά.		προσευχή, see δέησις.	
οἰκτείρω — ἐλέω,	796	προσεύχομαι — εὐχαριστέω, δέομαι, αἰτέω,	719
οἰκτίρων, see ἐλεήμων.		πρόσκομμα, see σκάνδαλον.	
ὅμοιος — ἴσος,	798	προσκυνέω — λατρεύω,	755
ὁμοίωμα — εἰκών, μορφή,	802	προσφέρω, see προσέρχομαι.	
ὁμολογέω — συμφωνέω,	402	Ῥῆμα, see λόγος.	
ὀργή — θυμός,	460	ῥύομαι — σώζω (see also κρίνω), . .	515
ὀφείλει — δεῖ,	683, 809	Σαρκικός — σάρκινος,	521
ὅσιος, see ἄγιος.		σάρξ — κρέας, σῶμα (see also πα- λαῖος ἄνθρωπος, ἔξω ἄνθρ.),	844 seq.
Παγίς, see σκάνδαλον.		σέβομαι, see φοβούμαι.	
παῖς — υἱός, τέκνον, δούλος,	810, 891	σεμνός, see ἅγιος.	
παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος — σάρξ,	105	σκάνδαλον — παγίς, βδελυγμός, πρόσκομμα,	752, 839
παλιγγενεσία — ἀποκατάστασις,	670	σοφία — φρόνησις, σύνεσις, ἐπι- στήμη, γνῶσις,	870
παράβασις — ἁμαρτία, παρακοή, παράπτωμα,	120, 498	στέρεος, see βέβαιος.	
παρακοή, see παράβασις.		συναγωγή, see ἐκκλησία.	
παράνομος — ἀντίνομος,	789	συγγενής, see οἰκεῖος, γνωστός.	
παράπτωμα — παράβασις,	498	συνιγινώσκω, see ἀφήμι.	
παρεπίδημος, see πάροικος.		συνείδησις — σύνεσις, μνήμη (see also καρδιά),	233
πάρεσις, see ἄφεσις.		σύνεσις, see συνείδησις, σοφία.	
παρήμι, see ἀφήμι.		συνίημι — νοέω, γινώσκω,	299
πάροικος — παρεπίδημος, ξένος, . . .	447	συνμαρτυρέω — μαρτυρέω,	779
πατριά — οἶκος, φυλή,	473	σχῆμα, see μορφή.	
πειράζω — δοκιμάζω,	494		

	PAGE		PAGE
σχίσμα, see αἵρεσις.		Φανερῶ, see γνωρίζω, ἀποκαλύπτω.	
σώζω, see ῥύομαι, κρίνω.		φήμη, see δόξα.	
σῶμα, see σάρξ.		φιλαδελφία, see ἀγάπη.	
Τεθνηκώς, see νεκρός.		φιλανθρωπία, see ἀγάπη.	
τέκνον — υἱός, παῖς, . . .	891, 810	φοβέομαι — σέβομαι, τιμάω, . . .	898
τελείω — πληρῶ, . . .	740	φόβος — δέος, . . .	899
τιμάω, see φοβείσθαι.		φρόνησις, see σοφία.	
τύπος — ἀντίτυπος, . . .	544	φυλή, see πατριά.	
Τίος, see παῖς, τέκνον.		Χάρις — ἔλεος, . . .	572
ὑπηρέτης, see διάκονος.		χαριτόω — χαρίζομαι, . . .	576
ὑπισχνέομαι, see ἐπαγγέλλομαι.		Ψεύδομαι, see ἀρνέομαι.	
ὑπομένω, ὑπομονή, see ἐλπίς.		ψυχή, see πνεῦμα, καρδιά.	

III.

INDEX OF TEXTS IN THE N. T. SPECIALLY REFERRED TO.

	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
Matt. i. 19, .	189	Luke xxii. 37, .	542	Rom. v. 6, .	324, 526
" iii. 11, .	127, 128	John i. 1, .	14, 393 sqq.	" v. 7, .	3
" v. 9, .	246	" i. 18, .	730	" v. 10, .	91
" v. 21, 33, .	116	" i. 25, .	127	" v. 16, .	373
" vi. 11, .	239 sqq.	" i. 29, .	102, 619 sq.	" v. 19, .	311
" vi. 13, .	496, 511, 510	" iii. 3, 5, .	229	" vi. 5, .	571, 803
" vi. 23, .	564	" iii. 3, 7, .	106	" vi. 20, .	251
" viii. 22, .	418	" iii. 12, .	153	" vii. 6, .	217
" x. 32, .	401	" iv. 24, .	509	" viii. 3, .	377, 803
" xi. 12, .	142 sq.	" vi. 28, 29, .	256	" viii. 19, 22, .	381
" xi. 19, .	196, 555	" viii. 23, .	106	" viii. 19, .	177
" xii. 32, .	50	" viii. 25, .	114	" viii. 23, .	118, 537
" xii. 33, .	300	" viii. 32-36, .	250	" viii. 30, .	211
" xii. 36, .	259	" viii. 56, .	126, 229	" viii. 35, .	594
" xiii. 52, .	412	" x. 36, .	54, 562	" ix. 3, .	547
" xvi. 19, .	407	" xix. 28, .	543	" ix. 4, .	209
" xvii. 11, .	312	" xxi. 15 f., .	12	" ix. 22, .	461
" xviii. 18, .	407	Acts ii. 39, .	339	" ix.-xi, .	404
" xx. 28, .	408	" iii. 16, .	484	" x. 1, .	215
" xxiv. 29, .	219	" iii. 21, .	174, 312 sq.	" x. 4, .	542
" xxiv. 34, .	149	" vii. 6, .	94	" x. 17, .	82, 623
Mark i. 15, .	838	" xvii. 21, .	321 sq.	" xii. 1, .	396 sq.
" ix. 12, .	312	" xvii. 23, .	157	" xii. 2, .	325
" x. 45, .	408	" xviii. 25, .	275	" xii. 6, .	399
" xiv. 71, .	887	" xix. 1, .	412	" xii. 11, .	218, 275
Luke ii. 14, .	215	Rom. i. 3, .	52, 462	" xiv. 1, .	376
" ii. 32, .	343	" i. 17, .	271	" xv. 16, .	295, 763
" ii. 35, .	196, 555	" i. 19, .	156	1 Cor. iii. 22, .	137
" xi. 3, .	239	" i. 30, .	282	" iv. 8, .	137
" xii. 8, .	401	" ii. 15, .	258	" v. 7, .	290
" xvi. 8, .	201	" ii. 22, .	295, 735	" v. 6-8, .	723
" xvi. 10, 11, .	200	" iii. 23, .	207	" vi. 2, 4, .	374
" xvi. 16, .	141 sqq.	" iii. 25, .	298, 306	" vi. 18, .	537
" xviii. 7, .	289	" iv. 4, 5, .	258 sq.	" vii. 14, .	55
		" v. 5, .	16	" vii. 20, .	332

	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
1 Cor. viii. 4, .	708	Eph. ii. 2, .	238	2 Tim. iii. 16, .	731
„ x. 4, .	510	„ ii. 3, .	460 sq.	„ iv. 7, .	608
„ x. 13, .	106	„ ii. 6, .	226	Tit. ii. 13, .	279
„ x. 16, .	903	„ ii. 11, .	626	Heb. i. 3, .	118
„ xi. 10, .	237	„ ii. 12, .	281	„ i. 6, .	556
„ xii. 1, .	510	„ ii. 13, 17, .	223	„ ii. 5, .	447
„ xii. 28, .	386	„ ii. 15, .	205	„ ii. 15, .	218
„ xii. 31, .	443	„ iii. 13, .	73	„ v. 2, .	162
„ xiv. 6, .	343	„ iii. 14, 15, .	473 sq.	„ v. 7, .	387
„ xv. 29, .	128	„ iii. 19, .	837	„ v. 13, .	191
2 Cor. i. 11, .	459	„ iv. 20, .	410 sq.	„ vi. 1, .	427, 544
„ i. 21, .	140	„ iv. 23, .	428	„ vi. 2, .	129
„ v. 3, .	168	„ iv. 29, .	572	„ vi. 11, .	220
„ v. 7, .	231	„ v. 26, .	54, 266	„ vi. 12, .	29
„ v. 14, .	594	Phil. i. 9, .	620	„ vii. 19, .	253
„ v. 21, .	640	„ i. 15, .	215	„ vii. 22, .	222
„ vi. 9, .	159	„ ii. 6, 7, .	423, 649	„ vii. 26, .	327
„ vi. 17, .	687	„ ii. 7, 216, 353 sq.,	746	„ viii. 1, .	747
„ vii. 1, .	785	„ iv. 6, .	73	„ viii. 6, .	422
„ xi. 23, .	283	„ iv. 8, .	646	„ ix. 9, .	125
„ xii. 2, .	467	Col. i. 15, .	556	„ ix. 10, .	808
„ xii. 9, .	543	„ i. 24, .	839	„ ix. 10, 13, .	520
Gal. i. 4, .	309	„ i. 25, .	450	„ ix. 14, .	427
„ ii. 4, .	610	„ ii. 8, 20, .	878	„ ix. 22, .	71
„ ii. 11, .	675	„ ii. 9, .	539	„ x. 10, .	538
„ ii. 14, .	229	„ ii. 10, .	503	„ x. 15, .	416
„ iii. 2, .	624	„ ii. 12, .	484	„ x. 25, .	65
„ iii. 11, .	271	„ ii. 14, .	205	„ x. 26, .	100, 247
„ iii. 19, 20, .	421	„ ii. 17, .	539	„ x. 38, .	271
„ iv. 3, 9, .	879	„ iii. 5, .	820	„ xi. 1, .	248
„ iv. 4, .	879	„ iii. 10, .	160	„ xi. 11, .	123
„ iv. 5, .	60	1 Thess. v. 22, .	231	„ xi. 13, .	175
„ iv. 20, .	89	2 Thess. i. 11, .	215	„ xi. 17, .	685
„ iv. 22 sqq., .	97	„ ii. 6, 7, .	268 sq.	„ xi. 19, .	125, 658
„ iv. 22-31, .	250	1 Tim. i. 4, .	450, 671	„ xi. 27, .	351
„ v. 5, .	254	„ i. 7, .	790	„ xi. 29, 36, .	492 sq.
„ v. 24, .	876	„ i. 8, .	789	„ xi. 35, .	308
„ vi. 14, .	875	„ i. 18, .	606	„ xi. 39, .	29
Eph. i. 4, .	404	„ ii. 6, .	409	„ xii. 1, .	413
„ i. 10, .	450	„ v. 8, .	446	„ xii. 2, .	117
„ i. 11, .	358, 462	„ v. 17, .	182	„ xii. 23, .	556
„ i. 12, .	713	„ vi. 18, .	8	„ xiii. 15, .	771
„ i. 17, 18, .	439	2 Tim. ii. 13, .	477	Jas. i. 17, .	565
„ i. 23, .	501	„ ii. 15, .	886	„ i. 25, .	433

	PAGE		PAGE		PAGE
Jas. ii. 12, . . .	433	1 Pet. iv. 1, . . .	849	1 John v. 6, . . .	515
" ii. 19 sqq., . . .	485	" iv. 11, . . .	179	" v. 16, 17, . . .	285
" ii. 20, . . .	352	" iv. 15, . . .	528	" v. 18, . . .	99
" ii. 22 sqq., 257, 544		" v. 3, . . .	358	" v. 19, . . .	512
" iii. 17, . . .	376	" v. 12, . . .	631	2 John 9, . . .	606
" iv. 5, . . .	166	2 Pet. i. 1, . . .	193	Rev. i. 9, . . .	420
1 Pet. i. 2, . . .	602	" i. 3, . . .	110	" ii. 5, . . .	837
" i. 20, . . .	161	" ii. 12, . . .	162	" ii. 11, . . .	285
" ii. 2, . . .	396	" iii. 9, . . .	28	" iii. 1, . . .	418
" ii. 5, . . .	510	" iii. 18, . . .	78	" iii. 14, . . .	115
" ii. 9, . . .	132	1 John i. 5, . . .	565	" xii. 14, . . .	325
" ii. 19, . . .	234	" i. 7, 9, . . .	319	" xiv. 8, . . .	287
" iii. 12, . . .	130	" ii. 8, . . .	565	" xviii. 3, . . .	287
" iii. 18, . . .	61	" iii. 5, . . .	102, 619	" xx. 5, 6, . . .	307
" iii. 21, . . .	718	" iii. 9, . . .	99	" xx. 6, . . .	285

IV.

BIBLICO-THEOLOGICAL SUBJECTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
Allegory,	96	Death,	283 sqq.
Analogy of faith,	397	Demoniacal possession,	169 sqq.
Anathema,	547, 887	Diaconate,	179
Angel of Jehovah,	21	Earth, its relation to heaven,	152, 904
Angel of the seven churches,	19, 594	Ecstasy,	310, 397
Angels,	20 sqq., 115	Edification,	448
Antitype,	892	Election,	175, 214, 403 sqq., 775
Apocatastasis,	312	Eternity,	620
Apostolate,	530	Excommunication,	64, 547
Archangel,	24	Faith,	478 sqq., 831
Atonement,	302 sqq.	— in the O. T.,	480 sq., 833
See also <i>κατάρα, υπόδικος, ἔγγυος,</i> <i>ἀποθνήσκω, λύτρον, ἀντίλυτρον,</i> <i>ἀντάλλαγμα, ὀφείλημα, ραντίζω.</i>		Father as the name of God,	472
Ban,	64, 547	Fear of God,	898
Baptism of John,	127	Flesh,	69, 101, 518 sqq., 845 sqq.
Bishop,	865	Following Christ,	81
Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost,	50	Freedom, Christian,	251
Blessing,	769	Gehenna,	146
Blood of Christ,	69, 515	Gentiles and Jews,	223, 227
Book of Life,	665	Gift of tongues,	164, 680
Canon,	744	Grace,	574
Capporeth,	736	Guilt, see <i>παράβασις, ἄγνοια, υπόδικος,</i> <i>ὀφείλημα, παράπτωμα.</i>	
Church,	333 sq.	Hades,	2, 67 sq., 610
Circumcision,	884	Heart,	343 sqq., 504 sq.
Conscience,	6, 233, 341	Heaven,	465 sqq.
Consecration,	766 sqq.	Holiness,	35 sqq., 596, see <i>φῶς.</i>
Conversion,	531	— its relation to righteousness,	45
Corporeity and its import,	536 sqq.	— to love,	47
Covenant,	888	— of God in the N. T.,	50 sqq., 598
Cross of Christ,	875	Holy Spirit,	48 sq., 337 sq., 507 sq.
Crucifixion,	876	Hope,	252 sqq., 420
Darkness,	866	Idol,	706
Day of the Lord,	276	Idolatry,	709
		Inner man,	104

	PAGE		PAGE
Inspiration,	393, 397, 731	Resurrection,	307
Jehovah,	382 sq., 473	Righteousness,	191 sqq., 692
Joy,	590	Righteousness of God,	191
Justice, judgment,	199 sq., 754	Sacrifice,	291 sq.
Justification,	55, 193 sqq., 318	Saint, a designation of Christians,	51
Kingdom of God,	662	Sanctification,	56, 602
Kingship,	658	Scribe,	167
Lamb of God,	102, 112	Scripture, Holy,	165 sq., 665
Law,	89, 429 sqq.	Second death,	285
Leaven,	723	Son of man,	560
Letter and spirit,	166	Soul,	584 sqq.
Life,	272 sqq.	Spirit,	503 sqq.
Logos, The,	393 sqq.	— its relation to the soul,	506, 583
Lord's Supper,	536	— to the heart and conscience, 104, 504	
Love,	592	Sprinkling,	514
Mammon,	778	Substitution of Christ,	284, 291
Miracle of Pentecost,	163 sq.	Temptation,	496
Name of God,	277 sqq., 455 sqq.	Testament,	890
New man, The,	105	Threefold division of human nature,	585
Office,	180	Tongues, Gift of,	680
Old man, The,	105	Tradition,	787
Parables of Christ,	125	Truth,	629
Paraclete,	337	Twofold or threefold nature of man,	505, 536, 585
Peace, Christian,	244 sq.	Type,	892
Prayer,	720	Wisdom,	868
Presbyter,	513, 529 sq.	Word of God,	393, 397
Priesthood,	293 sq.	Works,	256 sqq.
Propitiation (see Atonement),	92	World,	366 sqq., 450
Regeneration,	148, 150, 225, 506, 670	Worship,	756
Repentance,	792	Wrath of God,	303, 460

V.

HEBREW WORDS REFERRED TO.

	PAGE		PAGE
אב	181, 470, 473	אלהים	270, 277, 278, 383, 455, 464 sq.,
אבר	451, 797		509, 708, 729
אברון	453, 712	אלהי צבאות	20, 21, 369
אביון	539	אלילים	170, 418, 708
אדם	103, 278, 559, 635, 732	אל שדי	455
אדמה	592, 904	אמה	702
אדון	382	אמונה	477, 480 sqq., 627 sqq., 831
אדני	382, 383	אמות העולם	368
אהב	10, 13, 592, 773	אמלל	746, 859
אהבה	592	אמן, Niph.	477, 480 sqq., 627 sqq., 829, 836
אהל מועד	414, 605	אמן, Hiph.	480 sqq., 627 sqq., 832, 836
אוח, Piel,	615, 733, 773	אמן	668
אוייל	790	אמן, Piel,	337
אולת	790	אמין	861
און	746, 781, 790	אמר	613, 715, 742
אור	564, 895	אמרי אל	397
אור, Hiph.,	895	אמה	85, 88, 627 sqq., 711
אות	454, 550, 628, 801	אנהש	103, 523, 629
אורה	447	אסף	63, 606, 828
אח	66, 223, 447, 502	אסר	205, 721
אחות	552	אף	287, 289, 733
אחוז	721	אפל	866
אחרון	268	אצל	223
אחרית הימים	75, 76, 268, 589	ארון הברית	552, 550
איב	746	ארך אף, Hiph.,	289
איד	797	ארף אפים	288
אימה	898	ארף רוח	289
אינקנא	236	ארץ	153, 446, 465, 904
איש	103, 502, 635	ארר	109, 640, 741
איש דברים	766	ארשת	729
אכזרי	712	אשם	162
אכל קרצא	120	אשם	162, 163, 435, 468, 498
אלה	108, 277, 639		

	PAGE		PAGE
אֶשְׁמָה	860	בְּרִיא	775
אֶשֶׁר, Piel,	778	בְּרִיָּה חֲדָשָׁה	322, 670
אֶשְׁרִי	777	בְּרִית	322, 549 sqq., 596, 665, 887 sqq.
אֶתָּה	714	בְּרִיךְ, Piel,	570, 770, 773
בָּנָה	764, 790	בְּרִיָּה	769
בָּרָא, Niph., 95;	Hiph. 805	בְּרִיָּה	770
בּוֹא	263, 264, 714	בֵּר	773, 775
בּוֹם	785, 823	בֵּשֶׁר, Piel,	33, 337
בָּשָׂח, בָּשָׂח	626	בִּשְׁרָה	31
בּוֹה	596	בִּשָּׂר	70, 103, 518 sqq., 729, 845 sq.
בָּחַן	628, 700, 896	בִּי יְהוָה	70, 612, 848
בָּחַר	403, 613, 615, 700, 733, 773	נָאָה	210
בָּחִיר	13, 17, 405	נָאָל	408, 516, 776, 785
בָּטָא	766	נָאָל	44, 409, 517
בָּטַח	253, 475, 712, 829	נָבֹר	219
בָּטַח	712, 829	נָבֹרָה	219, 394, 858
הָ בָטַחָה	831	נָדַע	751
בָּטָן	806	נָהַלָם	146
בֵּן	180, 299, 437, 441, 793	נָו	882
בִּינָה	Niph. 867; Hiph. 867, 882	נָוֵל	648
בֵּית, 293, 445, 473;	300, 440, 791	נָוִיָּה	882
בֵּית־אֵב	473, 446	נָוִי	94, 327, 597, 760
בִּבְרֹר	555	נָזַר	447, 795
בָּלַג, Hiph.,	588	נָזַרְל	357, 657
בָּלָה	817	נָזַר	883
בָּלִיעַל	790	נָזַל	590 sqq., 902
בָּמָה	292	נָלָה	342, 566, 747, 897
בָּנָה	448	נָר	265, 447, 690
בָּנִין	806	נָשָׂם	882
בָּן	554, 810, 891	נָשָׂה	387
בָּנִי and בָּן	555, 558 sqq.	דָּבָק	846
בָּנִי אֶדָם	560	דָּבַר, 18, 266, 267, 352, 375, 435, 714 sq.	
בָּנִי אֱלֹהִים	474	דָּבָר יְהוָה	393
בָּסַר	849	דָּבָרָא	394
בָּעַת, Piel,	126, 451, 640	דָּבִיר	306
בָּעִיר	902	דָּוִד	148
בָּעַע	778, 783	דָּוִן	183, 753
בָּקַשׁ, Piel,	716	דָּבָא, Piel,	882
בָּקַר, Piel, 869;	בָּקַרָה, 865	דָּבָא	539
בָּר	316, 559	דָּל	539, 859
בָּ' וְנִיָּאָה	339	דָּלִית	357
בָּרָא	380, 549, 653	דָּלָל	882
בָּרָה	549		

	PAGE		PAGE
דם,	70, 848	חבֵּלָה,	498
דמה,	674, 799 sq.	חבל,	357, 418, 589
דמיות,	236, 559, 802	חבֵּשׁ,	117
דעת,	300, 440, 620, 791	חבר,	364
דרך,	443, 822	חִבְר,	750
דָּרַךְ,	328, 440, 443, 444, 791, 900	חִבֵּר,	364
דִּירוֹר,	297	חִבְרָה,	364
דרש,	174, 255, 603, 684, 716, 863	חול,	826
הבל,	418, 708, 781	חדש, Piel, 323;	Hithp. 323
הדר,	210, 401	חֲדַשׁ,	322, 428
הוד,	52, 110, 646	חֲדַשׁ הָעוֹלָם,	670
חנה,	419	חוב,	468 sq., 809
הימנותא,	482	חוב,	469, 810
חליץ,	790	חֻכָּה,	469
חלץ, 714, 822 sq.,	Hithp. 644	חֻיֵּב,	468, 809 sq.
הלל, 790; Piel, 596, 823; Hithp. 212, 590,	823	הל, Hiph.,	388
	823	חזה,	393
המה,	724	חֹה,	393, 550, 887
המון,	724	חֹן,	897
הם,	388	חזק, 721, 758 sq., 862; Piel, 337, 386, 862	Hiph. 386; Hithp. 351
הפך,	880	חטא,	98, 101, 468, 633 sq.
זבח,	290, 291	חָטָא, 102, 523, 597, 857;	Piel, 318
זבח,	191	חָטָא,	285
זבל,	615	חָטָאת,	59, 98, 304, 434, 634, 781, 857
זָבוּ עֵץ,	60	חִירָה,	124
זוד, Hiph.,	858	חי,	270, 278, 722, 732, 892
זוד, 95,	94, 150	חיה,	270, 274, 588, 722, 905
זוי, 423,	119	חִיָּה,	739
זף,	463, 896	חִיִּים,	278, 564, 732, 905
זכא,	810	חיל,	220, 589, 778
זכה, 58, 195, 692 sq.;	Piel, 693	חכה,	782
זכות,	692, 832	חכם,	868 sq.
זפה,	857	חָכֵם,	867 sq.
זמן,	324	חִכְמָה,	167, 868 sq.
זמר,	883	חלב,	118
זנה,	881	חלה, 684, 741, 859;	Niph. 819
זעם,	640	הל,	48, 49, 141, 362
זמן,	513	חָלוּם,	278
זרע,	386	חלל, Piel, 48, 362;	Hiph. 388, 653, 790
זרח,	895	חָלָל,	141
זרק,	514	חִלְקָה,	301, 668
זכא, Hiph.,	743	חלק, Kal. and Hiph.,	150, 632, 670

	PAGE		PAGE
חלק	361, 379, 616	מהר, Piel, 59, 317;	Hithp. 59
חמור	733, 773	מהרה	59, 319
חמדה	775	מהור	58, 316, 463, 595
חמה	287, 733	מוב	208
חמל	247, 615, 710, 819	מוב	3, 85, 339, 340, 341, 640, 807
חמס	201, 434, 524, 696, 790, 857		Fem. 8
חמר	287	מל, Hiph.,	357
חמץ	723	ממא, 782;	Piel, 782
חנה	323	ממא	362, 595 sqq.
חן	248, 573, 575, 902 sq.	ממן	743, 778
חנם	417, 418	מעם	148
חנן, 249, 719, 796; Hithp. 174, 684, 779		מנף	784
חנן	710, 796	מרה	648
חנה	785		
חנה	190, 434, 523	אל, Hiph.,	653
חנפיה	785	ידר	657
חסד	711	ידה, Hiph.,	401, 767, 771
חסד	88, 210, 248, 249, 463, 481, 575, 711, 902	ידר	17
ח' ואמת	88, 629 sqq.	ידע, 155, 229, 299;	Hiph. 677 sq.
חסיד	37, 51, 387, 388, 463, 576, 629	ידעני	673
חסה	388, 475, 712, 829	יד רמה	162, 247
חסר	684, 726, 778	יהוה, 276, 278, 335, 382, 455, 580, 757	
חפץ	145, 213, 615, 726, 733	י צבאות	369, 382
חפץ	728 sq., 773	יחיר	655
חפר	715	יובל	297
חצה	616	יום, 114, 324;	י' יהוה, 176, 276, 383
חק	198, 373, 429, 549 sqq.	יחיד	17, 18, 150
חקה	198, 372, 373	יחל, Piel,	782
חקר	700	יחש, Hithp.,	671
חרר	898	יטב, 640;	Hiph. 808
חרה	746	יבח, Hiph.,	248, 421, 812
חרון	733	יכל	704
חרץ	862	ילד	147, 555, 810
חרם, Hiph.,	546 sqq., 887	ילוד אשה	147
חרם	47, 64, 547, 805	ימן יהוה	172
חרש, Hiph.,	625	יסר, Piel,	442, 812
חשב	388, 398, 400, 765	יטף	906
חשך	865 sq.	יפה	339
חשק	613, 733, 865	יטב, Hiph.,	628
חתם פשע	407	ירא, 278, 388, 522, 567, 756, 898	Niph. 567
חתת, 858;	Niph. 877; חתה, 898	יראת יהוה	525, 732
		ידר	822
טבל	126, 127, 784	ירה, Hiph.,	357, 657, 895

	PAGE		PAGE
ירש	360, 361, 721, 749, 757	לחן, Hiph.,	790
ירשה	360, 749	לח	815
יקר	210, 697	לחם הפנים	553
יקר שכניא	119	לחם חקנו	242
ישב	795	לכד	358
ישן	818	למד	180, 411
ישע, Hiph.,	516, 532, 882	לענאול	297
ישע	534 sq., 693, 882	לקח	619, 688, 721, 773
ישועה	532 sqq., 882	לשון אחרת	681
ישר, Piel,	640, 885	מאן, Piel,	728
ישר	107, 807	מאם	112, 701
ישר	85, 107, 184, 316, 387, 511, 641	מבטח	253, 712, 829
כבר, 210 ;	Niph. 211	מנקה	747
כבוד	150, 208, 210, 394	מגור	795
כבש	758	מגן	386
כחה	843, 906	מדע	233
כחן	132, 294, 295, 733 sq.	מדרש	665
כחנה	734	מחמון	779
כח, 807 ;	Hiph. 652 ; Piel, 652, 808	מחר, 344 ;	Piel, 829
כחב	352, 418, 781	מוג	902
כלה, 825, 883 ;	Piel, 828	מול	883
כלל Schafel,	652	מולה	884
כננה	799	מום	425
כנס	65	מונה = מן	779
כנע, Hiph.,	882	מוסר	814 sq.
כסה, Piel,	342, 743	מועד	324, 605
כסיל	790	מוקש	360, 752, 859, 862
כסף עבר	778	מור, Hiph.,	90
כעס	733	מורא	278, 900
כפר, Piel,	302, 317, 735	מוש	826
כפר	90, 302, 304, 320, 408, 776	מות	285, 732
כפרים	304, 317, 319	מות	732
כפרת	305, 736	מזבח	290, 291, 292
כרוזא	355	מזפה	440, 791
כרת	451, 549, 751, 883, 887	מחזה	712
כתב	665	מחלקת	616
כתב	205	מחר	239
לאה, Hiph.,	607	מחיר	632
לאם	760	מחשבה	439, 765
לב	344 sqq., 435, 437, 439, 905	מטמון	778
לכב	344, 435, 439, 905	מטרה	863
לחוח חביר	550	מימרא	394, 396
		מין	799, 800

	PAGE		PAGE
מִי נִדָּח	515	מִשְׁחָה	579 sq.
מִשְׁרִים	807, 887	מִשְׁחָה	76, 580
מִכְסָּה מִכָּס	882	מִשְׁל	653, 654, 757, 799
מִכְשׁוֹל	859	מִשְׁל	124, 657 sq.
מִלָּא	501 sq., 837; Piel, 883; מ' יָד, 840	מִשְׁרָח	177
מִלְאִים	883	מִשְׁפָּחָה	148, 445, 473, 668, 689
מִלְאָה	18, 19, 21, 121, 338, 568, 843	מִשְׁפָּט	183, 178, 199, 231, 372, 753, 813
	Plural, 170	מִשְׁתָּה	666, 685
מִלְאָכָה	256	מִשְׁתָּה	579
מִלָּה	375, 715	מִתּוֹם	359
מִלַּט	Piel, Niph., Hiph., 882	נָאֵם	383, 568, 897
מִלְצָה	124, 338	נָאֵן	570 sq., 596
מִלָּךְ	659 sq., 757	נָבִיא נָבֵעַ, נָבִיא	568 sqq.
מִלָּה	131, 659	נָבִיט	Hiph., 791
מִלְכֻת	136, 659 sq., 810	נָבֵל	300, 815
מִמְלַכַּת	132, 596, 659, 734	נָבֵלָה	882, 891
מִמּוֹן	778	נָגַד	Hiph., 338, 749
מִמְשָׁלָה	770	נָגִיד	654
מִנְדָּע	344	נָגַף	752
מִנּוּחַ	827	נָגַשׁ	224, 294, 705, 757
מִנְחָה	827 sq.	נָדָבָה	247, 402, 614
מִנְחָה	291	נָדָו	64
מִסָּה	496, 836	נָדִיב	524, 654
מִסְפָּכָה	887	נָדַר	719, 771
מִעוֹן	386	נָדַר	402, 719, 721
מִעַל	498, 638	נָחַ, 826;	Hiph. 361, 826, 829
מִעַל	309	נָחַ, 739;	Hiph. 739
מִעֲנָה	375	נָחַ, Hiph.,	805
מִפְקָד	527	נָחַ, Hiph.,	514
מִצּוֹחַ	198, 429	נָזִיר	56
מִצּוֹת	724	נָזַר	719
מִקְדָּשׁ	56	נָחַל, 358, 361, 721;	Hithp. 358, 361
מִקּוֹה	253, 420, 782	נָחַלָה	357, 358, 360, 552, 616, 749
מִקּוֹם	627 sqq., 662	נָחַם	Piel, 302, 304, 337, 339, 440, 710, 735; Niph. 440
מִקְלָט	806	נָטָה	657
מִקְרָא	332, 742	נָטָה, Hiph.,	123
מִרְאָה	207, 231, 559, 567	נָטַשׁ	881
מִרְדַּךְ	476	נָבִיא	905
מִרְחָה	475 sq.	נָבִיחַ, Hiph.,	546, 751
מִרְיָה	83, 181	נָבִיחַ, Hiph.,	150
מִרְדַּךְ	476, 523, 880	נָבִיחַ, Hiph.,	94, 150
מִשְׁבָּה	328	נָסַח, Piel,	494 sqq.
מִשְׁחָה	534		

	PAGE		PAGE
נער,	428, 740, 810	ערה,	63, 333, 334, 606
נפח,	330	עדות,	414, 549
נפל, Hiph.,	357, 497, 657, 684, 837	ערי,	364
נפלאות,	211, 220	עדר,	842
נפש,	504, 583, 905	עדר, Hiph.,	416
נצב,	737	עזה,	99
נצח,	882	עז,	386
נצל, Hiph., 516;	Niph. 882	עולם,	75, 79, 550, 620
נצר,	332, 516	על,	498, 790
נקי,	583	על,	790
נקר,	751	עלה,	434, 554
נקם,	183, 203	ען,	98, 319, 328, 434, 523, 696
נשא, 101, 174, 296, 300, 344 sqq., 459, 684		עור, Hiph.,	705
נשא נפש,	101	עז,	52
נשא עין,	101, 618	עז,	655
נשא פנים,	458 sq.	עור,	386
נשיא,	654	עורה,	386
נתן,	357, 575, 715	עורה,	293, 305
נתר, Hiph.,	407	עטף, Hithp.,	905
סבב, Hiph.,	880	עיה,	905
סבל,	102, 619	עלם, Hiph., 620, 790, 881;	Hithp. 846
סבר,	794	עלה, Hithp.,	905
סנלה,	242, 243, 281, 773	עם,	148, 227, 281, 760
סנר,	805	עמד, 705, 737;	Hiph. 706, 830
סוד,	788	עמית,	503
סוף,	882	עמל,	822
סור, 308, 615;	Hiph. 815, 880	ענה,	374, 375, 624, 882; Hiph. 741
סבל,	861	עני,	741, 882
סלח,	296, 301, 302, 735	עני,	525
ספד,	751	ענה,	357
ספר, Part., 167;	Piel, 26	עפר,	653, 904
ספר,	167, 433, 551, 664 sq., 789	עצבת,	859
סרד,	475 sq., 880	עצר,	605
סתר,	743, 880	ערב,	113
עבר,	389, 703, 762 sq., 881	ערבון,	113, 422
עבר, 811;	ע' יחזה, 692, 811 sq.	עריץ,	221, 434
עברה,	390, 703, 762	ערד,	891
עבר,	119, 550, 697	ערל,	362, 626, 885
Hiph. 26, 319, 615, 656, 703		ערלה, 626;	ע' לבב, 350, 626
עברה,	733	עשה,	220, 329, 372, 631
עד,	412, 779	עשק,	696
		עת,	324, 906
		עתיק,	817 sq.

	PAGE		PAGE
עתק, Hiph.,	817 sq.	עָלָא,	719
עתר,	684, 719	עָלָל,	724
		עָלָם,	236, 557, 708, 802, 892
פאר, Hithp.,	210, 212	עָפָה,	863
פּוֹנָל,	260, 783	עָר,	121
פּוֹדָה,	409, 719, 776	עָרַד,	121, 746
פּוֹדָת,	409		
פּוֹדָקֵן,	660	קבב,	640
פּוֹה,	715	קבץ,	606, 687 sq., 773
פּוֹה,	859	קָדְמָנִי,	117
פּוֹהַד,	277, 310, 898	קָדַשׁ,	38, 42, 47, 48, 595 sqq.
פּוֹטַט,	766		Piel, 54 ; Hiph. and Hithp. 602
פּוֹלָא, Niph.,	212	קָדַשׁ,	602
פּוֹלָט, Piel,	516	קָדַשׁ,	48
פּוֹלָטָה,	882	קָדַשׁ,	37, 38, 41, 42, 44, 464, 597
פּוֹלָטָה, Hithp.,	719	קָדַשׁ,	597
פּוֹלָטָהִים,	150	קָדַשׁ,	63, 65 ; Hiph. 63, 606
פּוֹנָה,	880	קָדַשׁ,	333, 334
פּוֹנֵי יְהוּדָה,	548	קָדַשׁ,	689, 781 ; Piel, 253, 689, 712, 781
פּוֹנִים,	458 sq., 565	קָדַשׁ,	369
פּוֹסֵל,	708	קָדַשׁ,	356
פּוֹסֵס,	290	קָדַשׁ,	705, 737
פּוֹעֵל,	628		Hiph. 225, 306, 550, 705, 739, 830
פּוֹקֵד,	527 sq., 863	קָדַשׁ,	705 ; Hiph. 705
פּוֹקֵדָה,	203, 528, 864	קָדַשׁ,	338, 604
פּוֹקֵד,	527	קָדַשׁ,	740
פּוֹרֵץ,	120, 861	קָדַשׁ, Piel,	109, 640, 741
פּוֹרַם,	356	קָדַשׁ,	108, 109, 640
פּוֹרַק,	660	קָדַשׁ,	76, 883
פּוֹרַקָלֵט,	338	קָדַשׁ,	117
פּוֹשֵׁעַ,	98, 308, 434	קָדַשׁ,	357
פּוֹשֵׁעַ,	98, 163, 434, 498, 523, 696, 858	קָדַשׁ,	688
פּוֹת,	453, 859	קָדַשׁ,	733
פּוֹתִי,	327	קָדַשׁ,	883
פּוֹתֵר,	378	קָדַשׁ,	344, 859
		קָדַשׁ,	344, 905
עבא,	219, 365, 762	קָדַשׁ,	330, 332, 355, 748
עָבָא,	20, 365	קָדַשׁ,	224, 704
עָדַק,	183, 187, 195, 690 sqq.	קָדַשׁ,	61, 265, 291, 294, 343, 705
	Hiph. 194, 195 ; Hithp. 195		Piel, 705, 773
עָדַק,	187, 191, 481, 630		Hiph. 61, 224, 265, 291, 330, 705
עָדַקָה,	198, 630, 693, 711	קָדַשׁ,	343, 344, 439
עָדִיק,	183, 524, 693 sq.	קָדַשׁ,	265, 291
עָיִים,	170	קָדַשׁ,	356

	PAGE		PAGE
קח	210, 525	רשעה	523
קשב, Hiph.	625, 862	רשת	859
קשה	861		
קשט	628	שאל	68, 610
קשי	862	שאל	715 sq., 733
		שאלה	73
ראה, 126, 229, 299, 567 sqq.	791, 895	שאלתא	130
ראש	117, 354, 654, 747	שאר	723
ראשון	268, 604	שאר	689
ראשית	76, 118	שבר, Piel	689
רב	789	שבת, 446, 825; Hiph.	828, 880
רבוי	181, 471	שבחון	827
רבי	181	שגנה	163, 247, 793
רבין	825 sqq.	שנה	162
רגל	445	שגיאות	498
רדה	653, 757 sq.	שנל	785
רח, 287, 344-350, 435, 504-509, 583, 733, 847, 852		שר	170
רחם, Hiph.	615, 805	שרי	465, 468
רע, Hiph.	749	שוא	418, 781
רחם	710, 796	שוב, 440, 531, 880; Hiph.	375, 828
רחם, Piel	249, 710, 773, 796	הש' פנים, 459; Piel	504
רחמים	711, 796 sq., 902	שום	546, 657, 688, 737, 891
רחץ	126, 406, 852	שום בל	607
רחצה	406	שום מעם	672
ריב, Verb	183, 195, 696	שות	891
ריב, Noun	198, 604, 753	שור	793
ריק	352	שוע	684
רמס	822	שהה, Hithp.	898
רנה	592, 684	שחיה	498
רנן	590	שחט	290
רע and fem., 326, 328, 329, 512, 842		שחת	543
רע, Hiph.	329, 741, 842	שמן	120, 121, 746
רע	502, 696	שכב	732
רעה	696, 741, 778, 841	שכינה	208, 394
רעה	840	שכל, 299, 793; Hiph.	437, 867
רפה	858	שכן	380, 826
רצה	175, 213, 688, 726 sq.; Hithp.	שלום, 37, 244, 245, 535, 628, 892 sq.	
רצו	176, 214, 248, 573, 641, 726, 902	שלח	19, 530, 877
רש	539	שלט, Hiph.	758
רשו	469	שליח צבור	19, 877
רשע, 100, 120, 512, 524, 741; Hiph.	7	שלף, Hiph.	357, 657
רשע	100, 434, 523, 741	שלם, 544; Hiph.	549, 631
רשע	102, 190, 201, 326, 434, 523, 857	שלם	543, 603, 882

	PAGE		PAGE
שְׁלֵמִים,	882	תְּהִלָּה,	110, 646
שֵׁם,	335, 454 sqq.	תּוֹכַחַת,	203
שְׁמוֹד, 797;	Hiph. 546	תּוֹחֶלֶת,	177, 315
שִׁמּוֹחַ,	666, 902	תּוֹלְדוֹת,	664, 668
שִׁמְפָּה,	297	תּוֹעֵבָה,	138
שִׁמְסִים,	464, 660 sqq.	תּוֹרָה,	429, 433, 435, 665
שִׁמְמָה,	797	תּוֹשֵׁב,	447, 690
שִׁמֹּן, Hiph.,	580, 843	תּוֹחֶנֶה,	684, 721
שִׁמְעַע, 476, 523, 623, 625, 660, 833		תּוֹחֲנוּגִים,	684
שִׁמְעָה,	18, 27, 82, 623	תּוֹחֲנוּת אֶרֶץ,	106, 153
שִׁמְרָה,	550, 624	תֵּלָה,	876 sq.
שִׁמְחָה,	64	תֵּלְמוֹד,	789 sq.
שִׁעָה,	906	תֵּלְמוֹד,	789
שִׁעִיר,	170, 418	תִּמָּם, 883;	Hiph. 107
שִׁעַן, Niph.,	827, 829	תָּם,	327, 463, 511
שִׁפְחָה,	702	תָּה,	107, 883
שִׁפְטָה, 200, 203, 370, 373, 653, 753, 755		תָּמָה,	327, 883
שִׁפְלָה,	539, 858 sq.	תָּמִינָה,	208, 423, 803
שִׁפְלָה רַחַ,	541	תָּמִים,	107, 426, 463, 543, 788, 883
שִׁקְרָה,	138, 708	תָּמִיד,	615, 652
שִׁקָּם,	826, 828	תָּמִינִים,	743, 797
שִׁקָּץ, Piel,	137, 783	תַּעֲב, Piel,	137
שִׁקָּר,	352, 434	תַּעֲבָה,	785
שִׁר,	24, 654	תַּפְּאֶרֶת,	213, 364
שִׁרְיָנִים,	357	תַּפְּלָה,	684, 719 sqq.
שִׁרְתָּה, Piel,	177, 294, 762	תַּפֵּשׁ,	758
שִׁשָּׁה,	592	תַּפֵּת,	146
תְּאֻדָּה,	346, 641	תַּרְדֵּמָה,	310, 509, 898
תְּאֻרָּה,	231, 786	תַּרְדֵּמָה,	805
תְּבִילָה,	447, 465	תַּרְפִּים,	708, 786
תְּבִנִית,	423, 557, 802 sq.	תַּשְׁוָּעָה,	532
תְּהִי,	781	תַּקָּה,	253, 315, 689, 712, 733, 782

T. and T. Clark's Publications.

'The best New Testament Greek Lexicon. . . . It is a treasury of the results of exact scholarship.'—BISHOP WESTCOTT.

GRIMM'S LEXICON.

Now ready, THIRD EDITION, demy 4to, price 36s.,

**GREEK-ENGLISH LEXICON OF THE
NEW TESTAMENT,**

BEING

Grimm's Milke's Clavis Novi Testamenti.

TRANSLATED, REVISED, AND ENLARGED

By JOSEPH HENRY THAYER, D.D.,

BUSSEY PROFESSOR OF NEW TESTAMENT CRITICISM AND INTERPRETATION IN THE
DIVINITY SCHOOL OF HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

'I regard it as a work of the greatest importance. . . . It seems to me a work showing the most patient diligence, and the most carefully arranged collection of useful and helpful references.'—THE BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER AND BRISTOL.

'An excellent book, the value of which for English students will, I feel sure, be best appreciated by those who use it most carefully.'—Professor F. J. A. HORT, D.D.

'This work has been eagerly looked for. . . . The result is an excellent book, which I do not doubt will be the best in the field for many years to come.'—Professor W. SANDAY, D.D., in *The Academy*.

'Undoubtedly the best of its kind. Beautifully printed and well translated, with some corrections and improvements of the original, it will be prized by students of the Christian Scriptures.'—*Athenæum*.

'It should be obtained even at the sacrifice of many volumes of sermons and homiletical aids. There is nothing so intellectually remunerative in ministerial life as foundation work of this kind. Without it no ministry can be solid and strong, nor can its results be profound and abiding. Rarely have Messrs. Clark laid our British Churches under deeper obligations than they have done by the issue of this noble and scholarly work.'—*Baptist Magazine*.

Just published, in Two large Vols. 8vo, price 18s. net,

OLD TESTAMENT THEOLOGY.

The Religion of Revelation in its Pre-Christian Stage of Development.

By PROF. HERMANN SCHULTZ, D.D., GÖTTINGEN.

AUTHORISED ENGLISH TRANSLATION

By PROFESSOR J. A. PATERSON, D.D.

'Professor Paterson has executed the translation with as much skill as care. . . . Readers may rely on his having given the meaning of the original with the utmost accuracy.'—*From the Author's Preface to the Translation*.

'The book will be read with pleasure, and, it need not be said, with profit, not only by professional students, but by all intelligent persons who have an interest in the Old Testament. . . . Though externally popular and of singular literary finish, the author's work within is a laborious and able study of the whole subject.'—Professor A. B. DAVIDSON, D.D.

'A standard work on this subject may be said to be indispensable to every theologian and minister. The book to get, beyond all doubt, is this one by Schultz, which Messrs. Clark have just given to us in English. It is one of the most interesting and readable books we have had in our hands for a long time.'—Professor A. B. BRUCE, D.D.

T. and T. Clark's Publications.

NOW IN COURSE OF PUBLICATION.

Parts I., II., III., and IV. ready, price 4s. net, each,

A NEW SYRIAC LEXICON.

BY DR. C. BROCKELMANN, Breslau.

WITH A PREFACE BY PROFESSOR T. NÖLDEKE.

NOTE.—The Parts will be issued in steady succession, and it is hoped that the publication will be completed (in about 500 pages) this year. The price (in parts) will probably not exceed 30s. A detailed Prospectus, with SPECIMEN PAGE, will be sent by the Publishers free on application.

'The appearance of a new Syriac Lexicon, designed to meet the wants of students, is an event of considerable importance for the progress of Semitic studies at home and abroad. The work, of which the first part has just been issued, will be welcomed on all hands as fulfilling what has long been the most conspicuous *lacuna* in Semitic bibliography. . . . The publishers have earned, and will certainly receive, the thanks of every Semitic student for thus coming forward to remove what had almost become a scandal to international scholarship, the lack of a student's dictionary of a language so important to the philologist, the historian, and the theologian.'—A. R. S. KENNEDY, D.D. (Professor of Oriental Languages in the University of Aberdeen), in *The Expository Times*.

In demy 8vo, price 7s. 6d.,

CANON AND TEXT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

BY PROFESSOR DR. FRANTS BUHL, LEIPZIG.

TRANSLATED BY REV. JOHN MACPHERSON, M.A.

. *Professor Buhl is successor to the late Prof. Franz Delitzsch, at Leipzig.*

'By far the best manual that exists on the subject of which it treats.'—Prof. A. B. DAVIDSON, D.D., in *The Expositor*.

'It would be difficult to find a more comprehensive, succinct, and lucid digest of the results of recent study of the Old Testament canon and text than is given in this volume. Instead of bewildering us with a crowd of discordant opinions, the author sifts the evidence and indicates the right conclusion. His tone is eminently free and impartial. He is no slave to tradition, and no lover of novelty for its own sake. The discussion in the text is kept clear by the relegation of further references and quotations to supplementary paragraphs. These paragraphs are a perfect mine of exact, detailed information.'—Prof. J. S. BANKS in *The Critical Review*.

Second Thousand now ready. Crown 8vo, price 2s.,

THE SUPERNATURAL IN CHRISTIANITY.

With Special Reference to Statements in the recent Gifford Lectures.

BY PRINCIPAL RAINY, D.D., PROFESSOR J. ORR, D.D., and

PROFESSOR MARCUS DODS, D.D.

WITH A PREFATORY STATEMENT BY PROFESSOR A. H. CHARTERIS, D.D.

'We have here a calm, masterly, and truly pious statement of the main positions of churchly Christianity. . . . This little book is intrinsically important; it is very timely; and we could wish that it were read by every minister of every church.'—Dr. W. ROBERTSON NICOLL in *The British Weekly*.

T. and T. Clark's Publications.

Now complete in Five Vols., 8vo, price 10s. 6d. each,

**HISTORY OF THE JEWISH PEOPLE IN THE
TIME OF OUR LORD.**

By **EMIL SCHÜRER, D.D., M.A.,**

PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF KIEL.

*First Division, in Two Vols., POLITICAL HISTORY OF PALESTINE, from B.C. 176
to A.D. 135.*

*Second Division, in Three Vols., INTERNAL CONDITION OF PALESTINE IN THE
TIME OF CHRIST.*

* * Prof. Schürer has prepared an exhaustive INDEX to this work, to which
he attaches great value. The Translation is now ready, and is issued in a
separate Volume (100 pp. 8vo). Price 2s. 6d. net.

'Under Professor Schürer's guidance, we are enabled to a large extent to construct a
social and political framework for the Gospel History, and to set it in such a light as to
see new evidences of the truthfulness of that history and of its contemporaneity.
. . . The length of our notice shows our estimate of the value of his work.'—*English
Churchman.*

'We gladly welcome the publication of this most valuable work.'—*Dublin Review.*

'As a handbook for the study of the New Testament, the work is invaluable and
unique.'—*British Quarterly Review.*

In demy 8vo, price 10s. 6d.,

**THE JEWISH AND
THE CHRISTIAN MESSIAH:
A STUDY IN THE EARLIEST HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY**

By **PROF. VINCENT HENRY STANTON, M.A., D.D.,**

TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

'Mr. Stanton's book answers a real want, and will be indispensable to students of the
origin of Christianity. We hope that Mr. Stanton will be able to continue his labours
in that most obscure and most important period, of his competency to deal with which
he has given such good proof in this book.'—*Guardian.*

'We welcome this book as a valuable addition to the literature of a most important
subject. . . The book is remarkable for the clearness of its style. Mr. Stanton is never
obscure from beginning to end, and we think that no reader of average attainments will
be able to put the book down without having learnt much from his lucid and scholarly
exposition.'—*Ecclesiastical Gazette.*

In demy 8vo, price 10s. 6d.,

**AN EXPLANATORY COMMENTARY ON
ESTHER.**

With Four Appendices,

CONSISTING OF

**THE SECOND TARGUM TRANSLATED FROM THE ARAMAIC,
WITH NOTES, MITHRA, THE WINGED BULLS
OF PERSEPOLIS, AND ZOROASTER.**

By **PROFESSOR PAULUS CASSEL, D.D., BERLIN.**

'A specially remarkable exposition, which will secure for itself a commanding
position in biblical literature. It has great charms from a literary and historical point
of view.'—*Sword and Trowel.*

'A perfect mine of information.'—*Record.*

'It is manifestly the ready expression of a full and richly stored mind, dispensing the
treasures accumulated by years of labour and research. . . No one whose fortune it is
to secure this commentary will rise from its study without a new and lively realisation
of the life, trials, and triumphs of Esther and Mordecai.'—*Ecclesiastical Gazette.*

T. and T. Clark's Publications.

In demy 4to, Third Edition, with Supplement, price 38s.,

BIBLICO-THEOLOGICAL LEXICON OF NEW TESTAMENT GREEK.

By HERMANN CREMER, D.D.,

PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF GRIEFSWALD.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN OF THE SECOND EDITION

By WILLIAM URWICK, M.A.

THE SUPPLEMENT, WHICH IS INCLUDED IN THE ABOVE, MAY BE HAD
SEPARATELY, price 14s.

TRANSLATOR'S NOTE.

SINCE the publication of the Large English Edition of Professor Cremer's *Lexicon* by Messrs. T. & T. Clark in the year 1878, a third German edition (1883), and a fourth in the present year (1886), have appeared, containing much additional and valuable matter. Articles upon important words already fully treated have been rearranged and enlarged, and several new words have been inserted. Like most German works of the kind, the *Lexicon* has grown edition by edition: it is growing, and probably it will still grow in years to come. The noble English Edition of 1878 being stereotyped, it became necessary to embody these Additions in a SUPPLEMENT involving the somewhat difficult task of gathering up and rearranging alterations and insertions under words already discussed, together with the simpler work of translating the articles upon words (upwards of 800) newly added. The present Supplement, extending over 323 pages, embodies both classes of additional matter.

To facilitate reference, a NEW and very copious INDEX of the entire work, *Lexicon* and Supplement, has been subjoined, enabling the student to consult the work with the same ease as the earlier edition, the arrangement of words by Dr. Cremer not being alphabetical save in groups, and requiring in any case frequent reference to the INDEX. Here at a glance it will be seen where any word is treated of in either Part.

One main feature of Dr. Cremer's additions is the consideration of the HEBREW EQUIVALENTS to many Greek words, thus making the *Lexicon* invaluable to the Hebraist. To aid him, the very full and important Hebrew Index, embracing upwards of 800 Hebrew words, and extending over several pages, is appended.

'It is not too much to say that the Supplement will greatly enhance the value of the original work; while of this we imagine it needless to add many words of commendation. It holds a deservedly high position in the estimation of all students of the Sacred tongues.'—*Literary Churchman*.

'Dr. Cremer's work is highly and deservedly esteemed in Germany. It gives with care and thoroughness a complete history, as far as it goes, of each word and phrase that it deals with. . . . Dr. Cremer's explanations are most lucidly set out.'—*Guardian*.

'It is hardly possible to exaggerate the value of this work to the student of the Greek Testament. . . . The translation is accurate and idiomatic, and the additions to the later edition are considerable and important.'—*Church Bells*.

'We cannot find an important word in our Greek New Testament which is not discussed with a fulness and discrimination which leaves nothing to be desired.'—*Nonconformist*.

In One large 8vo Volume, Ninth English Edition, price 15s.,

A TREATISE ON THE GRAMMAR OF NEW TESTAMENT GREEK, REGARDED AS THE BASIS OF NEW TESTAMENT EXEGESIS.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN OF DR. G. B. WINER.

With large additions and full Indices. Third Edition. Edited by Rev. W.
F. MOULTON, D.D., one of the New Testament Translation Revisers.

'We need not say it is the Grammar of the New Testament. It is not only superior to all others, but so superior as to be by common consent the one work of reference on the subject. No other could be mentioned with it.'—*Literary Churchman*.

T. and T. Clark's Publications.

WORKS BY PROFESSOR HEINRICH EWALD.

In demy 8vo, price 10s. 6d.,

OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT THEOLOGY.

By HEINRICH EWALD,

LATE PROFESSOR IN THE UNIVERSITY OF GÖTTINGEN;

AUTHOR OF 'THE HISTORY OF ISRAEL,' 'REVELATION, ITS NATURE AND RECORD,' ETC.

'Leading principles which can never be out of date enforced with the energy of genius.'—*Spectator*.

'Suggestive on every page, and therefore essential to every student of theology.'—*Record*.

'We have no scruple in characterising it as a noble and useful work, full of luminous and suggestive teaching. . . . No thoughtful or intelligent man can study it as it deserves to be studied without receiving from it both mental and spiritual stimulus, and being confirmed in the belief of the truth of the gospel of Christ.'—*Baptist Magazine*.

In demy 8vo, price 10s. 6d.,

REVELATION:
ITS NATURE AND RECORD.

CONTENTS.—Introductory: The Doctrine of the Word of God.—PART I. The Nature of the Revelation of the Word of God.—PART II. Revelation in Heathenism and in Israel.—PART III. Revelation in the Bible.

NOTE.—This first volume of Ewald's great and important work, 'Die Lehre der Bibel von Gott,' is offered to the English public as an attempt to read Revelation, Religion, and Scripture in the light of universal history and the common experience of man, and with constant reference to all the great religious systems of the world. The task is as bold and arduous as it is timely and necessary, and Ewald was well fitted to accomplish it. . . . The work has not simply a theological, but a high and significant apologetic value, which those who are called upon to deal with the various forms of modern scepticism will not be slow to recognise.'—*Extract from Translator's Preface*.

'Ewald is one of the most suggestive and helpful writers of this century. This is certainly a noble book, and will be appreciated not less than his other and larger works. . . . There is a rich poetic glow in his writing which gives to it a singular charm.'—*Baptist Magazine*.

In demy 8vo, price 8s. 6d.,

SYNTAX OF THE HEBREW LANGUAGE
OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

TRANSLATED FROM THE EIGHTH GERMAN EDITION

By JAMES KENNEDY, B.D.

'The work stands unique as regards a patient investigation of facts, written with a profound analysis of the laws of thought, of which language is the reflection. Another striking feature of the work is the regularly progressive order which pervades the whole. The author proceeds by a natural gradation from the simplest elements to the most complex forms.'—*British Quarterly Review*.

In post 8vo, price 9s.,

THE TEXT OF JEREMIAH;

Or, A Critical Investigation of the Greek and Hebrew, with the Variations in the LXX. retranslated into the Original and Explained.

By PROFESSOR G. C. WORKMAN, M.A.

WITH AN INTRODUCTION BY PROFESSOR F. DELITZSCH, D.D.

'The most painstaking and elaborate illustration of the application of his principles to this end that has yet been given to the world. . . . Scholars will hail it with gratitude, and peruse it with interest.'—*Guardian*.

T. and T. Clark's Publications.

In Twenty Handsome 8vo Volumes, SUBSCRIPTION PRICE £5, 5s.,

MEYER'S
Commentary on the New Testament.

'Meyer has been long and well known to scholars as one of the very ablest of the German expositors of the New Testament. We are not sure whether we ought not to say that he is unrivalled as an interpreter of the grammatical and historical meaning of the sacred writers. The Publishers have now rendered another seasonable and important service to English students in producing this translation.'—*Guardian*.

A Selection may now be made of any EIGHT VOLUMES at the Subscription Price of TWO GUINEAS. Each Volume will be sold separately at 10s. 6d. to Non-Subscribers.

**CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL
COMMENTARY ON THE NEW TESTAMENT.**

BY DR. H. A. W. MEYER,
OBERCONSISTORIALRATH, HANNOVER.

The portion contributed by Dr. MEYER has been placed under the editorial care of Rev. Dr. DICKSON, Professor of Divinity in the University of Glasgow; Rev. Dr. CROMBIE, Professor of Biblical Criticism, St. Mary's College, St. Andrews; and Rev. Dr. STEWART, Professor of Biblical Criticism, University of Glasgow.

St. Matthew's Gospel, Two Vols.; Mark and Luke, Two Vols.; St. John's Gospel, Two Vols.; Acts of the Apostles, Two Vols.; Romans, Two Vols.; Corinthians, Two Vols.; Galatians, One Vol.; Ephesians and Philemon, One Vol.; Philippians and Colossians, One Vol.; Thessalonians, One Vol.; Timothy and Titus, One Vol.; Hebrews, One Vol.; James and John, One Vol.; Peter and Jude, One Vol.

The series, as written by Meyer himself, is completed by the publication of Ephesians with Philemon in one volume. But to this the Publishers have thought it right to add Thessalonians and Hebrews, by Dr. Lünemann, and the Pastoral and Catholic Epistles, by Dr. Huther. So few, however, of the Subscribers have expressed a desire to have Dr. Dürstendieck's Commentary on Revelation included, that it has been resolved in the meantime not to undertake it.

'I need hardly add that the last edition of the accurate, perspicuous, and learned commentary of Dr. Meyer has been most carefully consulted throughout; and I must again, as in the preface to the Galatians, avow my great obligations to the acumen and scholarship of the learned editor.'—BISHOP ELICOTT in *Preface to his 'Commentary on Ephesians.'*

'The ablest grammatical exegete of the age.'—PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D.

'We have only to repeat that it remains, of its own kind, the very best Commentary of the New Testament which we possess.'—*Church Bells*.

In Three Volumes, demy 8vo, price 12s. each,

A HISTORY OF THE COUNCILS OF THE CHURCH.

VOL. I. To A.D. 325. VOL. II. A.D. 326 to 429. VOL. III. A.D. 431 to 451.

FROM THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENTS.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN OF

C. J. HEFELE, D.D., BISHOP OF ROTTENBURG.

'This careful translation of Hefele's Councils.'—Dr. PUSEY.

'The most learned historian of the Councils.'—Père GRATRY.

'A thorough and fair compendium, put in a most accessible and intelligent form.'—*Guardian*.

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY

H&SS
B
117

